might happen in 1956, if the special interest groups follow the same policy of election expenditures as in 1950, 1952, and 1954. No greater cloud hovers over the American system of free elections and representative Government than the fact that money is beginning to play such an important part in the elections of Presidents, Congressmen, governors, and other State officials. I read where Chairman Hall, of the Republican National Committee, has already admitted that $2 million worth of television time has already been signed. Five million dollars in addition has been raised by the Salute to Eisenhower meetings. There has not been revealed the added millions that will be derived from sources which brought about the great Republican campaign expenditures of 1950 and 1952. As of now, the Democratic Party has been unable to even talk to broadcasting companies regarding television and radio time because of a barren campaign budget.

I know the farmers of Indiana and America are very anxious to get the true facts as to why the Republican campaign promises of 1952 were completely reversed and they received the rural bankruptcy plan of Benson in 1953 and 1954. Apparently in the fall campaign the only television and radio time the Democratic Party will have available to inform the farmers of the true facts involved will be during the 6 a. m. milking hour. On the other hand, the only factual information labor can receive over television and radio as to why the Eisenhower promises of 1952 were not carried out will be the broadcasts at the 4 a. m. change of shift in factories throughout America. National Democratic Chairman Butler's plan to equally divide radio-television time would be a great step forward in enabling the American voter to decide this election on factual information in the true record of both parties. It is highly necessary that to preserve this free republic the Congress take steps to prevent buying of elections through tremendous campaign funds. The American people must know the true facts and issues in this coming campaign and unfortunately, it costs millions to bring this information to the people. The public is entitled to know what is going on in their Government and one of the unfortunate ways to prevent this information from going into the precincts are the fabulous campaign expenditures provided by special privilege groups to buy up radio, television, newspaper, magazine, and all other forms of advertising mediums.

Congress should take steps and take steps now to prevent money from being the deciding factor in the presidential and congressional elections of 1956.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. K. Gebhart, president, the Southwest Ohio Synod Evangelical and Reformed Church, Hamilton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who art the Creator of all things, and yet the Heavenly Father of all people, we humbly bow before Thee, in thankfulness and petition, as the deliberations of this day begin.

For all those who have served our country in the past, we give Thee our thanks. For those who serve it in this hour, we ask Thy blessing. Pour out from heaven a special portion of Thy courage, wisdom, light, and guidance unto those who serve it within these hallowed walls of this Congress.

May we as officials in government, as humble citizens at home, not be as reeds shaken in the winds of doubt and confusion, but help us, O God, that in Thy strength we shall be as a house built upon the rock of Thy eternal word. Guide us into all useful living, that the record of our life span may contain these words, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

In the name of Jesus we pray. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.; and

H. R. 7156. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah; and

H. R. 8320. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7030. An act to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDING SECTION 208 (B) OF THE TECHNICAL CHANGES ACT OF 1953

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2667, an act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 (Public Law 287, 83d Cong.), with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 8, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions from the gross estate for expenses, indebtedness, and taxes) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (d) to be subsection (e) and by adding after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Certain State death taxes:

"'(1) General rule: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) (1) (B) of this section, for purposes of the tax imposed by section 2001, the value of the taxable estate may be determined, if the executor so elects before the expiration of the period of limitation for assessment provided in section 6501, by deducting from the value of the gross estate the amount (as determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses described in section 2055 or 2106 (a) (2). The election shall be exercised in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(2) Condition for allowance of deduction: No deduction shall be allowed under paragraph (1) for a State death tax specified therein unless the decrease in the tax imposed by section 2001 which results from the deduction provided for in paragraph (1) will inure solely for the benefit of the public, charitable, or religious transferees described in section 2055 or section 2106 (a) (2). In any case where the tax imposed by section 2001 is equitably apportioned among all the transferees of property included in the gross estate, including those described in sections 2055 and 2106 (a) (2) (taking into account any exemptions, credits, or deductions allowed by this chapter), in determining such decrease, there shall be disregarded any decrease in the Federal estate tax which any transferees other than those described in sections 2055 and 2106 (a) (2) are required to pay.

"'(3) Effect of deduction on credit for State death taxes: See section 2011 (e) for the effect of a deduction taken under this subsection on the credit for State death taxes.'"

After line 8, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 2011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding after subsection (d) a new subsection as follows:

"'(e) Limitation in cases involving deduction under section 2053 (d): In any case where a deduction is allowed under section 2053 (d) for an estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed upon a transfer for public, charitable, or religious uses described in section 2055 or 2106 (a) (2), the allowance

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of the credit under this section shall be subject to the following conditions and limitations:

"'(1) The taxes described in subsection (a) shall not include any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax for which a deduction is allowed under section 2053 (d).

"'(2) The credit shall not exceed the lesser of—

"'(A) the amount stated in subsection (b) on a taxable estate determined by allowing the deduction authorized by section 2053 (d), or

"'(B) that proportion of the amount stated in subsection (b) on a taxable estate determined without regard to the deduction authorized by section 2053 (d) as (i) the amount of the taxes described in subsection (a), as limited by the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, bears to (ii) the amount of the taxes described in subsection (a) before appylying the limitation contained in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"'(3) If the amount determined under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) is less than the amount determined under subparagraph (A) of that paragraph, then for purposes of subsection (d) such lesser amount shall be the maximum credit provided by subsection (b)'.

"SEC. 4. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 made by sections 2 and 3 of this act, and provisions having the same effect as this amendment, which shall be considered to be included in chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, shall apply to the estates of all decedents dying after December 31, 1953."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill (H. R. 2667) and the Senate amendments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2667, as it passed the House, amended section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 by making that provision applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947, instead of to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1950. This change was thought necessary because section 208 of the act had permitted for estate-tax purposes the tax-free release of certain powers of appointment of discretionary trust if the grantor was under a mental disability for a continuous period of not less than 3 months beginning before December 31, 1947, and ending with his death. The provision did not extend relief to a grantor under such a disability who died after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1951.

The Senate, in acting on this legislation, amended the bill to include an amendment that had been previously added as an amendment to H. R. 6887 by the Senate in the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6887, as it passed the House, provided an extension for 1 year of the time in which income resulting from the discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation could be excluded from gross income.

H. R. 6887 was amended by the Senate to provide for the following situation: Existing law measures the deduction for charitable bequests by the amount which the charity actually receives. Therefore, if a State imposes a tax on the charitable bequest and the State tax must be paid from the charitable bequest, the Federal estate-tax deduction permissible because of the charitable bequest is diminished by the amount of the State tax and the amount of the Federal estate tax increased accordingly. If the additional Federal estate tax thus produced must also be paid out of the charitable bequest, the charitable deduction will be reduced again in turn and the estate tax correspondingly increased, with a resulting pyramiding of tax on tax. The combination of State tax and Federal tax thus imposed results in the dissipation of a large part of the bequest intended by the testator for charitable purposes.

The Senate amendment was designed to prevent this pyramiding by granting a deduction for Federal estate-tax purposes for the amount of an estate, succession, legacy, inheritance tax imposed by a State upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses described in section 2055 of the 1954 code.

After the adoption of the bill, as amended, by both Houses of Congress, the President indicated his disapproval of the amendment, stating that while he was sympathetic to the objectives of the amendment, certain defects had caused him to reluctantly withhold his approval. The Senate has reconsidered the amendment and incorporated in H. R. 2667 substitute provisions which meet the objections raised by the administration. I urge that the Senate amendment be agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the amendment added by the other body to H. R. 2667 was approved with minor variations last session by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means. As the distinguished chairman of our committee has explained, the amendment last year was the subject of a memorandum of disapproval from the President. The President's disapproval was based solely upon certain technical deficiencies in the language of the amendment and was not based upon the merits of the proposal. It is my understanding that the language in the amendment now before us meets these technical objections. In view of this fact, I join in asking that the House concur in the amendment.

TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939 TO PROVIDE A CREDIT AGAINST THE ESTATE TAX FOR FEDERAL ESTATE TAXES PAID ON CERTAIN PRIOR TRANSFERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7054) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "'transferor')", insert "who was the spouse of the decedent at the time of such person's death and".

Page 2, line 8, strike out "six months" and insert "two years".

Page 3, line 3, strike out "6 months" and insert "two years".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill (H. R. 7054) and the Senate amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7054, as it passed the House, added a new section to the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that an executor of an estate could elect to take a credit against the estate tax for the amount of tax paid on property passing to a decedent from a person who died within 6 months prior to the decedent's death. In addition, the bill provided that those claiming such a credit should forgo any deduction for previously taxed property allowed by section 812 (c) of the 1939 code. The new section was made available with respect to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1951, and before August 16, 1954.

The Senate amendments extend the time from 6 months to 2 years in which the two deaths must occur in order to obtain the election and provide that the person from whom the property passed to the taxpayer must be the taxpayer's spouse. I urge that the Senate amendments be agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill (H. R. 7054).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7054 is a bill sponsored by my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative BAKER.

Very simply, it corrects a very severe hardship wherein a small estate has been subject to two Federal estate taxes within a period of less than 6 months. The Senate amendment simply increases the 6-month period contained in the House bill to 2 years. I ask that the House concur in this amendment.

AMENDING THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I think the gentleman from Louisiana might well explain to the House exactly the action the Armed Services Committee took and the effect of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill has one single purpose: It deletes subsection (d), section 262, of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. At the present time a man entering the National Guard, a volunteer for active duty for training purposes, the committee found had been receiving the pay of E–1, which is $78 a month. The man, however, who for 6 months' training purposes enters the Army Reserve or Navy Reserve or any part of the Federal Reserve receives only $50 per month. We have the situation now of one man in active 6-months training getting from the National Guard $78 a month and another person from the Reserves getting $50. This bill would eliminate this inequity and give the enlistee in the Reserve for training purposes under the 6-months provision of the bill we passed last year $78, the pay of an E–1 soldier.

Mr. ARENDS. In other words, this bill merely equalizes the pay of these individuals who enter the six months' training program and then go into the National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Federal Reserve soldier gets $50; the trainee from the National Guard gets $78. This will equalize the pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does this equalization business reduce anyone's pay?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; it merely equalizes the pay of all the buck privates going in under this 6-month program.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.) is hereby amended by deleting subsection (d) thereof.

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. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to extend my remarks at this point on the subject of the development of the Reserve program.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a great many questions have been asked within recent weeks regarding enlistments under the terms of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which I sponsored through the Congress last year. I am glad to be able to report substantial progress is being made in obtaining enlistments under this new Reserve program. The encouraging feature is that enlistments are increasing week by week almost without exception, and by next June the Congress may learn that we have obtained a substantial portion of the goals allotted for the building of our Reserve program.

I include a chart giving the figures for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps:

Enlistments for Army under Reserve Forces Act

ARMY

	Sec. 261, 6-year Reserve enlistment, 2 years' active duty	Sec. 262, 8-year Reserve enlistment with 6 months' training	Sec. 263 (b), incentive program
August	67	65	3
September	453	779	13
October	548	1,243	60
November	670	1,644	86
December	774	2,341	102
January (estimated)	980	2,370	180
Total	3,492	8,442	444
Army grand total		12,378	

MARINE CORPS

August	----------	0	0
September	----------	124	0
October	----------	297	22
November	----------	253	19
December	----------	151	19
January (estimated)	----------	250	40
Total	----------	1,075	100

NAVY

Navy figures do not lend themselves to a monthly breakdown. Since the bill was signed into law under the program the Navy has enlisted under sec. 261 through Dec. 31, 1955, a total of 15,343. The Navy is averaging around 3,000 a month under sec. 261.

NOTE.—The figure that is given under sec. 262, that is 8,442 for the Army and 1,075 for the Marines, is not the figure of the enlistees who are actually in training at the present time in the 6 months' program because many of these have been deferred because of high school enrollment.

From week to week the Defense Department has given me reports showing the current enlistments in the Army. I am happy to be able to report that these enlistments are steadily climbing at the rate of almost 150 persons each week under this new Reserve program. I believe by the end of this month we may be obtaining for the 6 months' training program alone some 1,800 persons per month.

From the chart and explanation set forth above it appears the Marine Corps has an excellent chance of obtaining its yearly quota enlistment under the Reserve active duty training program, which quota has been set at 5,500. Already the marines have obtained more than 1,000 enlistments and they are steadily climbing.

The Navy enlistment program falls under section 262 of the law, which permits enlistments in the Reserve forces for 6 years, coupled with 2 years of active duty in the Navy, with an average of more than 3,000 per month. We can gain tremendous encouragement from the response given to the Navy appeal.

The difficult part of the program, of course, lies in the Army. At the rate these enlistments are climbing, however, there is still hope that before the end of the fiscal year the Army may have obtained a large percentage of its quota for enlistments generally and especially for its quota under section 262 for 6 months' active duty training.

NEWS RELEASES BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE WEEKS

Mr. PRESTON. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is second only to Secretary Benson of Agriculture in maintaining poor relations with the legislative branch of the Government. The most recent example of his ineptness was brought to light this morning when it became known through press circles that Mr. Weeks, aided and abetted by Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Louis S. Rothschild, released the list of Federal aid to airport projects in the various congressional districts approved for the remainder of the current fiscal year, through the National Republican Committee where advanced tips are being given to Republican national committeemen and to selected Republican Members of Congress in order that they might claim credit for having obtained Federal funds for local airports.

This action would not seem so strange if it were not for the fact that in 1954 this administration undertook to destroy the Federal aid to airport program by requesting no funds for it in the President's budget. It was revived by an amendment which I offered on the floor of the House to the Commerce Department appropriation bill providing $22 million to reinstate the program which was overwhelmingly adopted by the Democratic-controlled House.

Secretaries Weeks and Rothschild have clearly demonstrated their political contempt for Members of Congress of the majority party by their conspiracy to claim credit for a program this administration undertook to destroy. In other words, they deny parenthood but are willing to adopt the child.

When congressional indignation became apparent this morning to the Commerce Department, they hastily announced that the program would be announced at 11:45 today at a press conference at the Department of Commerce, and that copies of the program listing various projects would be available on Capitol Hill at 12 o'clock noon.

To say the least, we on this side of the aisle shall not be quick to forget this sort of political shenanigan.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia who just addressed this body.

The gentleman from Georgia is chairman of the subcommittee that handled this program, is he not?

Mr. PRESTON. I am.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman from Georgia have this list?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not.

Mr. BOGGS. Does any member of the gentleman's committee have this list?

Mr. PRESTON. They do not.

Mr. BOGGS. Where did the gentleman get his information that the Republican National Committee has the list?

Mr. PRESTON. I telephoned the Public Relations Office of the CAA after hearing reports to this effect and was advised that they had nothing to release on it, that they had received repeated calls from members of the press who stated to them they have been advised by the national committee of these various projects.

Mr. BOGGS. Was it not the work of the gentleman that made possible this existing program, and I refer to the gentleman and the other members of his subcommittee?

Mr. PRESTON. And supported by a majority of Democrats and a good many Republicans.

Mr. BOGGS. I submit this is an amazing piece of political propaganda.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FEIGHAN. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday the Committee on the Judiciary presented immigration bills in a new manner. Previously each separate immigration bill had been presented on the floor of the House. Under the new system all bills that are in a particular category will be grouped together, as they were last Tuesday, and presented on the floor of the House. In the report the number of each bill will be given together with the names of the sponsor and the beneficiaries. The Committee on the Judiciary will notify each Member of the action taken on his bill.

This has been done for the reason that it will relieve a burden on the President to sign so many individual bills and it will take less time on the floor of the House.

BRIGHT OUTLOOK FOR AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPPING ON GREAT LAKES-OVERSEAS ROUTE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning's announcement that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Seaway—the shipping route between Great Lakes ports and those of Western Europe—has been declared an essential foreign-trade route, carries an encouraging promise for the future of American-flag shipping on this vital waterway.

This determination by the United States Maritime Administration opens the way for American ship operators to receive operating-differential subsidy, provided in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, for service on this vital avenue of commerce.

At present, Great Lakes shipping—as well as shipping between Great Lakes ports and overseas destinations—is very active and growing in volume. However, there are no American-flag vessels operating between the Great Lakes ports and Western Europe. That entire commerce is carried in foreign-flag vessels.

The decision of the Maritime Commission will give American shipping considerable opportunity to compete with foreign-flag vessels in carrying trade between America's heartland and Western Europe. It will provide assistance to American shipbuilders, and American ship operators. It will mean brighter prospects for Milwaukee's outstanding shipbuilding and port activities.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this important development will speed up congressional action on pending legislation providing for the improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels. I am equally hopeful that it will expedite the necessary surveys of Great Lakes port facilities, and prompt carrying out of the required dredging and related projects. These steps are necessary to complete the opening of the Great Lakes to ocean shipping.

Now that the Great Lakes-Western Europe route has been officially declared essential to our Nation, we must move rapidly ahead in the directions I have just outlined. There should be no delays, no procrastination. The full opening of our great heartland to world commerce, in which American-flag shipping can play its proper role, is a paramount need of our day.

MARITIME LABOR STABILITY

Mr. BONNER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries made extensive field studies and conducted hearings on the difficult and complex problems of labor-management relations in our maritime industry.

In the course of these studies, it developed that collective bargaining agreements between different seagoing labor groups, longshore labor groups, and management organizations on the east and west coasts of the United States expire on June 15 and September 30 of each year. The lack of a common expiration date has plagued the maritime industry for years. Strangely enough, both management and labor leaders have recognized this and have stated publicly their support for the establishment of a common termination date. And yet, no real effort has been made to agree upon a satisfactory date. Accordingly I recently undertook to get the parties together in my office.

It is not my desire to have the Merchant Marine Committee interfere in labor negotiations. That is certainly not the function of any congressional committee. But, somebody had to take the initiative, and it seemed to me a natural followup on the extensive work we had done in this field.

I was gratified with the completely objective approach which both management and labor took at the conference. They readily agreed that a uniform date was desirable. The date decided upon, August 1, was selected only because it is halfway between the two dates when the contracts now expire, June 15 and September 30.

If the New York Shipping Association concurs in the date, the road will be open for maritime labor and management to begin an era of unparalleled stability in the industry. I am hopeful that the two great leaders of the seagoing unions, Mr. Joseph Curran and Mr. Harry Lundeberg, will see their way clear to accepting this new date for their contracts, as well. It is my intention to meet with them at the earliest opportunity.

CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW VETERANS' HOSPITAL IN THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and amazed to hear last evening on the radio a statement which was attributed to the Office of Defense Mobilization. The statement was to the

effect that the ODM was opposed to the construction of a veterans' hospital in the metropolitan Washington area. The reason given for such a stand was that this is a vital area, vulnerable to enemy attack. It was further reported that the ODM called for dispersal of veterans' hospitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us follow this trend of thought—that is the dispersal of veterans' hospitals—to its logical conclusions. If veterans' hospitals are not to be located in any large, urban, industrial areas because of the vulnerability to enemy attack it means that there will be no hospital services available to the veterans in these areas, the very veterans who contributed so much to the great industrial strength of our Nation. It would mean that a large proportion of the labor force in such industrial centers as Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Baltimore, and San Francisco would be without the facilities which a grateful people and a grateful Congress have determined to be rightly theirs. By the same token, it would mean that the veterans living in the area of the Capital of the greatest of free nations—which freedom they fought for—would be denied these facilities. Mr. Speaker, you may be able to disperse veterans' hospitals but you cannot disperse veterans.

While ODM is calling for the dispersal of veterans' hospitals they have not seen fit to raise their voices against the rather arbitrary attitude taken by the CIA in demanding that its junior Pentagon be located only a stone's throw from the White House. They have not protested against a proposed new State Department Building in the city of Washington. Let them be consistent but above all let them remember that veterans are human beings and are not to be treated as steel plants.

The situation in the metropolitan Washington area is deplorable. Mt. Alto, the only veterans' hospital in the area, was built many years ago as a girls school. It is totally inadequate to meet our needs. We need a new hospital and we need it in this area. The veteran population of this area is tremendous.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this type of thinking will not prevail and that this Congress will authorize and appropriate the money requested to construct a new veterans' hospital in this area.

FRANK COLLINS, BOY SCOUT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was given to me one of the great thrills of my experience here as a Member of Congress. I was a breakfast guest of a large and prestiged party that included an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and many others representative of the highest in governmental, civilian, and religious activities. But for Members of the Congress it was the most exclusive affair to which I have been invited during my terms in this body.

No Member of Congress got to that breakfast on his own merits. He was invited there because a young man in his district had rendered the outstanding service to God and country that gave to his Congressman the distinction of being a guest there. I owe my invitation to the service, the devotion, the quality of high character of Frank Collins, selected as one of the 12 outstanding Boy Scouts of the United States. I owe much to Frank Collins, as also does the Second Congressional District of Illinois, to which he has brought this distinction and for which he has set a pattern of good citizenship.

Frank is 17 years old and he resides with his parents at 5543 Dorchester Avenue, Chicago. He is an Eagle Scout and Explorer of Post 2512, sponsored by the Hyde Park Methodist Church. I know that the members of that church must be very happy that a member of the unit sponsored by them has been chosen as one of the 12 outstanding Boy Scouts of the Nation. It is a signal honor. Never before has a member of the Boy Scouts in Chicago been given this most enviable honor.

Frank began as a Boy Scout in December 1947, and achieved Webelos rank. He is a lodge chief of the Order of the Arrow. He participated in 36 days of rugged camping at the Philmont Scout Ranch in 1953, attended the Second National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America at Valley Forge in 1950 and also took part in the Eighth World Jamboree last August at Ontario, Canada. He attends Hyde Park High School, where he is president of the Conservation Club and photographic editor of the school annual. How proud and happy the faculty and teachers at Hyde Park must be with this great honor attained by a Hyde Parker.

Frank is a holder of the God and country award. He had 8 years of perfect attendance at Sunday school and is president of the Methodist Youth Fellowship. I especially congratulate and commend this young man for his regularity in attendance. I am sure that if when he is older he is elected to the Congress he will hold to the same rule of regularity in attendance and end up with a perfect record on rollcalls including quorum calls.

He was one of eight Explorers selected to accompany the submarine *U–505* from Montreal to Cleveland. He has built up a mineral collection as his intellectual hobby and on leaving Hyde Park High School intends to study civil engineering.

Here in Washington we have many affairs to which we are invited because we are Members of the Congress. This was a breakfast where being a Member of Congress did not count. Frank Collins earned the invitation for me, and I was never so honored as when I sat by his side, he who had earned for his Congressman this invitation by his own fine service as a good citizen.

Under the slogan "Onward for God and my country," the Boy Scouts are marching on to meet the challenge of these times. As I sat at that breakfast table listening to Frank and the other honored 11 Boy Scouts I could not escape the thought that here in this great Scout movement was the answer to the juvenile-delinquency problem. If our newspapers would give less space to the sensationalism of teen-age gangs and more space to what the Boy Scouts are doing in ingraining in young minds the tenets of good citizenship and the precepts of religion, it seems to me that we would have a much more accurate picture of the American youth of today.

My hat is off to Frank Collins, to his fellow Scouts, to the dedicated leadership of the Boy Scout movement and to all the youth of America which, given the chance, will prove itself and prepare for a better tomorrow.

LEAKING INFORMATION AT THE CAA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my deepest sympathy to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] who was shocked by the fact that the New Dealers here in the executive departments broke down the other day and gave Republicans some information about what was going on. Heretofore they have been withholding that information. These hold-overs, these New Dealers, have channeled that information to the Democrats. Now it seems that someone—it was not I—learned something about what was going to happen in his district and took a little advantage of it. That is terrible, to give us any information. I hope hereafter they will give us some more.

ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Adminstration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 526) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri explain this joint resolution and the necessity for it?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will be happy to.

Most of the Members will recall that a few years ago we provided for the

purchase of electrical office equipment for use in the offices of the Members. We included in that legislation officers of the House and committees of the House, under the same restrictions as individual Members.

This joint resolution would remove the officers of the House and the committees of the House from these limitations. Many of the committees have many subcommittees, and because of this they find it impossible to furnish their subcommittees with sufficient electrical equipment under the law now in effect. We are asking that the committees and the officers of the House be removed from that limitation.

The other change is that we would provide for the use of electric typewriters as standard equipment in offices where they are desired, up to a limit of two machines, which would not be charged to the Member's electrical-equipment account. In the case of those Members who now have electric typewriters charged to their electrical equipment, that charge would be removed. Members who now have manual typewriters and who feel that the work of their offices could be expedited and done more effectively and efficiently with electric typewriters could have up to two of those machines without their being charged to the electrical-equipment account.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is true, of course, that all Members may have two electric typewriters now if they are willing to have them charged to their equipment account; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is correct, yes sir.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution just removes that restriction?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We are removing that part of the restriction, yes sir.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does it seem necessary?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Many Members came before our committee and indicated that while, perhaps, it is not necessary, it is desirable. I think with the progress that has been made in the development of office equipment, we have found over the years that electric typewriters have become the generally accepted efficiency machine. May I say for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa who served on the committee with me, as he knows I was opposed to the first legislation which set up this equipment account.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As I was also.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. And I made certain predictions of what I thought would happen. As a member of this subcommittee, I have tried to bring about not only efficient operation but also more economical operation, and I will continue to do so. I do not want to leave the impression that this is not going to cost some additional money, but we also find that in the conduct of many offices there are added expenses coming along at all times.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What the gentleman says is correct, that he and I stood together in minority, I think, in opposing the electric equipment proposition when it was first inaugurated.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I would like to know will the committee staff, the minority members of the staff, under this have an opportunity to get electric typewriters?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would presume that any staff would have the opportunity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but the minority, for example, on our committee where we have some 50 employees, we have 2 minority out of 50 and they are both operating with manual typewriters. We would just like to catch up with the other 40.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I suggest the gentleman talk to his chairman and I am sure that if it is found to be necessary, he will get the typewriters.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is the understanding we are going to get some; is it not?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think it is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 526

Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives," approved March 25, 1953, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (a)), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(b) Subsection (b) of the first section of such joint resolution, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The value of equipment furnished under this section, together with the value of any equipment purchased under House Resolution 318, 82d Congress, which may be in use in the office of a Member at any one time shall not exceed $2,500. For the purposes of this subsection the value of any article of equipment shall be deemed to be the cost thereof less depreciation, determined in accordance with rules or regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration."

(c) Subsection (c) of the first section of such joint resolution, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (c)), is amended by striking out ", officer or committee."

(d) Subsection (d) of the first section of such joint resolution, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 112a (d)), is amended by striking out ", officer, or committee."

SEC. 2. Such joint resolution approved March 25, 1953, is further amended by renumbering sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 as sections 4, 5, 6, and 7, respectively, and by inserting immediately after the first section thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 2. In addition to the electric typewriters which may be furnished under the first section of this joint resolution, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, upon request of any Member, shall furnish for use in the office of such Member not to exceed two electric typewriters.

"SEC. 3. The cost of electrical or mechanical office equipment furnished under this joint resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives."

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.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

WASHITA RIVER BASIN RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 363) providing for the consideration of S. 180, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 363 will make in order the consideration of the bill, Senate 180, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

House Resolution 363 provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on the bill itself.

Construction of this project would provide for storing floodwaters to meet the needs for irrigation and for municipal and industrial water supply. The detailed plan of development is set out in House Document No. 219 of the 83d Congress.

The estimated project costs total $40,600,000. The cost allocated to irrigation would be repaid without interest

under the 50-year principle in reclamation law. The amount assigned to be repaid by the irrigation water users would be returned in a period of not more than 55 years, exclusive of any development period. The cost allocated to municipal water would be repaid in 50 years with interest at the same rate which the Federal Government pays on its long-term loans. Municipal water payments to the Federal Government would continue so long as the costs of irrigation works are unpaid.

Irrigation benefits from construction of the works which would be authorized are estimated to be $750,000 annually. The flood-control benefits are estimated to be $734,000 annually.

I hope the rule will be adopted so that the House may proceed to the consideration of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill S. 180 for the Washita project. In looking over the report on this bill, I am struck by the fact that a substantial portion of the project has to do with flood control. In the congressional district which I represent we have lately, in December of this past year, suffered terrific flood damages. Six of the seven counties I represent are declared disaster areas, so we know something about floods. We know the value of any legislation which will help in the way of flood control.

There was no objection on our side in the Committee on Rules to the adoption of this rule, and I hope the House will adopt it without delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 180, with Mr. ABERNETHY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] and his associate, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], on the other side have outlined the general purport of this project. This is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project in Oklahoma.

The bill we have before us, S. 180, was passed by the Senate on May 2, 1955, without any opposition, it being sponsored in that body by Senator KERR and Senator MONRONEY. The House hearings were held on a similar bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The Department of the Interior has filed with our committee a favorable report on this legislation, which appears, for those who desire to look at it, on page 7 of the committee report. There are several letters in the latter part of the report because of certain discussions which occurred with regard to the allocation of the funds for this project as between municipal water supply, irrigation, flood control, and so forth. But the key statement made by the Secretary of the Interior is on page 7, in which he says in his letter of June 30, 1955, to Mr. ASPINALL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

> Our review of these documents indicates that the amendments suggested in our letter of May 25, starting on page 2 thereof, and numbered (1) through (4), inclusive, have been covered in S. 180.

The Secretary in a previous letter dated May 25, 1955, approved the project subject to certain amendments being adopted which, as indicated in his letter of June 30 of the same year, have been incorporated in the Senate bill which is before us.

The Bureau of the Budget has also approved the legislation, and their letter appears on page 6 of the report and more particularly at the top of page 7. The Bureau of the Budget, through Mr. Belcher, the Assistant Director states:

> Accordingly, enactment of S. 180 would be without objection only if it is amended to conform to the Secretary's modified project report of July 28, 1953, and the conditions set forth in the above-mentioned letters.

Which, of course, is to be read in conjunction with the statement made by the Secretary of the Interior in his letter.

Another significant fact about this legislation is that the President of the United States in his budget message of last year recommended the appropriation of $500,000 for this project even prior to the time the project was authorized. That matter appears on page 3 of the report as follows:

> It is proposed to initiate construction of the Washita project, Oklahoma * * * in the fiscal year 1955, when authorized. The Washita project is needed to store water for municipal use and possible future irrigation development and for flood protection. * * * An amount of $500,000 is included in the budget as an estimated 1955 supplemental appropriation for these projects.

As I say, it is rather unique for the Bureau of the Budget to approve funds for a project prior to the time the project is actually authorized by the Congress, but it demonstrates, in my opinion, the general support which this project has not only in the Congress but also in the executive branch of the Government.

The cost-to-benefit ratio of this project—rather, to state the case the other way, the benefit-to-cost ratio—is 1.6 to 1, and almost that on direct benefits, because irrigation in this project is not the most substantial feature of it.

The need for this project I think is demonstrated by some of the photographs that you can see if you step out in the Speaker's lobby where there are pictures of the terrible floods. The erratic distribution of the rainfall in the area to be protected by this project is the factor that causes these floods to occur. The map before the committee at this time shows the relationship of the project to the State of Oklahoma—that is shown by the small insert; possibly some of you may not be able to see that because it is small, but the general physical features of the project are indicated on the map which is hanging here to my right.

The committee report on page 1 deals with the need for this project:

> Because of lack of dependable groundwater supplies, cities and industries have had difficulty in obtaining municipal and industrial water and must depend upon surface water sources.
>
> Within the last 20 years crop production in the Washita Basin has been, on the average, reduced by 50 percent because of the drought conditions. At the same time, many cities and towns in the project area have been forced to curtail water use even for domestic purposes. During the summers restrictions have been imposed and enforced by heavy penalties for violation of water-use limitations fixed by ordinances. Construction of the works authorized by this legislation would provide for storing the floodwaters which have resulted in extensive damage and later using these waters to meet the urgent needs for irrigation and for municipal and industrial water supply. The works authorized would be beneficial to fish and wildlife and would meet an important need in the area by providing recreational facilities.

I think this project indicates a format of which we are going to see more as time goes along, and that is that instead of the single-purpose flood-control projects, we are going to build these as multiple-purpose projects in order to catch the floodwaters and save this floodwater for subsequent use.

An examination of the pictures on the outside in the Speaker's lobby will indicate the devastating damage that occurs in this area by reason of the erratic nature of the storms and the waterflow in that area. Yet these people are so hard up for water in the summertime that they have penalties in the municipal ordinances if they wash their cars or water their lawns at the wrong time.

We have seen that same situation in California in the last few months where $150 million of damage was done in one flood; yet next summer we will be so dry that large areas will be in desperate need of water. We have to catch and hold these floods and use the water in the succeeding summer months.

The difference between a single purpose flood control project and a multiple purpose flood control irrigation, municipal water project is this: You have to

build them bigger. If you build a single purpose project that will hold 350,000 acre-feet of water for flood control, that water then has to be released immediately after the flood and gotten out of the way so that the flood storage will then be available to catch a new flood. If a project is going to be used to catch the water and hold it, it has to be big enough to catch one flood and be ready also perhaps to catch all or parts of another.

On the American River development in California, we first planned the Folsom project for 350,000 acre-feet. That was regarded as a mistake because that stream is one of the major sources of water for summertime use. So the project was expanded to a million acre-feet, keeping the 350,000 acre-feet for flood control storage and adding twice again as much for irrigation and municipal uses. This year we had a flood, but it happened that the dam was empty or practically empty because it had just been completed. That dam contained nearly a million acre-feet of flood water and saved the city of Sacramento, our State capital, from going under flood which would have caused damage at least equivalent to the cost of the project. It has been stated by the Army engineers and by other water authorities in California that the Folsom project completed this year has already paid for itself so far as its flood control benefits are concerned.

As I said, this is the same kind of a proposition in this area stricken by these terrible floods. It would cost $20 million to build a single-purpose flood-control project. This project will cost $40 million. But on the allocation of benefits, the allocation for flood control is $15 million; therefore, $5 million of that allocation goes into these repayable benefits that come back to the Federal Government. Instead of building a single-purpose flood-control project that costs $20 million, and that eventually we would have to build anyway, this committee proposes, and I think this is going to be the format that we will see more and more throughout the country, we are going to build this a little bigger. The people are going to pay back the money used to supply municipal water. In this instance it will be something like $13 million. These people in the muncipalities agree, incidentally, that if the irrigators do not go ahead and use any part of these works for irrigation, the municipal water users will pick up the amounts which are allocated in the main structure, that is, in dams for the benefit of irrigation. The municipal water supply constitutes about $12½ million of this project. So, as a consequence, we get a project here which is beneficial to this area in two ways.

It is beneficial because it serves the flood-control needs of the area, and it is beneficial because it makes available to this area, which is in desperate need, water for the common necessities of life, making that water available to them, not only for the period of the payout of this project but for year and years after that.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, several years ago I had a project known as the tridam project that I tried to get through the House in 1953, but I could not get the approval on the Democratic side to let it pass through the Congress unless this particular project was also coupled with it. We were unable to accomplish that because of resistance on both sides of the aisle. Personally I am heartily in favor of this project. The chairman of the Interior Committee of the House is probably the pioneer in recommending these multiple-purpose projects. He will remember that when the Folsom Dam was first inaugurated, it was a flood-control project. Senator Downey and myself had bills put in and testified to its utility for flood-control benefits. Then later on we had the Engle bill, and it was my pleasure to join with my colleague from California to see that the multiple-purpose project rather than Folsom Dam, as a flood-control dam would be enlarged to a multiple-purpose project. I also think that the record ought to show that the one who really brought the Departments together, the Interior Department and the Army engineers, was our Governor, Earl Warren. These departments were fighting each other over jurisdiction, and the Governor got them in his office and literally bumped their heads together and said, "You better find a way to get along together, not only to stop floods but to conserve water." For that reason I think any project of this kind that we can put on the books will be a splendid investment. This last year we have had the most disastrous year, I think, in the whole history, almost, of our country in having very devastating floods in all parts of the Union. I am very happy to support this bill, and I want to congratulate my colleague on the Armed Services Committee the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], who is the author of this bill, and I hope that the bill passes by a unanimous vote.

Mr. ENGLE. I would like to comment on what my friend from California has said, with particular relevance to there being any partisan connotation so far as I am personally concerned with respect to the tridam bill which was before our committee and of which he was the author in the last year or so. There has been, and as long as I am chairman and can prevent it, there will be no consideration of these beneficial water projects on a partisan basis. I would like to say that the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, the ranking minority member of our committee, has cooperated with me and I with him in getting out good and beneficial projects. A week from today we will have the Ventura project, which is sponsored by our friend from California, Mr. TEAGUE. We voted out the other day, authored by the ranking minority member and former chairman of our committee, Dr. MILLER, the Ainsworth project. The Fryingpan project, which is sponsored by Judge CHENOWETH, of Colorado, has been voted out. Last year I recall we had one for our colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] and one for our colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and just the other day we voted out the Wapinitia project in Oregon for the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. So, I just cite the record in order that there cannot be any doubt on that point. We take these projects as they come, and we vote on the merits, and we realize that if we do not work together, especially in our great arid West, to build these necessary projects, we are not going to get them built.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman will yield further, I did not intend to say that there was partisanship on the gentleman's side alone. It was there on both sides. I could not get them to join in in support of the two projects and agree that each one would be passed. Consequently, both projects failed of passage in 1953. The tridam project had the approval of the President, the Interior Department, the House and Senate Interior Committees, and yet it failed of passage.

Mr. ENGLE. I am not so sure that they could have been joined.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not criticizing the gentleman's committee. I have had excellent treatment from the gentleman's committee and from the other committees. The gentleman knows that I am not a partisan Member of Congress. I try to figure out what I think is the right thing to do and do it.

Mr. ENGLE. I believe that is true of the gentleman—that he does try to figure out what is the right thing to do and then tries to do it.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McVEY. I have been interested in the gentleman's excellent presentation of this subject. I wonder if the gentleman has figures on what the ultimate cost of this project will be when completed.

Mr. ENGLE. When it is completed?

Mr. McVEY. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. The cost as shown by the reports, which the gentleman will find on the last page of the committee report, is $40,600,000. There is a breakdown there. There is something over $11 million for irrigation, $12 million for municipal water, $15 million for flood control, $839,000 for fish and wildlife, and $550,000 for recreation.

That may not be what it will cost, because the irrigators have 10 years to implement their part of the authorization, which permits them to build some irrigation works. If they do not do that, then all of this irrigation authorization of $11,378,000 will not be used. Approximately $3 million of it will be in these dams. The municipal water users will pick that up and pay it. But it would reduce the total cost of the project to about $32 million, all of which would be repaid with interest, save the interest on the $3 million. And it would reduce the amount for flood control from $20,500,000, which would be the cost of building this project as a single-purpose flood-control project, to the allocation made

here, which is $15 million. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McVEY. Yes, sir. I think this is a very worthwhile undertaking.

Mr. ENGLE. As a matter of fact, this way of doing it brings the Federal Government out ahead of where it would be if we built just a single-purpose flood-control project.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would explain to the House what type of land will be brought into production on this irrigation project, and the type of products raised. In other words, is it the intention here to build an irrigation project which will produce more surpluses to be piled up on the surpluses we already have?

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that the area which would be irrigated here is already in farm operation. We are not going out and bringing in virgin lands. But the water on the land will change the crop characteristics to some extent and to the extent that it does change the crop characteristics it will move in the direction of going away from those items which have caused us the most trouble, like wheat and corn, and move in the direction of irrigated pasture, and things like that, which have caused us the least amount of trouble. I might say that there has not been a very great demonstration of interest, so I understand, in the building of these irrigation features up to this point. That is why the bill provides that these areas will have 10 years in which to make up their mind. But I emphasize that this project does not add to the total area in production. The land is already in production. To some extent it will change the pattern of production, and for the better so far as our surpluses are concerned. Less wheat, for instance, and more irrigated pastures and row crops.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. There is included a sizable item for irrigation, $11 million. There is $15 million for flood control and approximately $11 million for irrigation. That is quite an inducement to them to get into irrigation. So I want to renew the question asked by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY]; what kind of crops are they going to grow on this land?

Mr. ENGLE. They have to pay back the $11 million; do not forget that.

Mr. GROSS. I heard the gentleman state that.

Mr. ENGLE. They are not getting a gift that would represent any inducement to them.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of crops are going to be grown on this land?

Mr. ENGLE. I understand that the crops at the present time are primarily wheat and corn. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] if that is not correct?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If the gentleman will yield to me, yes, wheat and cotton and corn. A lot of this area is similar to the area of the W. C. Austin project which is about 50 or 60 miles away. It will grow carrots, spinach, asparagus, okra, onions, and many vegetables; considerable alfalfa. It will probably take out of production a lot of the cotton and wheat and corn which are in surplus. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is right in asking that question. It does not bring in any new reclamation projects. This particular land is suitable for irrigation and much of it is being irrigated at this time by pumps with water out of the river. This project is one of nine similar irrigation, reclamation, and flood control projects. They are multipurpose projects. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa there is no power involved in this project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], has explained quite thoroughly the provisions of the bill which is presently before us, S. 180.

There are some amendments the committee adopted. I think the gentleman from California brought out the fact that in the 83d Congress there was some controversy over two or three similar bills. There was some controversy over this particular bill at that time, and there was some controversy this year, with some members of the committee raising questions about the production of surplus crops, and about bringing more land under production. They are items that naturally worry people when there are surpluses on hand.

I call attention to the fact that just 11 years ago we had a committee in this House investigating shortages of food. On that committee was one of our former colleagues, Mr. Pace, of Georgia, the chairman; the now Senator from New Mexico, Mr. ANDERSON; Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota; and I am not sure but that the gentleman sitting in the chair was a member of that committee. But 8 or 10 Members of this House were investigating shortages of food, of wheat, corn, chickens, pork, and beef. If you want some reading that is rather interesting, get the 4 or 5 reports made by that committee and just let your mind drift back 10 and 11 years ago, when there was a shortage of food. I warn you this shortage could occur again.

The question has been raised here about what might be raised on that land. I think the report shows that 36 percent of the land had been planted to wheat. That was on the Foss project alone. We do not irrigate wheat. So we will not raise wheat, that is then less wheat to add to the now existing surplus.

You will have more alfalfa grown and other crops that are not in surplus. Indeed, less than 1 percent of the corn and wheat is grown on irrigation projects of the 27 million acres of irrigated land under Federal control. Less than 1 percent is added to the crops that are presently in surplus. So I would not worry too much about what will be produced.

Yes, there was some opposition and some questions were raised in the 83d Congress. I think it was wise to hold the measure up until we could adopt some amendments. I believe those amendments have been adopted in the bill as it is at the present time.

May I read the amendments first and then ask the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], if they were adopted.

The Department of the Interior in their letter of May 25, 1955, which you will find on pages 4, 5, and 6 of the report, suggested that certain amendments be adopted. On page 6 they suggest that an amendment be adopted to section 2 (b) to provide a final date as of which the interest rate on the municipal water allocation is to be determined, and so forth. Was that amendment or some form of it adopted?

Mr. ASPINALL. The amendment was adopted in the Senate. It will be found in the present bill that is before the Committee. The amendment was discussed in the House committee when we were considering the legislation, and it is presently in the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wanted to make it clear that these amendments were discussed and were adopted.

The second amendment is to make it clear that the language of section 2 (c) is not intended to preclude the temporary furnishing of irrigation waters, under contracts appropriate for that purpose, from Foss and Fort Cobb reservoirs with or without the construction of specific irrigation works and to permit, as general reclamation law permits, the use of a development period for irrigation. As I read the bill, that amendment was also adopted.

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, that amendment was adopted, and is found at the end of section 2 (c) of the bill now before this Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The third amendment was one which, if the Committee determined to include an authorization for irrigation works, would permit the adoption of a variable payment plan for the irrigators and adjustment of the actual period of payment in accordance with the operation of such a formula.

Mr. ASPINALL. That amendment was adopted and is a part of subsection (c) of section 2 of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Now I would like to read in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, the last paragraph of a letter from the Secretary as being a part of the bill or in substance a part of the bill. It is in quotations as an amendment:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized to be constructed by section 1 of this act the sum of $31,750,000 plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the costs of construction of the types involved in the Washita River Basin project as shown by engineering indexes. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of said works.

I believe the substance of that amendment was adopted.

Mr. ASPINALL. The amendment, as suggested, sir, does not include additional works for irrigation allocations.

With the additional sums for irrigation then the amount is brought up to $40,600,000 as specifically set forth in this bill to conform in actuality to the desires of the Department.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. That was my next question, as to the amount in the bill—that answers it completely.

The bill is primarily a municipal water-supply bill and for the control of floods. I think it is an investment in the resources of the United States. I think it is well for this Congress from time to time to take a long view and a broad view of what is needed. Some day I am going to make a speech, Mr. Chairman, of the money we are spending in foreign lands on irrigation projects. I hold in my hand a report which I received a year ago. The report shows that from April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1954, there were 127 irrigation and power projects scattered all over the world that received money from good old Uncle Sam. I defy my colleagues to tell me in what country some of these projects are located. When you read the names, they are almost unpronounceable. There are 127 projects on this list. I understand since June 1954, about 30 more projects have been added. I hope to insert a revised list in the RECORD before long. We are spending more money on irrigation and flood control and power works and irrigation projects all over the world than we are spending in our own country. I think it will make interesting reading, when I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this revised new list of projects.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. In view of the statement just made by the distingiushed gentleman from Nebraska, I hope he will join with us in trying to cut down on some of these projects in foreign countries when the foreign aid bill is before the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman I have never voted for foreign aid. I think sometimes I might have been mistaken during the war days, but I am starting on my 14th year in the Congress, and I have never yet voted for foreign aid as such. I did vote for UNRRA and lend-lease when the war was on because I thought it was necessary, but the great FOA and the so-called Marshall plan called for tremendous spending and we get back not one penny, and frequently not even good will is returned.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have never voted for a dime of that foreign giveaway business either. But I do not know how I can go along with a bill of this kind. This ought to be a flood control bill and nothing more or less than a flood control bill, it seems to me. I would like to ask a question about the proposed municipal water supply. What does that go to? Does that provide for filtering beds and for municipal water plants? Just what is the story?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is to supply water for a number of towns along the river basin that are short of water. They hardly have enough water in their faucets to get a drink. It is for reservoirs. Every penny of it will be paid back, with interest.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but suppose a new town is established in the district which I have the honor to represent in Iowa, is the Federal Government going out and loan the money to establish a municipal water plant?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No. This is for reservoirs only. The cities do the rest of it.

Mr. GROSS. All right. Will the Federal Government build a reservoir at Avondale, Iowa, which we will say is a town just coming into being as an incorporated town?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I think if the gentleman will introduce a bill, if he can show any justification for it, the committee will give sympathetic consideration to it.

Mr. GROSS. Where else in the country are we subsidizing municipal water systems as we are doing in this bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is done in several places. A number of our irrigation projects are also municipal water supply projects. That is not a new thing at all. Of course, in these 127 projects scattered all over the world there are many, many municipal projects, outright grants and gifts, on which there is not any return whatever.

Mr. GROSS. This provision for flood control irrigation and municipal water supply is going to result in the development of that particular area, is it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It will develop the resources of this country, and the community will pay back all of the money in taxes. Flood-control money is not returned—money for irrigation is reimbursable.

Mr. GROSS. We have plenty of places in the State of Iowa where industries can be located. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] mentioned the industrial development that can take place as a result of this legislation. We have plenty of places in Iowa where we have sufficient water supply, free from annual floods, where industry can be located. But I am being asked to vote to provide funds to develop more industry in Oklahoma.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is the same way with soil conservation in the gentleman's State. He does get a healthy slice out of soil conservation. I am sure the gentleman is not opposed to that. This is soil conservation in another manner. It will prevent floods.

Mr. GROSS. Soil conservation in a municipal water supply? That is a new one.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has his own views and he is entitled to them, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this involves a section of Oklahoma which lies in the western or drought-stricken area of our State. The projects under consideration are in the district represented by my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Personally, I want to take this time to thank the distinguished chairman of this committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee and other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the manner in which this matter has been handled.

I think we all agree that problems of this kind are not partisan problems. Only a few days ago I recall an instance when the majority leadership cleared a bill involving more than a million dollars, by unanimous consent, coming out of the Committee on Public Works, I believe, for a district in California, a bill which, incidentally, carried the name of a Republican Member. Only 2 days ago the entire House, almost unanimously on both sides of the aisle, agreed that we should heed the pleas of our New England colleagues for the protection of municipalities, industries, and homes in that great and dynamic section of our country. I mention these things only to emphasize that matters of this kind affecting the development of our country are nonpartisan in character and are so considered by the leadership of the House.

I also want to take this time to pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], whose constituents are directly concerned over the outcome of this matter. He has diligently pursued the problem for years. I wish also to pay tribute to my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] who is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Mr. EDMONDSON has returned to his district today on important business. Had he been present he would have spoken in support of this bill. He has worked on it in the committee for many months. He has asked me to read into the RECORD at this time a brief statement in support of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Before the gentleman does that, Mr. Speaker, will he yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman give me any information at all as to when if ever the committee will get around to doing something for the erosion and damage done by the floods along the western and southwestern side of Michigan where the highways are washing into the lake?

Mr. ALBERT. While I cannot speak for the committee, I will assure the gentleman that if a measure involving that matter is reported it will certainly receive the sympathetic consideration of the leadership of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly appreciate that. Let me say to the gentleman that we have had the sym-

pathy of the Corps of Engineers and of the committee for something like 3 or 4 years. I was hopeful that we might get something besides sympathy, even just the promise of action some time.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not get anywhere.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I now read the statement of my colleague [Mr. EDMONDSON]:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDMONDSON

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that any Member who has seriously considered the Washita reclamation project, and the very grave and urgent need for it, can offer valid argument against S. 180, which was introduced by both of Oklahoma's Senators and by our colleague, VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Here is a measure which has the overwhelming support of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the specific approval of the President of the United States, as recently as his 1955 budget message.

Here is a bill which fully embodies the partnership principle favored by this administration, with full provision for reimbursement of Federal investment in irrigation and water supply.

Here is a bill for flood control in a basin which has suffered the devastation of floods at regular intervals since the great flood of 1903—with heavy damage in 1934, 1949, 1951, and 1954.

In the 1934 flood, 17 Oklahomans lost their lives and many more suffered injury or property damage. Three more of our citizens lost their lives in the 1951 flood. The toll in damage to property, roads, bridges, and utilities has been a terrible one throughout the years.

On the other hand, the bill would serve the double purpose of aiding a region which has suffered heavily from drought in recent years, due to absence of any reservoirs for a water reserve.

Some towns in the Washita Basin have been rationing water for years, and some have been hauling in water by truck for years. In the last 20 years, crop production in the basin has fallen by 80 percent, due to drought.

No region in the United States has a more urgent need for Federal assistance to meet its flood and water-control problem, and the committee has found S. 180 to be a practical answer to this need.

I urge the bill's approval by the House.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa, who is one of the most conscientious and able Members of this House, has raised a question with respect to the portion of this particular bill which provides for municipal water. We have the situation, I should like to say to the gentleman, where flood-control reservoirs have been recommended for many years in the Washita system at a cost of more than $20 million. The flood-control portion of these projects under the modified program will amount to some $15 million. So the flood-control cost to the Federal Government has been decreased. The point is the Federal Government will get $20 million worth of flood control for $15 million by adopting this bill.

It would seem to me that in all instances and on principle whenever a flood-control project is to be constructed and other important uses can be made of the particular reservoir with modifications, such as providing domestic water and drinking water for American citizens in the area, it would certainly be the part of wisdom to make provision for a multipurpose project. In this particular case some 16 municipalities are involved and the problem of obtaining water for domestic purposes places upon those communities year after year burdens which they can hardly endure. Some of these communities have taxed themselves to the limit trying to obtain adequate water for their people. They have done everything within the power of local municipalities to provide such water.

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

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

Mr. ENGLE. It would be a rather strange situation to catch that water behind a dam and then to release it and let it go on downstream while the people are standing around with their tongues hanging out for a little water?

Mr. ALBERT. I think it would be the part of wisdom to catch this water and sell it to the municipalities, and at the same time decrease the contribution that the Federal Government must make to provide flood control.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I would have no opposition to a flood-control project, but this goes far beyond flood control.

Mr. ALBERT. My point is, if the gentleman will bear with me, I think it should go beyond the flood-control aspects. Does the gentleman think it would be wise to build a flood-control project, then dump the water which is so badly needed by nearby communities when by catching and holding this water the Government can sell the water to these municipalities at a profit?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but are not these municipalities capable, after construction of the reservoirs, of obtaining and distributing the water? Are they not capable of running pipes to the reservoirs to get the water and handle it without putting $11 million into the bill for that purpose?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, that amount is not to be used exclusively to finance the water plants of these municipalities. I would yield to members of the committee who are more familiar with the breakdown to answer that particular part of the question. I am sure a portion of the $11 million is to finance the additional water storage.

Mr. GROSS. It has been stated here this money could be used for filtering beds and so forth and so on, for plants for the distribution of water?

Mr. ALBERT. It is necessary to finance these projects over a period of time.

Mr. GROSS. Why do not the municipalities take care of that expense without putting it in this bill?

Mr. ENGLE. They are going to take care of it. I tried to explain that earlier. Whenever you build a single-purpose flood control dam, you do not have to build it as big, because you do not have to hold the water. You catch the water, and immediately after the flood it is released downstream, so that the flood control capacity of the reservoir is available. When you want to save that water for municipal use and irrigation, you have to have big enough capacity in the dam so that you can hold the water and at the same time have some flood control protection left. I gave the illustration of the case on the American River where we had 350,000 acre-feet. Once we shoved it up to a million acre-feet. We still kept flood control. It cost $300 million, and that was their contribution to enlarge the reservoir. Further than that, the farmers came along and said, "If you do not pay it, we will."

Mr. ALBERT. In this drought-stricken area, out of which thousands of people migrated in the 1930's to California and other States, there now live 160,000 Americans who are trying to earn a livelihood and keep their communities going. These communities have strained their financial resources to the breaking point. Many of them have hauled water in trucks for their homes and domestic use for miles. They have done this summer after summer, and I know the gentleman is going to go along with us in our effort here to provide a partial solution to their problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

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

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There has been so much discussion about the cost of municipal water supply. The question is this: There is an item of $15 million included in this bill under the heading of municipal water supply. Is it the intent and purpose of this legislation that the municipalities benefiting from this water will pay back to the Government, that is reimburse the Government $15 million or whatever the amount may be?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I will say to the gentleman that the municipalities will pay back every penny that is advanced for municipal water with interest.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa has asked some very pertinent questions, and they should be answered, particularly on this matter of flood control. Now, there is a question as to whether or not this project should have come under the flood-control provision rather than to be considered by the Interior Committee as a reclamation project. But, I must say to the gentleman that under the terms of this bill the Federal Government is getting a greater return for the money it advances for constructing this project than it would if it went under the flood-control provision. As the gentleman well knows, flood-control money is not reimbursable except in certain instances where there are municipal benefits. But, this committee has given very careful and long consideration to the provisions of this bill, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma has explained, it is going to return to the Federal Government more money than they would get if we just went ahead on a piecemeal flood-control basis and then let the water go to waste.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that we realized that the time is fast approaching in this country where we are going to have to pay more attention to the resources of the country, particularly water. Of course, in the past year we have had it brought forcefully to our attention in the East as a result of the great and serious floods. I am one of those who believes in flood-control expenditures. In my State we only have 12 inches of rainfall a year. This question of water is a matter of life and death with us, and if we do not conserve each drop of water that is available to us, we are lost. That is the reason we are fighting so hard to preserve our water rights and develop our projects. Some may say that the municipalities should go ahead and do this themselves. This is one of those projects where the Government must step in, where you have a combination of flood control and also municipal uses of water, and it is one of those projects where we do need Government help.

I trust that you will give this very careful consideration, and at least give us a break with some of these foreign countries where you have been spending money for flood-control projects and dams which never return a single penny to this country; yet here we have a case where the money is going to be repaid, that which is spent for municipal purposes, and I think we should at least give those folks in that drought-stricken area a break.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, while discussing this proposed new project in Oklahoma, I think it appropriate to digress a moment to mention an accomplished flood control, watershed protection, and reforestation project in my own State of Ohio which is, I think, the outstanding example of a conservation project in the United States or anywhere else.

I refer, of course, to the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, of which Louis Bromfield once said:

> The Muskingum Conservancy District is probably the greatest example up to now in all civilization of man's understanding of how to develop his natural environment to his greatest good.

The district had its beginnings in tragedy. The terrible floods of 1913 caused people to consider the need for a new kind of governmental operation to deal with the devastation that periodically swept through the countryside of Ohio. This immediate result was the passage in 1914, in the Ohio General Assembly, of the Conservancy Act, permitting the establishment of a public corporation operating over an entire watershed. The first such district, still operating successfully, was the Miami district. Its experience was a tremendous value when the much larger Muskingum district was organized in 1933.

The Muskingum Conservancy District was formally organized on June 3, 1933, but even before this, district supporters had been meeting with the officials of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. Since there was no Federal flood-control policy at this time, only this agency could make Federal funds available to the district. All expenses before June 3, 1933, including engineering surveys, were paid by contributions from local people, with the exception of a $10,000 grant from the State of Ohio. Once organized, the district made a small levy against the counties it operated in to meet immediate expenses. This was later repaid.

The original Public Works grant of $22,590,000 for the Muskingum project was made on the basis of estimated national benefit which would result from its construction, chiefly flood protection in the Ohio River drainage area outside the Muskingum region, and unemployment relief. Later changes of Federal policy allowed increased payments. Approximate total Federal contribution to the construction program is $42 million.

The State of Ohio estimated that it would cost more than $6 million to replace bridges and highway structures if there were to be another 1913 flood in the Muskingum country. In recognition of the benefits to the State as a whole, the legislature authorized contributions of that amount.

The district itself issued nearly $4 million worth of bonds against its appraised flood-protection benefits. These benefits were estimated to be $12 million on 25,000 pieces of property. A 50 percent benefit assessment was made against these parcels; however, up to 1955, only 1 of the 58 semiannual benefit assessment collections had been made. The waiving of collections has been made possible by a broadened Federal flood-control policy adopted after the district construction was completed. Under its provisions, the War Department was authorized to take over existing flood-control works, and pay for the assets thus acquired. All such payments are used to retire the district's bonded indebtedness.

Last fall the district and the Corps of Engineers entered into an agreement that will complete the reimbursement of the amounts owed to the district by the Federal Government. The sum involved is $525,000. Inasmuch as the understanding was entered into on the basis that payment would be made July 1 this year, I trust that provision for this amount will be included in the civil functions appropriation bill.

The Muskingum Conservancy District has been in existence for a generation now. It is fair to ask what it has accomplished for the people who brought it into being, and for the people of the State and Nation, who also have a stake in it. A box-score summary might read like this:

First. Damaging floods in the Muskingum country have been greatly reduced; the Army engineers estimate benefits to date in the Muskingum and Ohio River drainage at more than $38 million—nearly the cost of the entire project—and they increase every year.

Second. Streamflow below the reservoirs has been maintained and tends to neutralize drought effects. This, coupled with flood control, has greatly encouraged new industry.

Third. New building encouraged by the district lakes has substantially increased tax duplicates.

Fourth. More than 2,500,000 persons a year visit the lakes for recreational purposes. Recreation benefits have been estimated at more than $1 million a year by the National Park Service.

Fifth. Better land use and reforestation have been encouraged throughout the district area.

Sixth. The district has operated without tax revenue since 1939 and pays taxes on the land it owns. Payments to 1954 total $400,000.

I call your attention particularly to the last point. This project is now self-sustaining. Not only does it operate without revenue from taxation, it actually pays taxes on every acre of land that it owns. Few other public projects, if any, can make that statement.

I would like to offer a brief description of the project, which I feel certain will be of interest to everyone who has a conservation problem. For most visitors, the story of the Muskingum Conservancy District can be summed up in the 10 lakes. They are the physical evidence of what has been done, the tangible reminder of the vast change that has been made.

The fact that the lakes exist at all goes back to a basic, far-reaching decision made by the people of the watershed. That was the decision to adopt what is known as headwater flood control, an idea new and somewhat suspect a generation ago.

Early studies centered around 1 or 2 large dams built well down the main stem of the Muskingum. It was soon evident, however, that land values here would be so high, and resulting dislocations so great, that this would not be economic. Further study showed that if a number of dams were built upon the headwater streams, the lower cost of land would offset the cost of more construction. At the same time these many small dams would protect farms, villages, and towns that would be unprotected under the old plan. A dam protects only what is below it. The farther upstream you can reasonably build it, the more it will protect.

With these things in mind, the people of the Muskingum and the Corps of Engineers planned a series of headwater dams, to be built in sites of limited commercial or agricultural value. Once the decision to build a number of dams was made, it became clear that, on 10 of them, the expenditure of very little extra money would raise the dam high enough so that it could impound a permanent pool and still provide all the storage necessary for flood control. These permanent pools became the Muskingum Lakes, the site of a major recreational development.

All told, the reservoirs have a capacity of 1,539,200 acre-feet, of which 1,327,800 acre-feet are reserved for flood control and the remaining 211,400 acre-feet for water conservation or recreation. Individual lakes range in size from 3,550 acres—Seneca—to 420 acres—Beach City. At the time of construction, the district lakes increased Ohio's inland lake area by approximately 50 percent.

If you build a reservoir for any reason whatsoever, you must immediately make plans to protect it. Floodwaters coming down from an unprotected watershed carry enormous quantities of silt. This will settle out behind a dam and reduce the effective storage capacity of the reservoir. There is only one way to check the ever-present threat: you must keep the soil on the hills.

With this in mind, the district acquired a margin of land around its lakes. Land suitable for conventional agriculture was kept in farm crops, and conservation farming methods were instituted at once, with the help of the Soil Conservation Service.

From 40 to 60 percent of the land in many counties in the Muskingum country should never be used for ordinary farming. The slope is too steep, the soil too thin. Trees are the crop choice on these hills. They save soil, reduce runoff—and provide a good financial return.

The district now controls 18,000 acres of timberland—both old woodlots which are being restored and fresh plantings. Including 1955, the district has planted approximately 5,000 acres; plans now anticipate an ultimate planting rate of 1,000 acres a year. Good forestry practice also calls for regular harvesting. The district cuts 800,000 board-feet of its own timber yearly, most of which is sawed in its own mill.

The district's forestry program has been developed and administered by technicians provided by the Soil Conservation Service. The Ohio division of forestry and the United States Forest Service have cooperated in this program.

District planting is done by a unique tree planter, developed by the district with the help of the Soil Conservation Service, Ohio State University, and a manufacturer of tree planting equipment. The machine can plant as many as 1,000 trees an hour—about 2 acres—following a contour furrow across hills so steep nothing else but a crawler tractor can cling to them. In contrast, an average man working by hand will plant 60 trees an hour.

While protection of reservoirs was the immediate and compelling reason for a district land conservation program, there have also been important secondary results. The district is a testing ground—a large laboratory—for the people who created it. Its farmlands and woodlots are small holdings scattered over the Muskingum country, not grouped in one place. Therefore, the methods and techniques which prove to be economical in its operations can also be used economically by other landholders who face similar problems throughout the watershed.

One of the enduring results of the formation of the Muskingum Conservancy District seems certain to be the widespread demonstration of the economic soundness of good conservation practices.

Necessarily, I have not touched upon the new industry, increased property values, and new jobs that have come into the area as a result of this project. Nor have I mentioned the increase in wildlife and the fine fishing now available.

These values will continue to increase. There is now proposed the assignment of a United States Forest Service expert for a study of the economic possibilities of new timber developments in the central States. With the Federal Government furnishing the expert and the district furnishing office space and equipment, another cooperative project promises to be of great value to all of the many areas where similar problems in forest economics require solution.

This is one of the items suggested in the new budget for the Forest Service, which I hope the Congress will approve.

In closing, I want to say a word about Bryce C. Browning, secretary-treasurer of the district, who has earned a nationwide reputation as the man who guided the Muskingum project through the years of its growth to the present. I am proud to number him as a member of my constituency.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has been the watchdog of this House since the retirement of our colleague, Bob Rich, of Pennsylvania. I desire to compliment him for being so careful in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I think the gentleman is wise in going into many features of this project. He is a good friend of mine. I know that he wants the facts and the facts are these:

If the Committee on Public Works had considered and favorably reported on the Kerr-Monroney-Wickersham bill, then ultimately the flood-control features alone would have cost his taxpayers and my taxpayers $20 million. As it is the cost item for the flood-control feature will be $15 million plus. Cost factors adopted by the committee were based on the old formula.

Another question that the gentleman brought up was whether this will result in a lot of raw land or reclaimed land being brought into production. This will not bring in any additional acreage into cultivation, or any under irrigation that previously was not under cultivation. The gentleman comes from the State of Iowa where they grow a lot of corn. Very little corn is grown on this land now, and there will probably not be any corn grown there in the future.

Gentlemen such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and others from the Northwest; the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and others, are naturally concerned with the overproduction of wheat. I believe I could safely say that the one-third of this land now in wheat will probably be taken out of wheat, because it is not economical to produce wheat under irrigation.

With reference to another question which the gentleman raised, and which I think is proper, I should like to state that there are 10 other projects similar to this multiple-purpose project. In fact, the Altus project has proven to be one of the most successful. That is less than 100 miles away from the Ross and Cobb Creek projects proposed under the Kerr-Monroney and Wickersham bills. It has proven one of the finest projects for that area because of the fact that about 34,000 acres of land were planted under other crops and very little wheat is being grown where a large acreage was previously grown. Many farmers are growing okra, asparagus, spinach, and some other vegetables, including onions and potatoes, as well as alfalfa, and so forth.

I should like to pay particular tribute to the President of the United States who was for this project 2 years ago and 1 year ago. He endorsed same, and included it in his budget message by name. I am confident that he will budget the item and request a supplemental appropriation as soon as we pass this measure.

I should like to give thanks to the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, and to the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, for the valuable assistance that they have given; also to the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, the assistant minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, and to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], for the cooperation they have given the entire Oklahoma delegation on this important measure.

I should like to pay particular credit to Senator KERR, former Governor of Oklahoma, who foresaw the great possibilities and needs of this project many years ago and to Senator MONRONEY who likewise assisted in guiding the measure through the Senate without an opposing vote. By all means, I should like to give credit to Don McBride who hails from Anadarko, who was in charge of the planning and resources program in Oklahoma prior to the time he came here to work for Senator KERR as a legislative assistant.

Also I desire to pay special tribute to the former chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and the present chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]; also to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the subcommittee, for their untiring efforts on behalf of this bill and the manner in which they pursued every phase of this bill over a period of weeks. Also I should like to give credit to other Members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], in whose district this project starts.

I want to say that this is a nonpartisan matter. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], one of the ablest Republican Members of the House, has assisted in this program from the beginning. The Republican national committeewoman, Mrs. Pearl Sayre, lent her efforts, too. It is a good program. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has been most diligent from beginning to end. Our chairman, Mr. STEED and our whip, Mr. ALBERT, as well as Mr. JARMAN and other members of the Oklahoma delegation, have put their shoulders to the wheel to assure consideration and passage of this important irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and city water supply project.

I wish to pay special tribute to the farmers in this western Oklahoma area,

Now, to answer the final question raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I have a letter here from Mr. Parker Woodall, of Verden, Okla., in behalf of the farmers. I was there last week and the farmers have indicated over a 90-percent signup on the irrigation features of this project. As a matter of fact, indications were that there were as many acres to be signed up for as there would be acres available.

I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Mark Barkley, director of the Bureau of Reclamation of Oklahoma, and Mr. Ira Huskey, a representative of Hon. Raymond Gary, the Governor of Oklahoma, as well as the previous Governor, Hon. Johnston Murray, for their untiring efforts in behalf of this project.

Also Hon. Fred Aandahl, Wilbur A. Dexheimer, and Goodrich Lineweaver, of the Bureau of Reclamation; and George W. Abbott and Sidney L. McFarland, staff members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, all of whom have so ably assisted in securing the facts upon which to present this Kerr-Monroney-Wickersham project.

Senator MILLIKIN, who at this time is ill, was most helpful in the past in assisting Senators KERR and MONRONEY in securing favorable consideration of this measure in the Senate.

These 11 towns will benefit by this, to wit, corn: Elk City, Clinton, Cordell, Bessie, Rocky, Sentinel, Canute, Hobart, Anadarko, Verden, and Chickasha. Some other cities, including Lawton, have manifested an interest; also the adjacent military establishments.

Twenty-six thousand acres of fertile soil will benefit from the irrigation feature. This, known as the Kerr-Monroney-Wickersham project, really should be dedicated to the families who lost their lives in the serious floods of the past in this particular area.

There is a provision in this for fish and wildlife and recreation, but it is rather small. The real value will actually be many times the estimated value.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, he is saying this is not going to increase corn and small-grain production?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This will not increase corn production at all. It will decrease corn production some. It will decrease wheat production considerably.

Both the Senators and I feel that with the passage of this measure that it will loosen the log jam and speed the consideration, interest, and passage of a dozen other worthwhile irrigation, reclamation and city water-supply projects in western Oklahoma, thereby greatly increasing the economic value of the western third of our great State.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House of Representatives will pass this measure without a dissenting vote and without a rollcall.

I have requested the White House, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget to expedite a budget estimate and to include a request for a supplemental appropriation for this project as soon as the President signs the act.

I have also urged my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, Hon. LOUIS RABAUT, Hon. JOHN RILEY, Hon. JOE EVINS, and others who handle such matters to give prompt and favorable consideration to the appropriation of sufficient funds to carry out this authorization which we are making today.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of Senators KERR and MONRONEY, members of the Oklahoma delegation, and myself, I wish to pay special tribute to the untiring efforts of all the board of directors both past and present, including Albert Connel, chairman; Frank Raab, Charles Engleman, Fred Brawner, Harry Hilton, J. R. Symcox, Frank Smith, H. J. Statler, G. D. Adams, George Thiessen, J. E. Heinrichs, Percy Hughes, Herb Reimer, B. E. Crane, August Reuber, Kenneth Sprowls, Colonel Sparkman, Eugene Mann, LeRoy Bunch, Roy Nichols, W. A. Cowans, George Wingo, Elbert E. Karns, Oris Barney, Wallace Kidd, Parker Woodall, Percy Hutson, Houston Hulin, Vic Hewlitt, Harry Pitzer, R. K. Lane, Ted Savage, L. G. Cary, Odie Ditmore, Newt Spradlin, Frazier O'Rear, Esmond Weber, Dr. McLain Rogers, Ralph Duroy, Wade O'Neal, Shelby Wheeler, Frank Kliewer, Marlow Preston, Lou Preston, and Lonnie Preston, as well as many other individuals and many farm leaders, civic organizations, chambers of commerce, city officials who have manifested such a great interest in this important measure.

The Director of the Soil Conservation Service has informed me that this program will not interfere with the upstream Soil Conservation Service program. I have always supported and will continue to support the upstream soil-conservation program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues of the great State of Oklahoma in the support of this bill. I certainly hope this measure has the unanimous approval of the Members of this body.

The subcommittee under the able chairmanship of our colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] went very thoroughly into the conditions that exist and gave very serious study to the need for this particular bill and the conditions under which the people in this area have been living.

The people I represent in my area of California are vitally concerned with flood control and reclamation, and are ready and willing to support good measures of this kind at all times for areas that are in need of it, which this area certainly is.

I particularly commend my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] on the very excellent work he did on this particular project, because he very zealously worked at all times in an effort to bring about this particular project and to show the need for it.

It is my hope that this bill will pass unanimously today.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except so far as those laws are inconsistent with this act, for the principal purposes of storing, regulating, and furnishing water for municipal, domestic, and industrial use, and for the irrigation of approximately 26,000 acres of land and of controlling floods and, as incidents to the foregoing for the additional purposes of regulating the flow of the Washita River, providing for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and of enhancing recreational opportunities. The Washita project shall consist of the following principal works: A reservoir at or near the Foss site on the main stem of the Washita River; a reservoir at or near the Fort Cobb site on Pond (Cobb) Creek; and canals, pipelines, and other conduits for furnishing water for municipal, domestic, and industrial use, and for irrigation.

SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the Washita project, the Secretary shall allocate proper costs thereof in accordance with the methods used in determining the allocations made on pages 68, 69, and 70 of House Document 219, 83d Congress, but with appropriate adjustments for changes in actual cost of construction, under the following conditions:

(a) Allocations to flood control, recreation, and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife shall be nonreturnable.

(b) Allocations to municipal water supply, including domestic, manufacturing, and industrial uses, shall be repayable through contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations as defined by section 2, Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Such contracts shall be precedent to the commencement of construction of any project unit affecting the individual municipalities, and shall provide for repayment of construction costs allocated to municipal water supply in not to exceed 50 years from the dates water is first delivered for that purpose, and payments of said construction costs shall include interest on unamortized balances of that allocation at a rate equal to the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term loans outstanding on the date of this act: *Provided*, That such contracts shall provide that annual municipal repayments shall continue at the same rates until the costs of Foss and Fort Cobb Reservoirs allocated to irrigation are fully repaid: *Provided further*, That if irrigation works are constructed, as hereinafter provided, said annual repayment rates shall continue so long as the costs of irrigation works are unpaid.

(c) The authorization for construction of the irrigation works, exclusive of Foss and Fort Cobb Reservoirs, shall be limited, as to each reservoir, to a period of 10 years from the commencement of the delivery of municipal water from the reservoir on which the irrigation unit is dependent. Any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing operating and maintaining the Washita project which are properly allocable to irrigation and which are assigned to be paid by the contracting organization shall provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more blocks, to any such block over a period of not more than 55 years, exclusive of any permissible development period, or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation

of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the period stated under average conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay: *Provided*, That nothing in this section is intended to preclude the temporary furnishing of irrigation water under contracts appropriate for that purpose from Foss and Fort Cobb Reservoirs with or without the construction of specific irrigation works.

SEC. 3. Construction of the Washita project herein authorized may be undertaken in such units or stages as in the opinion of the Secretary best serves the project requirements and the relative needs for water of the several prospective users. Repayment contracts negotiated in connection with each unit or stage of construction shall be subject to the terms and conditions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary may, upon conclusion of a suitable agreement with any qualified agency of the State of Oklahoma or a political subdivision thereof for assumption of the administration, operation, and maintenance thereof at the earliest practicable date, construct or permit the construction of public park and recreational facilities on lands owned by the United States adjacent to the reservoirs of the Washita project, when such use is determined by the Secretary not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. No recreational use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws of the State of Oklahoma for the protection of fish and game. The costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the facilities authorized by this section shall not be charged to or become a part of the costs of the Washita River Basin project.

SEC. 5. Expenditures for Foss and Fort Cobb Reservoirs may be made without regard to the soil survey and land-classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954 (43 U. S. C. 390a).

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized to be constructed by section 1 of this act the sum of $40,600,000 plus such additional amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the costs of construction of the types involved in the Washita River Basin project as shown by engineering indexes. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of said works.

Mr. ENGLE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma, pursuant to House Resolution 363, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE STATE'S RIGHT OF INTERPOSITION

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, February 8, 1956, the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia adopted by a vote of 179 to 1 a very strong resolution of interposition in which without reservation that body reaffirmed its faith, and the faith of the people of Georgia, in our American institutions, in the Constitution of the United States of America, and in constitutional government.

On Monday of this week the Governor of Georgia, Hon. Marvin Griffin, delivered a speech to the general assembly and he urged the adoption of such a resolution, in a scholarly and masterful address in which he appealed to the voice of reason. This is a strong resolution and while there may be some who agree and some who disagree, it removes any doubt which others may have had about the position of the State of Georgia. It stated in no uncertain terms that we do and we shall ever eternally obey the Constitution and laws of the United States of America as they are written, but that we shall not obey illegal decisions of men when they overturn, flout, and defy the law.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include this resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, and also the address of Gov. Marvin Griffin before a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO DECLARE THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS OF MAY 17, 1954, AND MAY 31, 1955, IN THE SCHOOL SEGREGATION CASES, AND ALL SIMILAR DECISIONS, BY THE SUPREME COURT NULL, VOID, AND OF NO EFFECT; TO DECLARE THAT A CONTEST OF POWERS HAS ARISEN BETWEEN THE STATE OF GEORGIA AND THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO INVOKE THE DOCTRINE OF INTERPOSITION; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Georgia doth hereby unequivocally express a firm and determined resolution to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of this State against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles, embodied in our basic law, by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and assured;

That the General Assembly of Georgia doth explicitly and preemptorily declare that it views the powers of the Federal Government as resulting solely from the compact, to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument creating that compact;

That the General Assembly of Georgia asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are valid only to the extent that these powers have been enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have assented in subsequent amendments validly adopted and ratified;

That the very nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to surrender certain of their sovereign rights, but only certain of these sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people;

That the State of Georgia has at no time surrendered to the general government its rights to maintain racially separate public schools and other public facilities;

That the State of Georgia, in ratifying the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, did not agree, nor did the other States ratifying the 14th amendment agree, that the power to operate racially separate public schools and other facilities was to be prohibited to them thereby;

And as evidence of such understanding, the General Assembly of Georgia notes that the very Congress that submitted the 14th amendment for ratification established separate schools in the District of Columbia and that in more than one instance the same State legislatures that ratified the 14th amendment also provided for systems of racially separate public schools;

That the General Assembly of Georgia denies that the Supreme Court of the United States had the right which it asserted in the school cases decided by it on May 17, 1954, to enlarge the language and meaning of the compact by the States in an effort to withdraw from the States powers reserved to them and as daily exercised by them for almost a century;

That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions and the State of Georgia, for its part, asserts that it and its sister States have never surrendered such right:

That this assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to prohibit to the States certain rights and powers never surrendered by them;

That the General Assembly of Georgia asserts that whenever the General Government attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed

as acquiesence in the surrender thereof; and that such submissive acquiesence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question. The Supreme Court is not a party to the compact, but a creature of the compact and the question of contested power should not be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes;

That the legislation making provision for grants for the benefit of children of school age for educational purposes, as authorized by the amendment ratified by the people at the general election held in November 1954, whereby section 13 was added to article VIII of the Georgia constitution, will enable the people themselves to provide an educational establishment serviceable and satisfactory and in keeping with the social structure of the State, if the doctrine of said school cases of May 17, 1954, is eventually by naked force alone thrust upon this State;

That the doctrine of said decisions should not be forced upon the people of this State, and the public schools terminated thereby, for the Court was without jurisdiction, power, or authority to entertain said school cases, or to announce the doctrine therein asserted by it;

That the Court was without jurisdiction of said cases because (1) the jurisdiction of the Court granted by the Constitution is limited to judicial cases in law and equity, and said cases were not of a judicial nature and character, nor did they involve controversies in law or equity, but, on the contrary, the great subjects of the controversy are of a legislative character, and not a judicial character, and are determinable only by the people themselves speaking through their legislative bodies; (2) the essential nature and effect of the proceedings relating exclusively to public schools operated by and under the authority of States, and pursuant to State laws and regulations, said cases were suits against the States, and the Supreme Court was without power or authority to try said cases, brought by individuals against States, because the Constitution forbids the Court to entertain suits by individuals against a State unless the State has consented to be sued;

That if said Court had had jurisdiction and authority to try and determine said cases, it was powerless to interfere with the operation of the public schools of States, because the Constitution of the United States does not confer upon the General Government any power or authority over such schools or over the subject of education, jurisdiction over these matters being reserved to the States, nor did the States by the 14th amendment authorize any interference on the part of the judicial department or any other department of the Federal Government with the operation by the States of such public schools as they might in their discretion see fit to establish and operate;

That by said cases the Court announces its power to adjudge State laws unconstitutional upon the basis of the Court's opinion of such laws as tested by rules of the inexact and speculative theories of psychological knowledge, which power and authority is beyond the jurisdiction of said Court;

That if the Court is permitted to exercise the power to judge the nature and effect of a law by supposed principles of psychological theory, and to hold the statute or constitution of a State unconstitutional because of the opinions of the judges as to its suitability, the States will have been destroyed, and the indestructible Union of indestructible States established by the Constitution of the United States will have ceased to exist, and in its stead the Court will have created, without jurisdiction or authority from the people, one central government of total power;

That implementing its decision of May 17, 1954, said Court on May 31, 1955, upon further consideration of said cases, said: "All provisions of Federal, State, or local law * * * must yield" to said decision of May 17, 1954; said Court thereby presuming arrogantly to give orders to the State of Georgia;

That it is clear that said Court has deliberately resolved to disobey the Constitution of the United States, and to flout and defy the supreme law of the land;

That the State of Georgia has the right to operate and maintain a public school system utilizing such educational methods therein as in her judgment are conducive to the welfare of those to be educated and the people of the State generally, this being a governmental responsibility which the State has assumed lawfully, and her rights in this respect have not in any wise been delegated to the Central Government, but, on the contrary, she and the other States have reserved such matters to themselves by the terms of the 10th amendment. Being possessed of this lawful right, the State of Georgia is possessed of power to repel every unlawful interference therewith;

That the duty and responsibility of protecting life, property and the priceless possessions of freedom rests upon the government of Georgia as to all those within her territorial limits. The State alone has this responsibility. Laboring under this high obligation she is possessed of the means to effectuate it. It is the duty of the State in flagrant cases such as this to interpose its powers between its people and the efforts of said Court to assert an unlawful dominion over them: Therefore, be it further

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)—

First. That said decisions and orders of the Supreme Court of the United States relating to separation of the races in the public institutions of a State as announced and promulgated by said Court on May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, are null, void, and of no force or effect;

Second. That hereby there is declared the firm intention of this State to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to the State, to avoid this illegal encroachment upon the rights of her people;

Third. That we urge upon our sister States firm and deliberate efforts upon their part to check this and further encroachment on the part of the General Government, and on the part of said Court through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all the States, that by united efforts the States may be preserved;

Fourth. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by His Excellency the Governor to the governor and legislature of each of the other States, to the President of the United States, to each of the Houses of Congress, to Georgia's Representatives and Senators in the Congress, and to the Supreme Court of the United States for its information.

ADDRESS OF GOV. MARVIN GRIFFIN DELIVERED BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA MEETING IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES' CHAMBER AT THE STATE CAPITOL IN ATLANTA

Speaker Moate, Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, members of the general assembly, and my fellow Georgians, we are in session here today to give continuing consideration to the most vital issue to confront this body since its creation.

That is the question of our course of action in the face of decisions by the United States Supreme Court which seek to destroy our system of segregated schools.

Our peril is all the more grave because the means utilized in these rulings strike at the very existence of State authority.

This general assembly has enacted legislation making provision for education grants as authorized by the amendment adding section 13 to article 8 of the Georgia constitution.

This general assembly also has enacted other implementing legislation at this session.

These measures were recommended by the Georgia Commission on Education and by me. It has been my pleasure as chief executive, formally to approve these acts, and they are now the law.

I congratulate you upon this achievement.

We are determined to use all honorable means and legal resources in this fight.

We are now prepared, as and when necessary, and of course not until then, to commit the education of the children of this State to the people themselves.

Through a system of private schools, organized and founded by the school patrons in the local communities, an educational structure serviceable and satisfactory to Georgians will continue as long as the people desire.

We must now direct our attention toward the continued preservation of our public schools. Authorized by the Georgia constitution of 1777, the State's public-school system is the oldest constitutionally authorized system in the United States.

The social structure of the State is secure by reason of the legislation which you have enacted. As a result of these laws, the integrity of the two races in Georgia will be maintained.

But it is your solemn duty as representatives of the people, and it is my solemn duty as chief executive, to utilize every means at our disposal to protect and defend the right of the State to operate her public schools as long as she desires.

We labor under this duty because the public schools of Georgia are good schools, operating in an efficient manner and serving well the children of both races. Also because acquiescence in the edicts of the Supreme Court of the United States over public schools is an invitation to that Court further to extend unlawfully its authority over other matters concerning which they have no rightful jurisdiction.

The Supreme Court had no authority to declare segregated public schools unconstitutional. Therefore, Georgia may not be accused justly of violating her obligations as a member of the Union in continuing to operate her public schools in each and every school district in this State.

As a matter of right under these circumstances, the State ought to be possessed of power to declare that the Court overstepped its authority; that these decisions are null and void, and, thus, to justify before the Nation the interposition of her sovereign power between the Court and her public schools.

The Commission on Education has recommended that you adopt a resolution to that effect.

When I had the honor of addressing you on January 10, I stated it would be my privilege at a later date to present to you my views upon this matter. Since that time I have conferred at length with counsel, and have had the opportunity of meeting in Richmond with the chief executives of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the States of South Carolina and North Carolina and Mississippi.

It is my request that this General Assembly adopt a resolution declaring the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the cases relating to the public schools of Virginia, South Carolina, Delaware, and Kansas, to be null, void, and of no effect.

The Court's attempted usurpation is palpable and flagrant.

The circumstances are such as in my judgment authorize you to take this course.

Now, let us examine the nature and structure of the government provided by the Constitution of the United States, and the fundamental principles of relationship between the States and the Federal Government, with particular reference to its judicial department.

Here are some fundamental truths:

1. In this country sovereignty resides in the people of the respective States.

2. When the Constitution of the United States was formed and the Federal Government established, the people of the respective States delegated a portion of governmental authority to the Federal Government.

3. All of the power not so delegated to the Federal Government is retained by the people of the respective States.

4. The three departments of the Federal Government—the executive, legislative, and judicial—are agencies for the people of the respective States, created for the purpose only of carrying out the authority granted to each department.

5. The Supreme Court of the United States is one of the units of the judicial department of the Federal Government, and can have no authority beyond that delegated by the Constitution of the United States to the judicial department.

6. When any of the three departments of the Federal Government undertakes to exercise authority over matters concerning which it has not been granted power, such an undertaking is illegal and unconstitutional, because it is beyond the authority granted. No exception is made for the Supreme Court of the United States, and if it undertakes to exercise power over a subject concerning which no authority has been granted, its acts are illegal, unconstitutional, and without any lawful force.

7. The Supreme Court of the United States has no jurisdiction over any State of the Union except in the case of suits between States respecting boundary disputes and the like; and suits between the States and the United States in cases of that character.

8. Since the Federal Supreme Court has no other authority to render any judgment against a State, its declaration that the States are prohibited from operating public schools according to the segregated system is wholly without authority of the Constitution.

9. The judicial power of the United States does not in the nature of things extend to interfering with the States in respect of their public-school systems.

10. By these vicious decisions the Court undertakes to establish that its pronouncements are the supreme law of the land. The Court thus disobeys the Constitution, for it is there provided that the Constitution, the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, and treaties made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land. The Court assumes further unlawfully the power to judge all the laws of the States according to facts created by the Court, and to veto such laws if in the judgment of the Court they do not meet with its approval.

11. The Supreme Court has no power to judge the extent of its own authority. Its jurisdiction is that which is authorized by the Constitution. When it goes beyond the Constitution it oversteps its powers. It cannot by a mere claim of additional authority confer the same upon itself.

12. The authority which the Supreme Court may exercise must be found within the limits of the judicial power delegated by the States. If the Court attempts to intrude into an unauthorized field, a State possesses the right to take note of the unlawful conduct of the Court and formally to declare the true nature and character thereof, and to denounce the same as null and void. It is the duty of the State in flagrant cases to so interpose its powers between its people and the effort of the Court to assert an unlawful dominion over them. This right of interposition, though not expressly referred to in the Constitution, arises out of the nature and character of that instrument and the Government established by it, and exists of necessity.

The Constitution is in writing so that the powers granted to the Federal Government may be stated.

No other reason exists for a written Constitution.

A government of unlimited power needs no written constitution.

To prevent the Federal Government from thereafter claiming to possess powers not delegated to it, the First Congress submitted to the States for ratification the Bill of Rights, the 10th amendment of which is in the following words:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The outer limits of the powers of the judicial department are set forth in the third article of the Constitution. The Supreme Court is a part of that department. This article does not attempt to elevate the judicial department over and above any State of the Union or over and above the legislative and executive departments of the Federal Government.

When the Supreme Court of the United States acts beyond the powers delegated to it, it oversteps its authority.

Such acts cannot bind the States from whose people all its powers are derived.

We now reach the question as to the status of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States against the public schools.

By these decisions the separate school laws of those States affording each race its own schools were declared violative of the Constitution.

In these decisions the Court said "all provisions of Federal, State, or local law" contrary to the decision "must yield."

The Court thus undertakes to overturn separate school laws of all the States providing segregated education.

The United States Constitution prevents any State from being sued by individuals in the Supreme Court or in any Federal court without the State's consent. For this reason these decisions do not and cannot bind the State of Georgia.

Having no authority to entertain such a case against Georgia, the Supreme Court cannot bind this State by a judgment rendered in suits otherwise entertained. Being without authority to bind the State of Georgia directly, the Court cannot by indirection attain the same result.

The Court was without jurisdiction in these cases for each of two plain and specific reasons: (1) The cases were suits against the States and the Constitution forbids the Court to try them. (2) The controversies were not "cases in law and in equity" and the jurisdiction of the Court is expressly limited to such cases.

In each of the school segregation suits the real defendant was the State but the truth is that this Court refuses to confine itself within limits set up by the Constitution.

The Constitution confines the Judicial Department to matters of a judicial nature and character. Before a suit can be entertained by any Federal court it must be in law or in equity.

The great educational and social questions involved in the school segregation litigation do not relate to cases either at law or in equity.

A judicial controversy is not involved.

The controversy is a public one.

No court can determine it.

No system of law provides for the solution of such matters in judicial proceedings.

The Constitution of the United States provides no exception.

The truth is that the fundamental issue involved in this dispute is determinable only by the people themselves, speaking through their legislative bodies.

What then moved the Court to commit so grave an act of usurpation?

"Partisan politics" does not afford a complete answer.

The whole motivation may be found in pressures far more compelling. A close examination of what the Court has done discloses the true purpose to be nothing less than the destruction of the States.

The great body of the rights of freemen are not embraced within the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States. These rights are possessed in virtue of State citizenship alone, and it is to the State Government that the citizen looks for protection in respect of these rights.

This is admitted by the Supreme Court.

It was under the equal-protection-of-the-laws clause of the 14th amendment that the Court made these decisions under which it is claimed that the States have no authority to operate separate public schools.

The Court said such separate public-school systems are violative of the following words of the 14th amendment:

"No State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

There is no provision in the Federal Constitution dealing with education or schools.

Not one word or syllable.

Education is one of the subjects reserved to the States.

There are no provisions in the Federal Constitution on the subject of race, except those in the 15th amendment which relate solely to voting.

Nor does the United States Constitution provide one way or another with respect to the subject which so-called do-gooders refer to in vague and general terms as the doctrine of the "equality of mankind."

By what process of reasoning then does the Court attempt to justify its conclusion?

Let the Court speak in its own words, which I read:

"To separate them (the colored children) from others (the white children) of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race * * * generates a feeling of inferiority. * * * A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system."

Such a conclusion is absurd on the face of it and insulting to the intelligence.

The decision of the Court does not rest upon any construction of the Constitution. It does not rest upon inequality of protection under the language of the separate school laws. It is based entirely upon the "inferiority complex" finding just quoted.

The Court concocted this ridiculous theory and then pronounced it a part of the supreme law of the land. The dubious character of the several books on sociology and psychology cited by the Court is not here so important as that the Court sought to transmute socialistic theory into law.

Sociology and psychology are not exact sciences.

Their application to public education brings every phase of that subject under Federal jurisdiction. The laws respecting marriage and divorce likewise are subject to revision and review, upon allegations of unconstitutionality, by this new ruling of the Court.

And here, let all remember that central governments of general power are like the grave—they perpetually cry, "Give! Give!" And like the grave, they never return the liberties once taken.

The Court having exceeded its jurisdiction in the respects heretofore pointed out, these decisions are manifestly null and void, unless the Constitution gives the Court the power to determine the extent of its own authority.

The Court cannot be said to have the power to judge of its own authority when its entire authority is under the complete control and dominion of the Congress. Assertions that the Supreme Court can rightly do as it pleases have no basis in the Constitution.

This is not to say that the Supreme Court may not hold a law which is violative of the Constitution to be unconstitutional if it is necessary for the Court to determine this question in order to dispose of a case in law or equity legitimately before it for decision. The Constitution says nothing on this subject, but this power inheres in every Court when necessary to the exercise of its jurisdiction.

But the Court cannot overstep the Constitution.

Nor has the Court any power to say that the Constitution changes in meaning.

The interposition of authority against unlawful and unconstitutional actions of the Supreme Court peculiarly is within the province of the States.

The States alone are parties to the Constitution.

The Federal Government is no party thereto, but the creature thereof.

The States, by the compact of the Constitution, having created the Federal Government, have the right to pronounce as null and void the assertion of unlawful dominion by any of the departments thereof.

The fact that the Constitution does not refer to this right of the States is no evidence that it does not exist. The existence of the power is implicit in the nature and structure of our Government. It is among the reserved rights of the States.

Just as the Supreme Court may declare laws unconstitutional when such is necessary to exercise of the authority committed to it to try cases in law and equity, so the States may declare null and void and unlawful action of the Supreme Court which interferes with the exercise of their reserved rights.

Interposition is no new doctrine. It is one which has been recognized since the beginning and dealt with fully and supported by both Jefferson and Madison who certainly knew whereof they spoke.

Power is coexistent with duty. Each State necessarily possesses sufficient power to discharge the duty owed her citizens. Each State possesses the inherent power needed to discharge her governmental responsibilities.

Georgia has a right to operate and maintain a public-school system utilizing such educational methods therein as in her judgment are conducive both to the welfare of those to be educated and the people of the State generally.

This is a governmental responsibility which lawfully she has assumed.

Her rights in this respect have not been delegated to the Central Government, but on the contrary, she and the other States have reserved such matters to themselves by the 10th amendment.

Being possessed of this lawful right, she is clothed with power to repel every unlawful interference therewith.

The duty and responsibility of protecting life, property, and the priceless possessions of freedom rest upon the government of Georgia as relating to all those within her territorial limits. The State alone has this responsibility.

It would be vain for the State to be charged with the responsibility of protection of the fundamental rights of the people if she is powerless to declare null and void an overstepping of authority by the Federal judiciary.

The procedure of interposition is woven throughout the whole fabric of our constitutional history.

This right has been asserted many times over the years by both Northern and Southern States under a wide variety of circumstances.

Ample precedent for its exercise exists in the constitutional history of our own State of Georgia.

We can be proud that she was one of the first States in the country to rise up against usurpation of her reserved sovereign powers.

On three occasions in the past the Georgia General Assembly has interposed successfully against unconstitutional decisions of the Supreme Court in which the State of Georgia was involved.

The first interposition of Georgia resulted from the Chisholm case in which the State refused to appear because the Federal Supreme Court had no jurisdiction to entertain a suit by a private individual against the State without the State's consent.

The Court refused to obey the Constitution and held that Georgia and other States could be sued without their consent. The 11th amendment resulted, and the Court so rebuked, ordered the Chisholm case and other such cases swept from its records.

Later Georgia again was compelled to interpose against the Court in order to save for the State that enormous portion of her territory occupied by the Cherokee Indian tribes. This important part of our constitutional history appears in the famous cases of *Worcester* v. *Georgia; Cherokee Nation* v. *Georgia* and in the cases of Tassel and Graves.

In this great controversy with the Court, Georgia's interposition again was successful.

Constitutional history books are replete with numerous occasions where States have exercised the right of interposition to protect their people against unconstitutional Federal laws or Court decrees.

Kentucky, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Iowa, to name a few, have utilized the doctrine of interposition on one or more occasions. In doing so, they recited the very language expounded by Jefferson and Madison.

Invocation of this State's right of interposition is not a substitute for, nor does it take the place of, the plan formulated for going to private schools as a last resort to preserve segregation.

The private school plan is designed to provide segregated schools within the terms of the United States Supreme Court decision.

It is our first, last and only absolute remedy.

Interposition is the assertion of our rights in the hope of preventing a situation which would lead to the abandonment of the public-school system. It is an appeal to reason.

I have gone into considerable detail so that it might appear clearly that the States have both the right and duty of interposition against conduct on the part of the Supreme Court which is not authorized by the powers granted under the Constitution. I have demonstrated that the usurpation in the public-school cases is palpable and deliberate. I have shown that the rule announced by the Court will destroy the States.

Under these circumstances it is certainly, as I see it, the duty of this general assembly to declare these decisions to be null and void.

If by naked force alone the Federal Government unlawully forces these decisions upon us, the legislation which you have enacted at this session will protect the social structure. And at the same time, it will enable the people of the State to care for the eduation of their children. Education can be provided by other than public schools. You have seen to that.

By denouncing these decisions as null and void, you declare what is true under the supreme law of the land.

You vindicate the lawful power of the State.

And you make plain the right of Georgia to continue the operation of her public schools notwithstanding these decisions.

You do much more than that. As the representatives of the people, you place the State's power and prestige squarely in the fight to preserve an indestructible Union of indestructible States.

For that is the issue raised by the Court. Dunring our generation that issue will be determined, and upon its determination rests the future of the American people.

The Court by claiming its own supremacy asserts old doctrine dressed in new form. Absolutism is as old as tyranny. Louis XIV of France said "I am the State." The Stuart Kings of England announced that they ruled by divine right and that the king could do no wrong. But the genius of American institutions is that sovereign power resides in the people of the respective States.

We say with our fathers that no government, no governmental department, no court or other tribunal, has the right to dispose of the fundamental liberties of man. We believe that they derive from Almighty God. That when the great Creator of the universe breathed upon the dust and made an immortal soul, he gave that man certain rights and freedoms beyond the power of government or any court, no matter how supreme.

It is unnecessary to catalog these immunities, but among them are the rights possessed by every man to have a home and rear a family, to choose his own associates, to rear his children according to his belief, to stand erect in the dignity of his personality and to maintain the pride of his inheritance.

The liberties of men never have lasted long under governments of total power. Freedom is a fragile flower and must be tended by the people with that close watchfulness which can be given only to governments close to home and responsive to the local will.

Upon the great issues of the day Georgia always has played the valiant part. Let no one be mistaken about this and upon this issue the State and her people firmly will stand.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution and an address by Gov. Marvin Griffin, of Georgia.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FOOD TO THE NEEDY THROUGH A FOOD STAMP PLAN

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this week I introduced a bill to provide for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities to needy persons in the United States, by use of a food-stamp plan. I introduced a revised but substantially similar bill again last year. For the past 2 years I have found that there is a tremendous public interest in this proposal. Many people in St. Louis and welfare and civic leaders from many other parts of the country have written to me to tell me how valuable they think this idea would be not just in helping to dispose of some of our surplus foods but—more importantly—seeing to it that some of this food goes to those who need it most—to needy Americans who are not receiving adequate diets. I know that there are millions of such persons in this country and I think it is a tragic and shameful thing to have hunger in the United States—to have Americans unable to obtain an adequate, nourishing diet.

Mr. Speaker, I have been appealing for 2 years to the House Committee on Agriculture to act on my bill. Similar measures have been introduced within the past year in the Senate, but apparently, there too, the Agriculture Committee has not yet seen fit to act on the plan.

Probably the main reason for the reluctance of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to act on a food-stamp plan is the active and vigorous opposition of the Department of Agriculture in claiming that such a plan is not feasible or necessary.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members will look about them in the cities of our country they will see that such a plan is necessary—very necessary—if we are to get enough of the right foods to all of our people. It may not be the quickest or most efficient way of disposing of $8 billion worth of surplus food now in storage—perhaps it would be quicker and more efficient just to ship this food overseas and give it away behind the Iron Curtain or elsewhere, or just dump it in the ocean. I am afraid the Department of Agriculture looks at this food not in terms of the blessing it could be to undernourished Americans living on public assistance but only in terms of a storage headache and a factor in low farm prices.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to do everything I can to persuade the House to adopt a plan for the distribution of some of this surplus food—a billion dollars worth a year—to needy Americans under a food-stamp plan as provided for in H. R. 5105.

The text of that bill is as follows:

H. R. 5105

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation, as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods, and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assitance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food-stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivor's insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasuary not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

THE TIMBER SITUATION

Mr. COON. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, the great Northwest, of which the district I represent is a very important part, has timber and mineral resources which are not only of inestimable value to the people of that region, but will, if properly managed furnish the people of the Nation for centuries to come with an ample supply of products manufactured from timber—a list of which is too long to enumerate.

Naturally, the problems of economically and efficiently harvesting and utilizing not only the growing timber but that which has reached maturity or because of storms has been blown down or which has become insect-infested, are many and varied. And in those problems our people are not only vitally interested, but their interests are varied and diverse.

Whether marketing areas are or are not advantageous is a serious problem most difficult of solution, dependent usually upon the supply or lack of supply of timber in that particular area and the number of sawmills.

The necessity of a resurvey to determine how much timber can be cut in a particular area without endangering future supply is apparent.

The issue as to who shall build and maintain access roads so as to make timber available has long been a matter of controversy. That down and diseased timber, and timber that has passed maturity, should be harvested and the fullest possible use made of it is evident.

Joint Senate and House subcommittees were appointed, instructed to hold hearings on the timber situation, ascertain the facts, and report back as to the form and substance which any additional legislation should take, if such was needed.

Unfortunately, the investigation was made and the hearings conducted by a staff which apparently conceived its chief duty to be the discrediting of Secretary of the Interior McKay, the policies which he was following, and the manner in which they were being implemented, rather than a statement of the facts with suggestions as to a remedy, if such was indicated.

The subcommittee deliberately overlooked the fact that many of the decisions attributed to the Secretary of the Interior were based upon reports made by officials who had long been in the Department.

That most of the acts now complained of were the result either of legislation or regulations adopted under previous administrations.

The hearings conclusively show that the subcommittee, in addition to its effort to discredit the Interior Department and the Secretary for what had and was happening with reference to timber, and forgetting the real purpose for which it was established, just jumped the track and busied itself with an attempt to manufacture political propaganda.

At Portland, Oreg., when the western hearings were about to close, the subcommittee literally dragged in the old, threadbare issue of the granting of a patent to the Al Sarena mining claims somewhat like riding a dead horse. This was an issue injected into the campaign in 1954 by Drew Pearson, a master of misstatement and inaccuracy. His contention and that of those who followed his lead was overwhelming repudiated by the voters in November of 1954.

A reading of the record and more especially the testimony of Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence A. Davis, who as Solicitor made the decision granting patent, showed conclusively that, on the record, no other decision could have been made.

That the hearings were used to manufacture political propaganda is evident from the fact that a Republican Congressman was time and again assailed because he sought to assist interested constituents. That is something which every Congressman worth his salt should and does do.

No criticism was forthcoming of Democratic Congressmen, of Democratic Senators, who made similar efforts. The fact that Republican Congressmen were singled out for criticism, held up to the public as engaging in improper activities, while Democrats doing the same thing were not mentioned, is proof in itself of the partisan political trend which was followed in connection with the mining claim.

That the staff and those backing it were not successful in their efforts to smear Secretary McKay, the Department of the Interior, and Republican Congressmen, was due to the efforts of our colleague from Michigan, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who, at considerable personal inconvenience, attended hearings at Redding, Calif.; Klamath Falls, Medford, Roseburg, Eugene and Portland, Oreg.; Aberdeen and Seattle, Wash.; and actively—and in spite of almost constant efforts to silence him—opposed the unfair method in which the hearings were conducted and the lack of foundation for the false charges made against the Department.

Although there was a joint committee staff of at least five constantly present at the hearings, our colleague from Michigan, the only minority member present, was denied information which might have been helpful to him in following the hearings from day to day. Even when prepared statements were available, the procedure was to give him a copy when the witness took the stand.

That the hearings as conducted were political in their nature; that witnesses were unfairly criticized, their rights as citizens denied, will be shown by casual reading of the record.

As the Representative of a district whose people are vitally interested in timber, in mining, it is my desire to express to my colleagues in the House my appreciation of the service rendered us by our colleague from Michigan, CLARE HOFFMAN.

CREATE A WATER CONSERVATION AND PLANNING SERVICE IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope by these remarks to direct attention to legislation I have introduced today to establish a Federal water conservation and planning service.

The plain truth is that water is fast becoming our most critical natural resource. As a Nation we have been living off our water capital in recent years, and our problems are bound to multiply in the years ahead.

Although water is already in short supply in many areas, the most conservative estimate is that our per capita consumption of water will double and our industrial water requirement will treble by 1975. There is reason for alarm, too, in a recent authoritative report which showed that only 58 percent of the Nation's major urban public water supply facilities are adequate to meet present demands. In addition we are told that about 40 million Americans living in various regions are already face to face with water supply problems either involving inadequate quantity or unsatisfactor quality or both.

At the moment the situation is not out of hand, but there is every indication that the problem of water supply will be a paramount national concern within the next few years unless we move now to forestall this crisis. Only a few months ago one of our best-informed water experts stated the problem in these terms:

> Our store of water information, on which we can base actions to relieve prospective water-supply stringencies, is becoming relatively meager and unbalanced. Perforce, we have taken, and will continue to take, first steps toward rational management of our water destiny. But, we are beginning to outreach our information even on areas hitherto considered well covered. A decade or two hence we may be unable to resolve pressing water problems if we fail now to start relevant statistical records and their interpretations.

It is apparent then that in order to assure ourselves of an adequate supply of usable water for domestic, industrial, and agricultural purposes we must either discover and tap new sources of supply, or enlarge the use of our existing sources by developing new methods of water conservation. Failing in this, regimentation will inevitably follow as our governmental bodies are forced to pass legislation to curtail and strictly control the use of water in the public interest.

In looking ahead there would be grounds for optimism if we were aroused to the danger, and if our scientific work in this field was proceeding apace. However, this is decidedly not the case.

From a standpoint of available scientific data, basic water research is one of the most neglected fields of endeavor where the Government and private institutions are concerned. Those in our Federal bureaus who must meet this challenge are understaffed and have insufficient funds with which to tackle the formidable task before them. Although the United States Geological Survey is one of the finest scientific organizations in our country, of necessity its day-to-day efforts are largely directed toward seeking solutions—on what can only be described as a fire-alarm basis—for extreme water-crisis problems in various parts of the country.

Under its present program, in cooperation with the 48 States and other Federal agencies, United States Geological Survey is working on investigations designed to locate our water resources. These investigations are financed in part by Federal funds and in part by funds provided by States and local organizations which request cooperative studies. The 1954 annual report of the Secretary of the Interior recites that there were 43 State cooperative programs underway that year, and 30 other projects of primary concern to Federal agencies. The typical arrangement in these cooperative studies is for the survey to furnish trained personnel, and for all other expenses to be defrayed by the State or local agencies. In practice this tends to limit the work capacity of this department and direct much of its energies into emergency programs. Obviously this prevents the water scientists from developing broad studies which would enable us to anticipate and prevent such crisis.

For purposes of illustration let me describe one area where our watermen might produce remarkable results if they had an adequate work force. United States Geological Survey scientists hold the view that our subsurface reservoirs contain a vast untapped storehouse of fresh water. They tell us that ground water is our most neglected national resource and that only 10 percent of this great water reserve has been mapped out. There is not a State in the Union, say these hydrologists, that does not have ground-water shortage problems.

The vacuum of information in this vital area is dramatized by the fact that

in many regions of our country searchers for water still turn to the "water witch" or "water dowser" and his ancient rites rather than to geologists, who may have only sparse data to go by.

Paradoxically ground-water problems are not confined to the desert areas of our country. In recent years the water supply of some of our great coastal cities—New York, Los Angeles, and Miami, to name a few—have been seriously threatened by the infiltration of sea water into subsurface reservoirs. And again, contrary to expectation, serious underground problems have occurred in many States where rainfall is plentiful. Louisiana, for example, has experienced more trouble from declining wells than Nevada, the most arid State. Coming from a desert area myself, I was surprised to pick up Washington newspapers and find that a serious water famine exists in the nearby basin of the Potomac River. These are but a few instances of the multiplying problems we face in maintaining our water resources.

Once we realize that surplus flow and surplus storage constitute only a small part of our existing supply of water we can get some concept of the challenge we face in discovering and wisely using underground sources of fresh water. The magnitude of the task is demonstrated by the fact that our hydrologists have only meager scientific data concerning the geology and subsurface water of 90 percent of our total land area.

Foremost among the new water-saving methods we must develop are techniques to artificially recharge our underground reservoirs. This infant science could open up a whole new field of water conservation and would make our underground storage a readily renewable resource. Once we are able to manipulate our underground system and store away flood flows that otherwise might evaporate or escape, we will be well on the way to the solution of the major water problems which plague many States.

However, at present we have barely opened the door into this field of water conservation, and if we are to take the hydrologists at their word, we must redouble our efforts to learn these techniques before significant progress can be made in this promising field.

I firmly believe that the only way we can adequately meet our national water crisis is by creating a separate organization where our water scientists can concentrate on basic, unanswered questions with a full complement of trained personnel. Such an enlarged program would be essentially a cooperative venture between the Federal, State, and local groups. This agency could carry out research and factfinding, and come up with answers to the various water dilemmas which confront us in every part of the Nation.

The Government already has many water-use and conservation programs which are functioning well. I refer to the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, and the new programs now starting under the Water Facilities and Watershed Protection Acts enacted in 1954. In my opinion, we should fully support these programs and my legislation would not disturb them in any way.

However, in the field of basic water research we find a hodgepodge of activities and many gaps where little or no work is being done. I propose that all of these efforts be centralized under one specialized department where all of our water work will be carried on with a guidance and unity of purpose which are not possible under the present arrangement. As a starter, all of the work of the Ground Water Branch of the Geological Survey, our saline water research program, and studies of induced precipitation could be placed under this new department.

Some may say that nothing would be accomplished by such a coordination of efforts, except the creation of another unnecessary bureau. It seems to me, however, that it has been our experience, governmentwise, that many sound programs are hampered unless they have a separate identity and a unified leadership. A department with a clear mission to perform can secure from the Congress and from the people the support it needs to do a job of maximum efficiency.

Such a research and factfinding program is a traditional and accepted function of the Federal Government. To a considerable extent, local government and private enterprise become concerned with water problems only when answers are required. But sound answers to local water problems are possible only within a framework of factual data built on statistical records begun years before the local and immediate problems can be defined. Ordinarily, private enterprise and local agencies neither can nor will maintain the many prerequisite long-term records, or undertake the broad research involved. This alone is a summons to Federal responsibility and sums up the need for a national program.

As I have already indicated, I am not proposing a regional program but a national one. Available studies indicate that areas of water abundance have problems which are perhaps more serious than those of the arid States due to the fact that the bulk of our population is located in these regions.

Are we prepared to tackle and solve our water problems? As of today it seems clear that we are not. For many years our water scientists have been quietly telling us that we need to accelerate our water research work.

Belatedly, our policy makers are coming around to this point of view: Last year the second Hoover Commission raised a few eyebrows by recommending in one of its reports that the Federal Government increase its spending on basic research programs; and last month the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy specifically urged an expanded program of collection and evaluation of basic data. For example, it was recommended that ground water research be doubled over a period of 5 years, and that water quality studies be trebled.

It is time we took a hard look at the overall water requirements and resources of the United States. An all-embracing national water program is of the greatest urgency. We must map out our existing water resources and develop new methods of utilizing them before our economy is seriously damaged. Once we have taken stock of the available water we can then set about to wisely put our existing supply to the fullest use.

Our goal should be maximum use and maximum conservation of our full water potential. While sound conservation is now the rule where many of our natural resources are concerned, water-wise we have been rushing headlong to use up our resources without giving though to sound conservation principles.

Each generation should be able to say to its successor, "Here is our land. We give it to you renewed and improved." Unless this generation sets to work at once with new vigor on an adequate national water program it is entirely likely that we cannot honestly make this statement to our children.

HEMISPHERE OF THE AMERICAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the United States has shown a very proper interest in the economic development of our neighbors to the south by economic assistance, technical aid, scientific aid, military training missions, roadbuilding programs, student exchange programs, and others. In many instances, these have been important adjuncts and their value has been fully recognized. However, all of the above-mentioned aid is infinitesimal in comparison with the aid we have poured into Europe and Asia. Unfortunately, in this hemisphere, we have at times shown an inclination to dally with our commitments. Guatemala is a significant example of this. That courageous little Republic cast off the Communist yoke 1½ years ago. The Communists left her treasury stripped. Guatemala needed prompt and effective help. The help given has been slow and inadequate. The whole world has been watching and this hemisphere is particularly alive to the situation. The hour is late, but not too late, to remedy it. However, our interest in Central and South America must never be allowed to rest on that one base.

Broadly stated, the long term and bipartisan objective of United States-Latin American policy is to maintain peace, security, freedom and prosperity throughout this great hemisphere, in our own country, and in those of our partners in the inter-American system. These policies are long term and bipartisan because they reflect the deep feeling of the people of the United States for their neighbors in the other American Republics, and our strong and enduring interest in their well-being and happiness alongside our own.

In our general approach to this goal we seek to emphasize long-range objectives that offer lasting benefits to all the peoples of the Americas for our neighbors as well as to ourselves. No immediate military threat imperils the Western Hemisphere. Fortunately,

therefore, the overwhelming majority of the resources of our sister republics can be directed to their normal, wholesome economic development. Our own economic, mutual defense, political and cultural relations programs in the area can be realistically planned far ahead.

I would like to discuss economic policies. In this field our constant objective should be to cooperate with our sister nations in helping them to develop strong, self-reliant economies. It is in the interest of our own people to have independent, prosperous, and friendly neighbors with the resources and the will to cope with their own national problems.

It has been said—and it is certainly true—that the greatest contribution we can make to the economic development of Latin America lies in our support of an expanding inter-American trade. That trade is worth about $3.5 billion a year to our exporters. Where do our Latin American friends get that kind of money to buy our products? They get practically every dollar of it from sales of their commodities to us. How can we safeguard this tremendously important trade? First, by a policy of resisting understandable efforts by some of our own interested sectors to decrease access to American markets for key Latin-American products. To many of these countries, the sale of such products means the difference between national stability and instability, both economic and political. For example, Venezuela's petroleum market in the United States means for her people the difference between prosperity and possible economic chaos. Similarly, if the existing tonnage of our foreign suppliers of sugar were cut sharply the economics of some would be badly hurt.

It must be remembered in our own interest that if Latin America does not sell to us she cannot buy from us, and Latin-American markets for a great variety of United States products are strong and they are growing. We should never forget a simple basic fact of our inter-American economic community. If by a tariff or quota we reduce—let us say—Mexico's sales of a product to the United States by $100, we may automatically reduce the sales to Mexico by our own farmers and manufacturers by $100.

A great expansion of our trade with the rest of the hemisphere can be brought about without damaging legitimate interests in the United States. We should take advantage of the natural preference on the part of most of our neighbors for dealing with us, or they may in frustration seek to take their business elsewhere.

Two other important aspects of our policy have to do with basic national attitudes in this hemisphere. In spite of the many differences among the American republics—differences in size and wealth, in origins, in religion, and in language—there are great fundamental identities. In the first place, the form of government in all 21 republics is that of a constitutional democracy; the historic development has been from an epoch of discovery through colonial government to independence; and guiding objectives for us all have constantly been peace and progress. As a natural consequence, we have to come to realize that our independence involves our interdependence; that we best withstand attacks on our freedoms when we stand together. Let me amplify a little:

First, the 21 American republics with their similar views on the sovereignty of nations and the freedoms of peoples, constitute a powerful force in the United Nations for making the world a peaceful and properous place for all mankind. The United States works consistently and continuously in cooperation with our sister republics in this global effort which means so much to the security of our own people.

In connection with this matter of inter-American cooperation, I have been asked whether the increasing Soviet attention to Latin America and offers of trade should cause the United States to change its policies toward the other republics in the hemisphere.

In point of fact, it is doubtful that the Russians would see fit to keep their proposed increased trade commitments even if they concluded them. They have a sorry record of performance in this field.

Furthermore, it is clear to thinking people in all of the 21 republics that Russia does not make her bid for friendship and trade in Central and South America because she has any desire to lessen world tensions. It is rather an attempt to increase her own influence in relations between the republics, the better to sow seeds of discord and discontent. Her ultimate objectives are too well known to require further discussions.

The Latin American people will make their own decisions as to where their best interests lie, in the continued close cooperation of all the Americas, or elsewhere.

Hence, there is no reason for the Communist campaign to make us change the course that we are following. On the contrary, I am convinced that any significant change would be regarded by them as a notable success achieved by their propaganda. Insofar as Latin America is concerned, Latin Americans themselves have been pointing at the fact that our relations with the neighboring Republics are mutually friendly and mutually beneficial on the plane of equality and freedom; and that on the other hand, once the Soviets achieve control over any country or any region, they never disgorge it, but keep it and exploit it for Soviet benefit. The expansion of private United States investment in the other American Republics, and the improving investment climate there, gives statistical evidence of close inter-American cooperation. Direct United States investment of this nature is now in excess of $6 billion. Of our total exports, 27 percent go to Latin American markets; and 37 percent of Latin American exports come to our markets. We have aided stability and development in Latin America by encouraging free enterprise, within the countries as well as from without, to make investments there. We have made governmental loans in some countries where other financing for urgently needed projects was not obtainable. In isolated instances, grant-aid has been requested of us and we have cooperated by giving it. Latin America knows that this record of friendship, cooperation, and genuine helpfulness cannot be obliterated. It is there to be seen, and to be kept in mind.

Our country should pursue a strong, nonvacillating, and politically bipartisan set of policies in the area. They should be designed to promote the general welfare of the people of this hemisphere through cooperative programs to develop trade, stabilize economic conditions, expand cultural contacts, assure our mutual defense and encourage the continued growth of our free institutions. We should follow these objectives for the purpose of improving the living standards of the people of this hemisphere, thereby strengthening the security of all our nations—not just to fight communism. The realization of our goals is the most convincing refutation to the false promises of the Communists, in or out of the Western Hemisphere.

A final and most important political objective of the United States is to cooperate with the other American Republics in the preservation of peace in the hemisphere. It is in the interest of all of us that the occasional differences which arise among us be peacefully solved. How can we achieve these objectives? Primarily by cooperating with the 20 other American republics, with mutual respect and confidence, and on the basis of complete equality, in solving our hemisphere problems. The United States for more than half a century has given strong support to the inter-American system of conferences at a common round table to consider and resolve threats to the peace of the hemisphere and means for the peaceful advancement of our nations. The Organization of American States, which has its seat here in Washington at the Pan American Union, is our regional organization within the larger framework of the United Nations. In point of fact it provided and afforded a working model for the United Nations, of which it is one of the most powerful bulwarks.

In this hemisphere, our country and the other American Republics have known, and for 50 years and more have put the knowledge into practice; that one of the best methods of dealing with political problems of the hemisphere is for all our Republics together to use every conceivable practical means of strengthening this inter-American system. The United States should give full support to every effort for making the Organization of American States increasingly hardy and active, capable of taking our tough problems and acting effectively to solve them.

The OAS is one of the most useful organs the New World has yet achieved in the international field. It is based on the premise that in the Americas we should work honestly and loyally to build a future in which all our countries can develop in harmony with each other. We should all be joined in the belief that there shall be built here a political structure which shall be durable because it is upheld by our common respect for representative government rather than by fear and force. This concept will assure

to the smallest the same sovereign dignity that is enjoyed by the strongest.

These statistics serve to point up the importance of another area of our activities involving the information and cultural programs. In the long run, this complex area of our relationships with Latin America may be of determining importance. Most simply it involves the necessity for increasing the number of ideas and aspirations which we hold in common with the people of the Latin-American countries. Beyond that, it means a continuing effort to develop common definitions, because quite often people of different countries discover that they attach different meanings to such concepts as freedom, democracy, or individual initiative. In other words, while it may be possible to translate the words literally, the meanings conveyed by the words are not always the same to all people.

One of the most effective means of developing closer understanding in this area of international relations is through increased personal contacts. Student programs are of particular importance. In 20 or 30 years the present students of all our countries will be running this Government and those of the other American republics. We have a priceless opportunity here to help the young people of all our nations understand the peoples of the entire area, and our common aspirations, for a strong, free and prosperous hemisphere; to encourage democratic institutions and recognition of the need for cooperative undertakings for joint development and mutual security.

These considerations apply also to our United States Information program. Regardless of how fine, or pure, or noble our principles may be, it is difficult to understand how they can prosper unless people are informed of them. It is sensible to ask ourselves just how much do our friends in Latin America know about United States policies. Do our friends understand what we are trying to do? It is through the use of public information programs that we reach the peoples of these countries, and both the quality and quantity of what we have to say had better be effective. Now is the time that we have to explain to these people where we are going, and how we are going to get there.

I believe that we and the other American Republics have an opportunity to establish a model of international cooperation to inspire the whole world. We possess a unique opportunity to demonstrate to the rest of the world how 21 nations of widely varying size, population, and strength can live in harmony without trespassing on each other's sovereign rights. It is hard to overstate the potential impact of this demonstration on the unhappy, frustrated peoples of the Communist satellite states. As long as such examples exist no tyranny can rest easily, because its people are continuously confronted with incontrovertible evidence that better conditions exist elsewhere. This serves to keep alive and nourish the hope of all oppressed peoples that similar conditions may some time be brought about in their part of the world.

We do not intend to try remaking our sister republics into our own image. We must encourage a continuing understanding and respect for each other's ideas, convictions, and cultures, even though these may differ. We are fortunate that there exists among the Latin American Republics a remarkable degree of homogeneity, resulting in part from common historical and geographical factors. But there is also a great deal of dissimilarity among the countries of the Western Hemisphere, and this is in many ways a good thing. The vitality of nations, no less than that of individuals, is closely linked with the healthy competitions and debate which results from difference of opinion and outlook.

In our efforts to reach our common goals in the hemisphere, we should always be glad to offer our cooperation, but I would like to emphasize in closing that within the free republics of the Western Hemisphere, each government makes its own decision as to the programs on which it will embark. We then cooperate with each other to get the job done. I cannot stress too greatly the importance of hemisphere solidarity, progress, and prosperity. From these, all the nations of the hemisphere will benefit—none more than our own country.

WORLD AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the farm problem is everybody's problem. It is a problem that is here and is very real.

I have taken this time today to spread some dependable information upon the record. I believe that if we have more light than heat, we can help the present situation substantially. Certainly we cannot solve the farm problem by merely castigating the very sincere present Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, any more than in previous years we could find solutions to previous problems in American agriculture merely by casting aspersions on the then Secretaries of Agriculture. To my knowledge they have all had pretty tough sledding.

I have served as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for more than a decade. It may be that I take some license here but I would like to say that I have served the administration of four great Americans who were Secretaries of Agriculture—the Honorable Claude Wickard, the Honorable Clinton Anderson, and the Honorable Charles Brannan—and last but certainly not least, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson. Through those years have also paraded some outstanding Members of this House as chairmen of the House Committee on Agriculture legislation—the late Judge Hampton P. Fulmer was chairman of that committee at the time I came to Congress. He was a lovable person, dedicated to the cause of the American farmer as was his successor, John William Flannigan, Jr., of Virginia, Clifford Hope, and Harold Cooley, upon whose shoulders now rest the trust of rural America if legislation can assist in our present squeeze. And, through the years, it has been my privilege to serve under quite a list of other great Americans, equally devoted to the cause of American agriculture, the chairmen of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that supplies the funds authorized by the Congress and asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture. In my decade of service on that subcommittee, I have had the privilege of working with such men as Judge Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia; Everett Dirksen, of Illinois; H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota; and the present very able chairman of that subcommittee, Jamie Whitten, of Mississippi.

During my service in the Congress, I have seen much constructive work done when men such as those I have named have worked together in a full understanding of what the facts are and what can or cannot be accomplished.

I was particularly impressed at the time when President Eisenhower sent his farm message to the Congress to hear the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY assert that he was going to do his best to keep politics out of the considerations of his committee. I subscribe to that also and with you, I hope that we can promptly be about the business of helping in the present farm situation.

We have already passed one piece of legislation by mutual cooperation and while it is not a big item, at least, it is one step in the right direction. I refer to the removal of the gasoline tax for fuel used on the farm. I am happy also to note that the aisle does not stand in the way of the support for legislation that will greatly liberalize the loaning program of the Farmers' Home Administration. I trust that we can act speedily on the two measures that will provide longer repayment periods and the power to refinance farmers' home loans and generally make more effective that very useful Administration which takes care of the small farmer and those who are the poor risks among our farm population.

Another action that should be taken by the Congress immediately is on H. R. 8751 which would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to permit farmers to use the grain and wheat they have raised on their own farms to feed their own livestock.

The spectacle of a monastery down in Georgia faced with a penalty of $1.13 a bushel on wheat raised at the monastery, strictly for use there, should give us pause. Last year they raised more than their quota—hence the penalty under the law.

The same thing applies to many small producers. This proposal has already passed the other body and should be passed now in the House.

Through the years I have seen this House take action by full cooperation between the majority and minority parties that were truly helpful in solutions of our farming troubles.

What I have to say today involves one act of the 83d Congress that also was the result of such cooperation. It stands to perform much good today and in the future. I refer, of course, to the very

fundamental work that we are doing through the medium of our newly reinstated Foreign Agricultural Service. Perhaps a little history would serve us well here.

Our efforts to aid the American farmer in intelligent and timely marketing of his surplus crops in foreign countries actually begins in the late 1920's when Nils A. Olsen was Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1928–1935. Olsen was old-fashioned in his thinking, fortunately, for he believed that the American farmer had to have a profitable market for that which he produced. Further, he recognized that there were several agricultural commodities that had a long historical dependency on world markets. He felt that in order to maintain and extend overseas markets, it was important to have an understanding of foreign competition, demand, and marketing practices.

The five principal commodities involved are: First, cotton, an export commodity since 1739; second, tobacco, an export since 1615; third, fruit, since early in the 19th century; fourth, wheat; and fifth, rice. There are, depending on the seasons, many others of lesser importance historically. A new export, of real importance, is fats and oils.

Olsen felt that knowledge of foreign markets could contribute much to a more orderly program of marketing. With wider knowledge, the farmer could better plan his plantings and his shipments.

Olsen's dream resulted in the establishment in the Department of Agriculture of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service on July 5, 1930. It became the OFAS. Under its authorization, the Department sent specialists abroad to study marketing conditions and thereby to assist the American farmer in obtaining the maximum value for his product by enlarging every possibility in the domestic and the world's consuming areas.

But these specialists soon became more than that. Because they felt the responsibility of their specific and particular mission—the line of responsibility was clear and straight from them through the Secretary of Agriculture to the American farmer. They soon grew to know not only outstanding producers in foreign lands, but those whose business it was to import into those nations those commodities in which they specialized. They returned to the United States periodically and moved from area to area consulting with producers and shippers. They became a dependable liaison between areas of supply and areas of want. Their watchword was "service to the American farmer."

The record of these commodity specialists is good. That record was made during the great, worldwide depression years, and, therefore, adds to the credit they so justly deserve. From a nation famous for its production lines and specialized production, we had sent commodity specialists to help the world enjoy quality and superior condition of our specialized agricultural crops. The idea was original. It was properly directed. It was producing. The dream of Nils A. Olsen was beginning to bear fruit. It seemed that we were on our American way to a new approach and to a new era in foreign trade.

They knew that any American agriculture problem was the problem of every American and they were at work.

And then occurred a jurisdictional dispute at the Cabinet level. The State Department, feeling that everything outside the United States was their concern, and only their concern, looked on any real activity, regardless of its merits, as an invasion of their rights. They laid plans for an amalgamation of all foreign efforts under the State Department. They succeeded, and in 1939 this amalgamation took place with, it should be noted, the Departments of the Army and the Treasury, at least, refusing to go along and insisting that in their specific fields, they be assured their independence.

Under the amalgamation, OFAS employees were offered the opportunity to become employees of the State Department. This was optional and more and more accepted. They were offered far more than the Department of Agriculture could possibly offer: Better pay, shorter hours—since proven, better retirement benefits, more senior rights as to office space and subsistence facilities abroad, a chance for advancement—one employee is today an Ambassador, to my knowledge, and another, to my knowledge, has retired as a Minister of Embassy. It is my belief that the amalgamation actually took from the Department of Agriculture not only the clear straight line of responsibility from the Secretary to the commodity specialists but also the ability of the Secretary to do very much toward the protection of his foreign agricultural workers.

The amalgamation to all intents and purposes destroyed Nils Olsen's dream. Our attachés, as I have indicated, became agents of the Secretary of State rather than the agents of the Secretary of Agriculture. Moreover, we changed the name of the Service from that of Foreign Agricultural Service to the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. For a long while it did not make too much difference. The war broke out in 1941, and with it came military and strategic state trading to take over all normal trade and that condition existed by and large until about 1950.

During the war and the postwar rehabilitation period, we had a ready and a commanding demand for everything that the American farmer could produce. After the war, we went all out to feed and to rehabilitate the farmers of our neighboring nations. We had UNRRA and ECA, the Marshall plan, and President Truman's point 4 program, a program that involved the exporting of our know-how to foreign countries. We did bring them back to life, and in so doing we have added to our own problems here in America.

It shall be my purpose here today to show you as nearly as I can some of the facts of life regarding the competition that we are forced to meet. Broadly throughout the world, agriculture production today stands at 119 percent of agricultural production in the prewar years of 1935–39. In the free world, this figure stands at 125 percent.

Now, may I get back to the work that we in the Congress have already done in the name of our American producers to get tooled up so that we may more adequately gage and more adequately understand the problems that we face today in world agricultural production and market competition. Those of us on both sides of the aisle who watched the American farmer rise to his full stature during the war to produce those foods necessary to win the war and the peace, also watched our efforts through the various agencies—UNRRA, ECA, the Marshall plan, point 4, and a host of other activities of a subsidiary nature, to restore production to the farms of devastated Europe and the embattled areas and we felt, seeing what was going on, much as Nils Olsen must have felt in the 1920's. From 1948 on, in our private conversations and to my own knowledge, in our discussions on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, we suggested that we should have a stronger foreign agriculture agency in the Department of Agriculture. Many of us at first hand deplored what appeared to be a loose association between our own Secretary of Agriculture at home and those who were supposed to be attached from his Department in our foreign embassies. This was not peculiar to Secretary Benson any more than it was peculiar to his predecessors, Secretary Brannan and Secretary Anderson. As early as 1950, a great many of us on both sides of the aisle undertook to study this problem intimately. As far as our own Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations is concerned, our entire subcommittee planned a trip for the purpose of studying this problem. Personally, I made such a trip and upon my return reported informally to the members of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. That was in October 1953. This report was well received and widely reprinted. Following this trip by our subcommittee and following similar trips by the House Agriculture Committee, we did work together to the end that as part of the agriculture bill of August 1954. President Eisenhower signed the bill which returned the agricultural attachés to what we felt was their proper place as, first of all, responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. We also renamed the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations to the new name of Foreign Agricultural Service and arranged for the funds supplying it to be appropriated directly from the Department of Agriculture.

Looking back we must say that this should have been done years earlier. It is entirely possible that it should have been done as early as 1948 and I propose now to tell you why. That it was not done is no particular discredit to anyone but a review of the facts as we have them today will indicate that we might possibly have overcome or anticipated some of the problems that today exist and which we will have to live with until we have solved them.

As matters now stand, we are just completing the tooling up of this new agri-

cultural service in the Department of Agriculture that in the future stands to be most useful to the American farmer. Now in order to present some of the facts of foreign agricultural production most effectively at this time, I have had the Department of Agriculture prepare for me some charts which will bring us up to date as to world production.

As I have already stated, in the free world that production is 25 percent greater than it was in the 4 years just prior to World War II. It has been apparent to us for some time that our foreign aid programs should be reassessed to reflect this fact and that this country no longer should appropriate funds for foreign aid that will further aggravate this imbalance.

Just the other day we had the Prime Minister of England reassure us that his country no longer wanted economic aid. Only this week the international relief society that operates under the name of CARE announced that they are pulling up stakes in the free world and are moving their operations to the Orient where people are still hungry and where there is need for aid of this sort.

These charts which I will show you are purposely made as simple as possible. Obviously it will be impossible to reproduce them in the RECORD so I am taking the liberty of removing portions of an excellent pamphlet put out last month by the Foreign Agricultural Service which will deal with world production of at least two commodities which these charts reflect.

This pamphlet is entitled "The World Agricultural Situation, 1956." It contains an amazing amount of information regarding the world production situation. Most of the charts I propose to show you are contained in this publication. I commend this pamphlet to your study.

There are, of course, two commodities that are hurting more perhaps than others in the United States at this time. Mostly these two are suffering because of surpluses in the United States that according to the agriculture law of 1938 indicate the need for acreage reduction.

The first of these is cotton. Today, cotton and its problems is everybody's problem. Today the world supply of cotton stands at approximately 61.8 million bales. That is 3.3 million bales higher than a year earlier and is a new record high. The world production also is a new record high and world consumption is expected to be nearly equal to the 1954–55 record. However, due largely to the fact that in the year 1950 the United States production was unable to meet its overseas commitments, world production during the last four years has skyrocketed and in those 4 years has exceeded world consumption by nearly 10 million bales with the result that end-season world stocks increased by that amount between 1951 and 1955, due mainly to world competition. Our own stocks increased by 8.8 million bales which constitutes 90 percent of the world increase in surplus.

We are told that more than 50 percent of the world cotton stocks had accumulated in the United States by July 31, 1955, while most other countries, both exporters and importers, had reduced their stocks to a minimum in anticipation of some action on the part of the United States Government to reduce the price of cotton for export. Prices of foreign growths of cotton declined sharply during 1954–55 for the same reason and at the beginning of the 1955–56 season they were as much as 8 cents a pound below those for similar quality United States cotton.

As the 1955–56 season opened on August 1, there was an atmosphere of suspense in foreign cotton markets as importers purchased only for current minimum needs and exporters of foreign growths offered their cotton at lower prices in an effort to liquidate their holdings before anticipated reductions in prices of United States cotton for export. Export sales programs now in effect or announced for operation after January 1, 1956, include limitations intended to avoid any serious reaction in world markets that would be detrimental to foreign competitors and holders of stocks. The quantities of United States cotton involved in the programs are not large enough to stimulate exports sufficiently to bring them up even to the 1954–55 low level.

World cotton production in 1955–56 currently estimated at 40.6 million, 500-pound bales, is an increase of 2 million bales above that of a year ago, which was a record high at that time.

Half of the increase occurred in the United States. The United States increase is attributed to a 22-percent rise in average yield per acre that more than offset a 12-percent reduction in acreage under the production-control program. The increase in foreign production was due almost entirely to an increase in acreage.

World cotton consumption is estimated at 36 6 million bales and that is 800,000 bales higher than the previous record figure of 35.8 reported for 1953 and 1954. World consumption has increased steadily since the end of World War II but has not kept rise with the increase in production. Most of the increase, it should be noted, has taken place in countries that produce cotton and at the same time have high industrial development and high standards of living.

Cotton: Acreage and production in major countries, areas, and world average 1935–39; annual 1954–55 and 1955–56 [1]

Major countries	Acreage			Production		
	Average 1935–39	1954–55 [2]	1955–56 [2]	Average 1935–39	1954–55 [2]	1955–56 [2]
	1,000 acres	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*
Mexico	725	1,820	2,685	334	1,780	2,[illegible]
United States	27,788	19,251	16,882	13,149	13,696	14,[illegible]
Total, North America	28,642	21,444	20,058	13,523	15,825	17,16[illegible]
U. S. S. R.	5,087	(3)	(3)	3,430	(3)	(3)
India	[4] 24,204	18,350	19,000	[4] 5,348	4,250	4,[illegible]
Pakistan	(4)	3,185	3,100	(4)	1,300	1,40[illegible]
Turkey	667	1,440	1,480	249	650	67[illegible]
China	7,038	9,600	(3)	2,895	3,100	(3)
Syria	85	463	500	28	365	[illegible]65
Total Asia	33,805	34,771	36,201	9,038	10,297	10,5[illegible]
Brazil	5,562	4,500	(3)	1,956	1,630	(3)
Argentina	770	1,350	(3)	289	530	(3)
Peru	428	540	540	379	510	495
Total South America	7,060	6,875	7,376	2,711	2,877	3,056
Egypt	1,821	1,639	1,885	1,893	1,598	1,806
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	439	685	(3)	248	407	(3)
British East Africa	1,876	2,158	(3)	356	354	(3)
Total Africa	6,176	7,654	7,953	2,840	3,167	3,437
World total	81,142	78,330	79,498	31,689	38,410	40,585

[1] Crop year beginning Aug. 1. Production in bales of 500 pounds gross weight.
[2] Preliminary. [3] Pakistan included with India.
[4] Not available.

Cotton: Exports by country of origin, averages 1934–38 and 1945–49; annual 1951–52 through 1954–55 [1]

COUNTRY	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*	*1,000 bales*
Mexico	105	343	972	992	951	1,253
United States	5,296	4,065	5,711	3,181	3,914	3,685
India	2,746	568	123	292	104	209
Pakistan	(2)	(2)	919	1,273	898	634
Turkey	84	69	261	433	377	233
Syria	12	8	169	181	183	322
Brazil	1,065	1,116	347	145	1,412	1,020
Argentina	133	48	5	271	157	120
Peru	337	301	307	398	361	330
Egypt	1,747	1,451	908	1,727	1,485	1,081
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	257	287	398	267	413	298
British East Africa	[3] 334	[3] 285	340	445	341	375
Belgian Congo	[3] 133	[3] 208	187	212	199	180
Other	643	1,424	1,727	2,294	2,261	2,571
World	12,892	10,173	12,374	12,111	13,056	12,211

[1] Data relate to year beginning Aug. 1. Bales are equivalent 500 pounds gross weight.
[2] Pakistan included with India. [3] Calendar year prior to 1947.

World stocks of raw cotton increased rapidly during the past 4 years to 21.7 million bales at the beginning of the current season. This figure exceeds estimates for all peacetime years except 1938 and 1946. More than 50 percent—11.1 million bales—of these stocks were located in the United States. Stocks in possession of the United States Government, accumulated prior to that date under price-support program, has reached 8.1 million bales, or 37 percent of the world total.

In January 1955 prices of foreign growths of cotton were approximately equal to those of comparable qualities of United States cotton. A steady decline in prices of foreign growths that began soon after that month may be attributed to prospective large crops abroad, large surplus stocks in the United States, and market rumors that United States Government action to reduce prices of cotton for export was imminent. Prices of United States cotton declined slightly to the loan level, while prices of foreign growths continued downward to a current level for some growths as much as 8 cents a pound under United States prices. United States prices in recent months have been approximately the same or below the loan rate of 33.75 cents per pound for Middling 15/16-inch cotton at the 14 spot markets.

World trade in cotton under these conditions declined to 12.2 million bales in 1954–55, compared with 13.1 million a year earlier. The decline is attributed to a reduction in stocks and in consumption in nearly all net importing countries except India. Declining prices were the principal cause for reductions in trade, stocks, and consumption in these countries, which account for nearly all world trade in cotton. United States exports amounted to only 3.4 million running bales in 1954–55. Exports during the first 3 months of the current season totaled only half of that for corresponding months last year, but some improvement is expected after January 1, when a new export program to sell up to 1 million bales becomes effective.

The outlook for cotton is that trade and consumption in 1955–56 will be at least as high as in 1954–55, provided most of the uncertainty regarding price trends can be removed from the markets and confidence can be restored in stable world prices at whatever level they reach.

United States production is expected to be reduced in 1956 by further restrictions of acreage to 17.4 million acres, compared with 18.2 million allotted and 17.5 million planted last year.

The sharp decline in prices of foreign growths during the past year probably will result in some reduction in foreign production in 1956–57 and a little increase in consumption and inventories in importing countries.

However, since world production in 1955–56 is expected to exceed world disappearance—consumption plus destroyed—about 3.5 million bales, world stocks will probably be increased by this amount.

Now, let us keep this firmly in our minds. As of right now, the world's supply of cotton is estimated at nearly 62 million bales; the annual world's production as of today is more than 40.5 million bales; the world's annual consumption, while it is on the increase, is only a little more than 36.5 million bales.

You will note by studying this booklet of the Foreign Agricultural Service that we have had record increases in the production of coarse grains, rice, and tobacco. We have had a record crop in fats and oils but we are also exporting a healthy increase to foreign markets. At the same time, the world sugar production continues to rise despite crop restrictions in some of the larger producing areas of the Western Hemisphere. Livestock numbers throughout the world are at a record high. Poultry and eggs are on the increase, as is coffee, tea, chocolate, wool, hides and skins, and jute and hard fibers. Potatoes last year were below previous years. For raisins a favorable export market is forecast, while citrus continues to increase in production and prunes are not expected to figure in the export market for two reasons: First, the unusually strong United States prices, and, second, the large foreign pack.

Now, may we turn to the subject of wheat? It, too, is everybody's business.

The combined world wheat and rye production in 1955 is estimated at 260 million short tons compared with 250 million short tons in the preceding season and the post-war average of 220 million short tons—the period from 1945–49. Rye accounts for less than one-sixth of the total world bread grain production.

The 1955 world wheat crop of 7,300 million bushels was only slightly below the all-time record of 7,400 million in 1952. The estimated increase of 350 million bushels for 1954 is mainly a reflection of larger crops in Canada, Turkey, and the Soviet Union, the latter named country officially reporting a substantially larger area in the spring crop. And may I add here that farmers who visited the Soviet Union last summer brought back some disturbing rumors. We are told that Russia is moving into some of the previously unused areas to the east and reports have it that as high as 75 million acres are planned for planting in wheat. The current issue of Time magazine carries a story on this enterprise, referring to it as the virgin land. The reports we get also indicate that even this 75 million acres may be increased. Those who know the area and who know wheat growing do say that this is a marginal area, subject to extremely cold and vigorous weather. However, given a favorable season, it is entirely possible that the Soviet Union might give further disturbance to our own hopes for export markets. It would appear, however, that Russia is the biggest single nation in the production of food grains.

Because of our reduced acreage in the United States, our own crop was down some 6 percent. It is worthy of note that in Europe, even Italy, normally an importer of wheat, and the Federal Republic of Germany, also a net importer of wheat, had increases of production. Our reports out of eastern Europe and from the Soviet Union are, of course, controlled. We have to resort to their own handouts largely and to such reports as may be gained in other ways for factual information regarding eastern Europe. But we are assured that the overall increase was at least 3 percent for 1955 over 1954. Growing conditions were reported especially favorable in Poland. The total Asian crop was about 25 million bushels greater this year than last with significant shifts occurring among countries. Larger crops were harvested in Turkey, India, and Iran. Small crops were harvested in Pakistan, Syria, and Iraq.

To show you the effect that 1 year of adverse weather can have on world supply of any given crop, we can turn to Turkey who again this year will be an exporter of wheat, whereas a year ago she was a net importer.

In the Southern Hemisphere, the South American crop is estimated to be down somewhat from 1954, but Australia is harvesting a larger crop.

Wheat: World production, 1955 with comparisons

[Million bushels]

Continent or area	Average		1953	1954	1955
	1935–39	1945–49			
United States	758	1,202	1,169	970	916
North America	1,086	1,581	1,809	1,310	1,441
Europe	1,600	1,265	1,730	1,720	1,770
U. S. S. R.	1,240	885		1,340	1,525
Asia	1,558	1,585	1,790	1,790	1,815
Africa	143	134	195	220	190
South America	281	263	330	393	345
Oceania	177	183	203	171	214
World total excluding United States	5,327	4,693	6,221	5,975	6,384
World total	6,085	5,895	7,390	6,945	7,300

But in this whole field of foreign markets, there is a fact that all of us, I believe, should keep uppermost in our minds.

In a report to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the Marketing Service through the Foreign Agricultural Service supplied us with a rather interesting list of activities in other countries as regards their use of impediments to trade such as production incentives, export and import quotas, tariffs and other mechanics to protect and encourage

their own domestic production and, of course, to assist their farmers also to make full use of the export market. Here is a partial list that will appear in the written hearings. I might add that I have an incomplete report on the wage rates of these competitors. Our information is with regard to wheat, that France is paying her farmers the equivalent of $2.64 a bushel for soft wheat and $3.04 a bushel for hard wheat, while at the same time she is offering French wheat in the German market, which incidentally has always been a rather important foreign market to us, for $1.75 a bushel. Uruguay, we understand, is paying her wheat producers $3.51 a bushel, Sweden is paying $2.21 a bushel; Turkey is paying the equivalent of $2.49 a bushel, while Syria is paying her producers $2.20 a bushel. Not any of these particular countries is really an important exporter of wheat and probably these incentives mainly are used in the struggle of these countries to become self-sufficient as regards bread grains. However, many of them are the recipients of our economic aid or have been and insofar as they do pay these prices, our incentives are used to produce food grains which are then moved into the export markets in competition with us. This certainly should be kept in mind as we ponder the need for the application of any foreign military aid in this cold war.

When we get into the field of important producers and exporters, however, of bread grain we find Argentina offering wheat at $1.53 a bushel; Canada last October—the latest report I have—reduced her No. 1 Northern Ex-Fort William to $1.70 a bushel; her No. 2 and No. 3 at lesser prices and she is offering No. 4 Northern Ex-Fort William at $1.58 a bushel.

I am told that Australia's offering price, while I do not have the exact figure now, is comparable.

Into any consideration of world problems involving the United States and other wheat-producing and wheat-consuming countries, it would not be complete without some reference to the International Wheat Agreement.

This is an agreement first entered into formally in the year 1949 by 38 countries. Eight more nations joined later, and the volume of wheat within the scope of this agreement of 1949 concerned some 581 million bushels.

This first agreement was based on negotiations going back as far as 1931. The agreement is an international arrangement on multilateral trade; a marketing agreement, that is, on one major commodity. In concept, it is designed to assure stable supplies of wheat to importing countries and a stable market for exporting countries within an equitable price range. It assumes basically the importance of achieving some measure of stability in international trade in wheat that national measures alone cannot, in general, successfully cope with regarding the very great changes that take place in the wheat situation from time to time, and that such agreement provides the broad base through which national wheat production programs can be coordinated.

I have here a brief review of experience under the Second International Wheat Agreement and some problems confronting its renewal. This brief review was prepared for me by Dr. John Kerr Rose, Senior Specialist Division, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I would like to submit this complete report for your information. I believe you will find it interesting.

It may be that such a program as the International Wheat Agreement, if successful, might give us some ideas as to its possible application internationally to commodities such as cotton and others.

I would like to also relate some of my own personal experiences with the International Wheat Agreement.

To my knowledge, I am the only Member of Congress who has ever sat in as an adviser at the executive sessions of the International Wheat Agreement. This I did in April 1952, a privilege provided me by the then Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Charles Brannan, and with the cooperation of President Truman. These meetings were held in the Church House, a meeting place connected with Westminister Abbey in London. It was a very interesting experience. I sat as an adviser with the American delegation in what was known as the exporters' block. At that time there were but four members of the agreement considered exporters of wheat—the United States, Canada, Australia, and France, the latter, then, at least, with a very small amount. I was attracted to these meetings because under the agreement, it was costing the American taxpayers at least 45 cents a bushel for each one of the nearly 300 million bushels of wheat which we supplied to the International Wheat Agreement. And I come from a wheat area.

At that time, the first 3-year agreement was drawing to a close and the meeting which I attended was the first of a series of meetings designed to lay the ground work for renewal of the agreement. We were persuaded that it was costing the American taxpayer a considerable amount of money, well in excess of $600 million for our 3 years' participation in the agreement. We were anxious to raise the ceiling of the price range from $1.80 to a higher figure. The agreement was renewed in April 1953 with the ceiling raised 25 cents from $1.80 to $2.05. Our experience, under the second agreement, has not been nearly as satisfactory as that under the first agreement. Under the first agreement we managed to average well over one-half billion bushels of wheat by means of this agreement, half of which was American wheat. So far, the figures for the second agreement have been approximately one-half of that total. Negotiations now are underway, the first meeting have been held in October and November at Geneva to renew the agreement. There has been some discussion as to whether or not it would be renewed but most observers believe that it will. Obviously, the new agreement will carry a lower price range and should move more wheat through it. This should be apparent since Canada is now offering good wheat at $1.70 or less a bushel and Australia at about that figure. Probably if renewed at the lower price range, we may step up the movement of our wheat under the International Wheat Agreement. In any event, I am happy to supply for the RECORD, a very interesting discussion of the International Wheat Agreement, what it is and what the prospects are for its renewal:

A BRIEF REVIEW OF EXPERIENCE UNDER THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT AND SOME PROBLEMS CONFRONTING ITS RENEWAL

I. SOME BACKGROUND

The third and final year of the Second International Wheat Agreement is about half completed. Preliminary discussions looking toward renewal were held in Geneva in October–November 1955. Full-dress discussions will commence in February 1956. This makes pertinent and perhaps timely a brief look at the experience and achievements under the present agreement, plus some consideration of existing and emerging problems, not only of the wheat agreement as such, but of the closely interrelated world wheat situation.

The agreement is an international arrangement on multilateral commodity trading—a marketing agreement on one major commodity. In concept it is designed to assure stable supplies of wheat to importing countries and a stable market for exporting countries within a reasonable and equitable price range. It assumes, basically, the importance of achieving some measure of stability in international trade in wheat, that national measures alone cannot in general, successfully cope with the very great changes that take place in the wheat situation from time to time, and that such agreement provides the broad base through which national wheat-production programs can be coordinated. It is not, however, an agreement directed to the control of stocks or production, or of quotas for export, but an agreement which applies a preagreed price range to stipulated quantities of wheat moved in the ordinary course of international trade.

The first agreement, which followed repeated and long continued negotiations dating back to 1931, was signed and ratified in 1949 by 38 countries. Eight more nations joined later and the volume of wheat within its scope was increased to 581 million bushels. In 1953 the expiring agreement was subjected to comprehensive review with the result that the second agreement set a new price range of $2.05 per bushel maximum and $1.55 per bushel minimum for the 3-year life of the agreement as compared with a maximum of $1.80 per bushel and a minimum which declined from $1.50 to $1.20 during the 4-year life of the first agreement. Some other modifications were involved but the most significant difference was that the major importer, the United Kingdom, declined to participate under the second agreement, as did Italy initially. Even more important perhaps has been the sharply changed supply situation under which the second agreement has operated.

II. EXPERIENCE UNDER THE SECOND AGREEMENT

1. With respect to results one might perhaps generalize to the effect that it has functioned less adequately than the first agreement, but under more difficult conditions. It has nevertheless continued to function, whereas some had anticipated complete breakdown.

Grave fears were expressed for the success of the second agreement even before it went into effect, particularly when Britain, the world's largest importer of wheat, steadfastly declined to continue her participation because of the higher maximum price stipulated. Even in retrospect, there are those who still take a dim view of the adequacy

of the agreement and performance under existing conditions:

"Looking back, it is clear that the expiring agreement was already out of date in April 1953, before the signatures renewing it for a second term had dried. By then production of wheat in Europe and Asia had recovered from the ravages of war, and in some countries output comfortably exceeded the prewar average."[1]

2. Wheat has continued to move under the agreement in considerable volume, though in lesser bulk than under the first agreement, and with further decline apparent as the agreement approaches termination. The lesser volume is, of course, in part to be charged to the absence of the United Kingdom among the importers under the second agreement. Italy rejoined in 1954 but her quota was cut to 100,000 metric tons against a previous quota of 1,100,000 tons under the first agreement and an original quota of 850,000 metric tons under the second agreement.

Transactions in wheat and flour recorded under the International Wheat Agreement

Year[1]	Bushels: Wheat equivalent
1949–50	432, 120, 396
1950–51	530, 974, 733
1951–52	572, 203, 753
1952–53	572, 268, 837
1953–54	225, 192, 107
1954–55	290, 450, 000

[1] Year August 1 to July 31.

The early months of 1955–56 would appear to indicate that transactions under the final year of the second agreement will be considerably lower than in the previous year. As of January 20 (table I) with about one-half of the year gone, about 125 million bushels of confirmed transactions had taken place under the agreement as compared with a full quota for the full year of 394,958,000 bushels.

3. The decline in transactions under the agreement appears to have been shared rather evenly by the four exporting countries included (table II).

4. World trade in wheat has held up better than transactions under the agreement.

World exports of wheat and flour, in wheat equivalent[1]

[1,000 bushels]

Year:	World total
1945–49 (average)	877, 724
1950–51	936, 838
1951–52	1, 066, 013
1952–53	987, 266
1953–54	878, 909
1954–55	942, 850

[1] Data are for year beginning July 1, so are not strictly comparable with those for the wheat agreement year.

This suggests several possibilities, that is, that wheat may have been moved outside the agreement by the major exporters, that other countries may have increased their exports and that importing countries may have fallen short of guaranteed amounts under the agreement.

5. Some importing countries have fallen far short of their guaranteed purchases under the agreement.

This is, of course, their option under the agreement in as much as prices have not been lowered to the minimum. It does mean, however, that performance under the agreement has not yet been fully tested. That is, we know that the exporting countries did perform by continuing to fulfill their commitments during the first agreement, even though wheat would have brought more than the maximum price. There has not yet been a test of whether importing countries will take their full quotas at the minimum price. Presumably this test has been delayed, or avoided, at the option of the exporting countries, especially the United States and Canada.

6. Prices have shown considerable stability, have not fluctuated widly, though the trend has been a declining one during the second agreement. From a level near the maximum of $2.05 per bushel they have eased, in the face of record supplies, to a level not far above the minimum of $1.55 per bushel. However, just as the first agreement dampened the upward price trend during some or all of the years of its existence (that is, exporting countries sold wheat at prices below those which would otherwise have prevailed) so during all or part of the recent period, prices seem to have been sustained at a level somewhat above those which might otherwise have prevailed.

7. Direct subsidy costs to the United States have averaged about the same per bushel as under the first agreement.

Wheat and flour: United States exports and subsidy payments under IWA 1949–50/1954–55

Year beginning Aug. 1—	Exports in wheat equivalent	Total payments	Average rate per bushel
	Bushels	*Dollars*	*Cents*
1949–50	162, 724, 041	89, 763, 201	55. 2
1950–51	249, 525, 545	169, 718, 889	68. 0
1951–52	255, 523, 772	167, 310, 583	65. 5
1952–53	251, 430, 145	136, 080, 203	54. 1
Total, 1949 agreement	919, 203, 503	562, 872, 876	61. 2
1953–54	106, 413, 887	49, 709, 502	46. 7
1954–55	139, 210, 000	[1] 105, 267, 086	75. 6
Total, 1953 agreement (2 years)	245, 623, 887	154, 976, 588	63. 1

[1] Includes an estimated $10,859,632 to be paid in 1955–56 fiscal year.

Source: I. W. A. Branch—Grain Division, CSS.

8. Not only has world production of wheat increased to record levels in recent years but surplus stocks available for export have accumulated in unprecedented volume. Production has risen to a level in excess of 7,300,000,000 bushels in 2 recent years as compared with an average crop of about 6 billion bushels prewar and early postwar. July 1, 1955, stocks in the 4 major exporting countries were a record 1,800,000,000 bushels with the United States carryover in excess of 1 billion bushels, and Canada's carryover even larger in relation to her production and domestic consumption. Even more significant perhaps have been the substantial surplus situations developed in France, Turkey, Sweden, etc.

9. Assurance of supplies under the agreement apparently has not checked the policy of encouraging wheat production, even under substantial subsidy. The United States with a reduction of more than 20 million acres in recent years is about the only country which has attempted to adjust production downward in the face of increasing surplus. Over 96 percent of the world's wheat crop is produced and marketed under price supports or other forms of official incentive and planning.[2] In spite of the sharp decrease in United States acreage, world acreage in wheat production has risen to 483,480,000 acres as compared with about 406 million acres in the early postwar period and about 425 million acres prewar. Acreage trends, probably more indicative of production intent than the yield or production, are shown for some of the more important countries in table IV.

III. LIKELIHOOD OF RENEWAL

It is more than a little difficult to assess the probabilities that a new wheat agreement will be achieved. Representatives of about 60 countries met in Geneva late in October. They were invited especially to suggest and discuss possible modifications to the existing agreement, or alternative forms of agreement. Included were all, or nearly all, the 48 members of the second agreement. Included were the four designated exporters, Canada, United States, Australia, and France, plus several others which now are or would be exporters—Sweden, Turkey, the U. S. S. R., and the Danubian countries.

Our own position has been none too clear. Though United States officials were reported as hinting before the Geneva meeting that the United States might balk at renewal if Great Britain continued to boycott the agreement,[3] later reports indicated that we favored renewal provided the pact could cover "most international trade in wheat."[4]

The position of the world's major wheat importer was even more obscure. An influential British publication observed: "The present scheme no longer bears much reality to the world wheat trade, but if the conference fails to improve upon it then governments might fall back on its renewal, if Britain would rejoin. It is conceivable that Britain might find this politically expedient—given agreement on prices—for the sake of its relations with the Commonwealth producers, Canada and Australia."[5]

Reports from the preliminary Conference were not entirely discouraging as to possible eventual support from the United Kingdom.

Also, spokesmen for the principal importing countries, as distinct from the private traders of those countries, were reported as citing three reasons for importer interest in renewal:[6]

1. Will be very difficult to launch any other international commodity agreement if this one breaks down.

2. In spite of present oversupply and potential decline in world prices, the situation is not necessarily a long-term one, and agreement provides protection if the situation should change.

3. Agreement provides some basis for resistance to still higher domestic support schemes in importing countries.

The other major uncertain factor is Canada. They have appeared to be approaching the verge of desperation as regards the wheat situation. Late in September and early in October the Canadian Wheat Board reduced prices by 5 to 7 cents per bushel. This, for some unclear reason, was done in two moves, about a week apart. The lower grade was reduced the most. The resulting prices were, in Canadian funds, ex-Fort William: No. 1 Northern, $1.70; No. 2 Northern, $1.67; No. 3 Northern, $1.64; No. 4 Northern, $1.58.

The move was variously interpreted as clearing the air before the International Wheat Conference of October 26, as firm notice to the United States that further movement of wheat into the world market at cutrate prices (to relieve tight storage in some areas) would meet with retaliation, etc. In any case it was indicated that the board could hardly reduce prices any further without incurring loss; operating and storage charges added to the $1.40 per bushel initially paid to farmers equaling approximately present reduced prices.

They have had and still have a complex holding operation on the farm front. The

[1] Wheat in Plenty, the Economist, October 1, 1955, pp. 51–52.

[2] Foreign Agricultural Circular, FG 13–55, USDA, April 8, 1955.

[3] New York Herald Tribune, October 23, 1955, p. 24.

[4] New York Times, October 27, 1955, p. 41.

[5] The Economist, October 29, 1955, p. 414.

[6] New York Times, November 2, 1955, p. 49 et seq.

farmers are reported to be very dissatisfied with the present operative results of the wheat pools. With grain traffic channels pretty thoroughly clogged, the farmers cannot deliver this year's crop (nor even in some cases stored stocks from previous crops) to the local elevator where they would be paid the initial base price. They have instead been offered a government scheme for guaranteed bank loans up to $1,500 at 5-percent interest on the security of their farm-stored grain. This proposed pallative is reported to have been received without much enthusiasm.

The Government meanwhile has made at least two other interesting moves. They appear to have explored, at a high level, the possibility of an outlet for agricultural products on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Some wheat and rye have been sold to Poland, but to date no major success in this direction has appeared. Conferences in Ottawa, then in Washington, have been reported as involving an attempt to try to persuade the United States Government not to demoralize the world wheat market any more than its political necessities imperatively demand.[7]

Canada apparently approached the renegotiation not very confident that a new agreement would emerge, in the face of some opposition from the United States and the United Kingdom.[8] However, others surmised that Canada would not be much interested in renewal of the agreement were it not for fear of more United States giveaway programs in the absence of responsibility under the agreement.[9]

Few details have been released from the Geneva Conference of October–November, but comments have not been without hope:

"The International Wheat Conference has ended its meetings at Geneva in a way that will please those who think that any type of agreement is better than none, and disappoint those who hoped that a more constructive scheme would emerge from stabilizing world trade in wheat. The Conference was in favor, in principle, of a wheat agreement, and it considered that a scheme on broadly similar lines to the present one most likely to be acceptable. The Conference will meet again in the new year to start negotiations in earnest: The range of maximum and minimum prices, and the quotas between exporting and importing countries have to be settled, and a number of technical questions as well. No country was at all committed at the present session, but the general feeling was that the prospect of a more broadly based scheme, covering Britain and other countries now outside the present one, were fairly bright. * * *"[10]

Michael Hoffman, reporting from Geneva at the time of the adjournment of the preliminary meeting in November, indicated that the odds appeared favorable that a new agreement would result from 1956 discussion.[11] But it does appear that these preliminary discussions took place in the atmosphere of a buyers market (inevitable under present supply conditions); importing countries were free with their demands, and the United States delegation was disappointed that the first draft of the hoped for 1956 agreement (not yet made available) included many unagreed-upon loophole provisions favoring importing countries.

[7] The Economist, November 26, 1955, p. 762.
[8] New York Herald Tribune, October 20, 1955, p. 11 (sec. 2).
[9] The Journal of Commerce, October 21, 1955, p. 4.
[10] Wheat Pack Clears One Hurdle, the Economist, November 19, 1955, p. 684.
[11] New York Times, November 19, 1955, p. 24.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 26, 1956.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT SALES, JANUARY 18–JANUARY 24, 1956, TOTAL 848,000 BUSHELS

The United States Department of Agriculture reported today that during the period January 18, 1956 to January 24, 1956, inclusive, the Commodity Credit Corporation confirmed sales of 848,000 bushels of wheat (including wheat and wheat flour in terms of wheat equivalent) under the International Wheat Agreement against the 1955–1956-year quotas.

The sales for the week included 157,940 hundredweight of flour (368,000 bushels in wheat equivalent), and 480,000 bushels of wheat. The importing country principally involved in this week's sales was Japan.

Cumulative sales by the United States since the opening of quotas for the 1955–56 year on June 27, 1955, total 49,005,000 bushels. (See over). Sales by the United States are through January 24, 1956, and in the case of other exporting countries sales shown are those recorded by the Wheat Council in London through January 20, 1956.

The Department's report also included status as of January 20, 1956 of 1955–56 quotas assigned to territories of member countries (see below).

Status of territorial quotas, 1955–56, as of Jan. 20, 1956

[1,000 bushels]

Importing territory	Quota for crop year	Exporting countries—total sales				Balance [1]
		United States	Canada	Australia	Total	
Belgium: Belgian Congo	1,102	361	629	3	993	109
Netherlands:						
6 islands	441	85	61		146	295
Surinam	255	78	88		166	89
Portugal:						
Angola (PWA)	786	690	(2)		690	96
Cape Verde Islands	39	10	14		24	15
Macao	74	9	35		44	28
Mozambique (PEA)	661		132	355	487	174
Portuguese Guinea	26	4	6		10	16
Portuguese India	331	92			92	239
St. Thome and Principe	53	2	33		35	18
Timor	33			5	5	28

[1] Subject to remainder being within the unfulfilled guaranteed quantity of the parent country.
[2] Less than 1,000 bushels.

TABLE I.—*Wheat agreement sales, 1955–56*

[1,000 bushels]

Importing countries	Guaranteed purchases	United States sales for week [1]	Exporting countries—cumulative sales							Balance
			United States [2]			Australia [3]	Canada [3]	France [3]	Total	
			Wheat	Flour	Total					
Austria	9,186						934		934	8,252
Belgium	23,883	34	762	362	1,124	3	4,430		5,557	18,326
Bolivia	4,042		992	542	1,534				1,534	2,508
Brazil	13,228			216	216				216	13,012
Ceylon	10,288					7,259		363	7,622	2,666
Costa Rica	1,286	6		352	352		303		655	631
Cuba	7,422	96	1,362	2,096	3,458		613		4,071	3,351
Denmark	1,837									1,837
Dominican Republic	1,102	9	10	266	276		228		504	598
Ecuador	2,388		73		73		441		514	1,874
Egypt	14,698									14,698
El Salvador	735	4	28	379	407		123		530	205
Germany	55,116		6,600		6,600	1,992	10,642		19,234	35,882
Greece	12,860		5,190		5,190				5,190	7,670
Guatemala	1,286		26	83	109		40		149	1,137
Haiti	1,837	27		778	778		316		1,094	743
Honduras	735	14	62	128	190		20		210	525
Iceland	404		15	2	17		3		20	384
India	36,744		1,568		1,568	3,024			4,592	32,152
Indonesia	6,246	2		55	55	3,945			4,000	2,246
Ireland	10,105					683	2,854		3,537	6,568
Israel	8,267		168		168		724		892	7,375
Italy	3,674		2,604		2,604				2,604	1,070

[1] United States sales (net of adjustments) for week of Jan. 18 to Jan. 24, 1956.
[2] Sales confirmed by CCC through Jan. 24, 1956.
[3] Sales recorded by Wheat Council through Jan. 20, 1956.

TABLE I.—*Wheat agreement sales, 1955–56*—Continued

[1,000 bushels]

Importing countries	Guaranteed purchases	United States sales for week	Exporting countries—cumulative sales: United States: Wheat	United States: Flour	United States: Total	Australia	Canada	France	Total	Balance
Japan	36,744	437	5,948		5,948	5,374	8,508		19,830	16,914
Jordan	2,939			3	3				3	2,936
Korea	1,470									1,470
Lebanon	2,756	16		407	407				407	2,349
Liberia	73	1		17	17		4		21	52
Mexico	14,698		2,353		2,353				2,353	12,345
Netherlands	24,802	47	1,026	2,347	3,373	95	1,415		4,883	19,919
New Zealand	5,879					4,221			4,221	1,658
Nicaragua	368	−1		229	229		133		362	6
Norway	8,451	14	1,054	867	1,921		2,925		4,846	3,605
Panama	845	6		266	266		101		367	478
Peru	7,349			20	20				20	7,329
Philippines	8,672	102		2,515	2,515	173	3,016		5,704	2,968
Portugal	7,349	1	1,350	809	2,159	359	223		2,741	4,608
Saudi Arabia	4,409	23		265	265				265	4,144
Spain	9,186		996		996				996	8,190
Switzerland	7,900						3,043		3,043	4,857
South Africa	13,228		1,045		1,045		5,040		6,085	7,143
Vatican City	551		321		321				321	230
Venezuela	6,246	10	48	2,400	2,448		2,003		4,451	1,795
Yugoslavia	3,674									3,674
Total	394,958	848	33,601	15,404	49,005	27,128	48,082	363	124,578	
Guaranteed quantities exporting countries					196,523	45,013	153,078	344	394,958	
Balance					147,518	17,885	104,996		270,380	

TABLE II.—*Transactions in wheat and flour recorded under International Wheat Agreements*

[Bushels, wheat equivalent]

Exporting countries	1st agreement: 1949–50	1950–51	1951–52	1952–53	2d agreement: 1953–54	1954–55	1955–Jan. 20, 1956
Australia	80,805,775	87,285,430	71,252,167	86,673,052	27,777,774	41,245,000	27,128,000
Canada	185,447,268	190,883,744	241,586,122	231,078,276	90,894,059	109,343,000	48,082,000
France	3,306,934	3,885,206	4,085,901	3,380,421	367,437	376,000	363,000
United States of America	162,560,419	248,920,353	255,279,563	251,137,088	106,152,837	139,486,000	49,005,000
Total	432,120,396	530,974,733	572,203,753	572,268,837	225,192,107	290,450,000	124,578,000

Source: World Wheat Statistics, the International Wheat Council, London, April 1955; and various U. S. Department of Agriculture sources.

TABLE III.—*Transactions in wheat and flour*[1] *under the Second International Wheat Agreement*

[Bushels, wheat equivalent]

Importing country	1953–54	1954–55	Guaranteed purchases[2]
Austria		4,956,000	9,186,000
Belgium	15,204,154	20,102,000	23,833,000
Bolivia	1,265,728	824,000	4,042,000
Brazil	3,872,642	7,350,000	13,228,000
Ceylon	10,288,180	5,724,000	10,288,000
Costa Rica	1,324,212	1,284,000	1,286,000
Cuba	5,871,081	7,275,000	7,422,000
Denmark			1,837,000
Dominican Republic	867,960	948,000	1,029,000
Equador	2,401,525	2,254,000	2,388,000
Egypt	1,887,919	588,000	14,697,000
El Salvador	727,101	730,000	735,000
Germany	37,482,584	54,767,000	55,116,000
Greece	4,854,576	12,012,000	12,860,000
Guatemala	1,095,330	1,139,000	1,286,000
Haiti	1,634,482	1,852,000	1,837,000
Honduras Republic	518,940	475,000	735,000
Iceland	286,122	53,000	404,000
India	2,647,185	24,842,000	36,744,000
Indonesia	4,577,824	5,038,000	6,246,000
Ireland	2,656,450	5,928,000	10,105,000
Israel	5,915,092	8,413,000	8,267,000
Italy			3,674,000
Japan	36,945,848	36,875,000	36,744,000
Jordan			2,939,000
Korea	1,064,388	1,422,000	1,470,000
Lebanon	33,650	2,076,000	2,756,000
Liberia	45,703	50,000	73,000
Mexico	2,945,536	150,000	9,186,000
Netherlands	17,219,666	27,957,000	30,314,000
New Zealand	5,853,299	5,879,000	5,879,000
Nicaragua	356,463	367,000	368,000
Norway	6,826,351	8,334,000	8,451,000
Panama	651,390	679,000	845,000

[1] Calculated at actual rate of extraction.
[2] Specifically for year 1954–55.

TABLE III.—*Transactions in wheat and flour under the Second International Wheat Agreement*—Continued

[Bushels, wheat equivalent]

Importing country	1953–54	1954–55	Guaranteed purchases
Peru	676,624	729,000	7,349,000
Philippines	8,653,742	8,708,000	8,672,000
Portugal	4,043,271	2,947,000	7,349,000
Saudi Arabia	1,451,066	925,000	2,572,000
Spain	9,316,494	1,608,000	9,186,000
Switzerland	6,966,199	7,113,000	7,900,000
Union of South Africa	7,633,373	7,653,000	13,228,000
Vatican City	551,000	559,000	551,000
Venezuela	6,240,636	6,255,000	6,246,000
Yugoslavia	2,338,371	3,633,000	3,674,000
Total	225,192,107	290,450,000	393,047,000

TABLE IV.—*Wheat acreage*

[1,000 acres]

	Average: 1935–39	Average: 1945–49	1953	1954	1955
IMPORTING COUNTRIES					
Austria	630	528	563	588	603
Belgium	394	371	421	455	473
Denmark	319	175	173	211	164
Germany	2,785	2,283	2,832	2,735	3,200
Greece	2,172	1,917	2,581	2,540	2,564

TABLE IV.—*Wheat acreage*—Continued

[1,000 acres]

	Average: 1935–39	Average: 1945–49	1953	1954	1955
IMPORTING COUNTRIES—continued					
Ireland	225	561	380	486	360
Italy	12,577	11,742	12,100	12,100	12,300
Netherlands	333	262	161	272	235
Norway	80	91	43	50	
Portugal	1,720	1,665	1,867	1,907	1,918
Spain	11,253	9,640	10,606	10,670	10,536
Switzerland	183	223	211	223	236
Mexico	1,244	1,244	1,624	1,804	1,804
India	25,460	23,312	24,286	26,310	26,842
Pakistan	9,305	10,337	9,510	10,650	10,700
WHEAT SURPLUS COUNTRIES					
Canada	25,595	24,717	25,513	24,267	21,504
United States	57,293	71,024	67,661	53,712	47,376
Australia	13,128	12,662	10,751	10,499	10,500
France	12,560	10,354	10,430	11,100	11,300
Argentina	15,834	11,432	12,345	13,500	
Sweden	740	749	959	1,068	875
Turkey	8,973	9,436	15,840	15,830	17,790

And now I would like to outline some of the thinking that has gone on in my own area. I feel that the wheat growers out there have tried, diligently to be constructive. Whether or not their program can be made compatible, workable, and successful with the soil-bank plan, I do not know. Perhaps it can. At least it is worthy of consideration—especially if there are to be further merging of ideas—and final compromise.

Obviously, the purpose of all production is consumption. The making available of supplies to every demand that which is accessible and in some cases that which may be discovered or created, may find a new market for wheat. It is when we come face to face with the definition of "production" that we see some of the inequities in existing law and existing practices or regulations. The world agricultural situation is always like a kaleidoscope—ever changing. This is of tremendous importance and while I shall conclude with some references to

additional observations on what might be done to speedily improve the present agricultural picture in America, I would like to comment on my own particular section of the United States.

The agricultural economy of the States of Washington and Oregon particularly is based on wheat. We are isolated in peculiar ways from the rest of the United States and, in fact, because of national laws, from the world. In the north we have Canada with her huge surpluses of wheat and a country that is actually outselling us on many occasions in the export market. Canada, wheat-wise, is desperate and has an aggressive export program. Because of the peculiarity of the loan rates on commodity credit loans, we have to yield the southern, or so-called California market, to the wheat producing areas of southern Idaho and northern Utah. And, of course, freight rates exclude us almost entirely from the eastern United States markets. We are worried, out our way, about the wheat situation—worried particularly because so large a proportion of today's surpluses are in our area. The farmers in my area are much in favor of the so-called domestic parity plan. It is a very simple plan. Certainly, it is worth a brief outlining here. It is entitled to our consideration. It is not too far away from the National Grange's export debenture plan of the late twenties and it does still follow a lot of the general idea of those who, being Americans, whether industrial or agricultural, want a part in our great domestic market—and yet being legally free to compete abroad. It is predicated on first determining what the wheat grower could get for his wheat if he sold it on the open market—sold it, that is, for just what he could get for it.

In addition to the price received in the market place, each wheat grower would receive a certificate for part of his crop, based on his average production. The Secretary of Agriculture would estimate the value of the certificate during the spring of the year. Let us say he estimates the market price will be $1.50 a bushel and that a 100 percent of parity is estimated at $2. The value of the certificate that the farmer would receive would be on that basis—50 cents a bushel. Certificates would then be issued each wheat grower based on his average yield for about one-half of his production, this being the national percentage of wheat used for human consumption.

Assuming that a farmer's average production was 1,000 bushels a year, he would receive certificates on about 500 bushels which would return him 100 percent of parity on half his crop. These certificates would be negotiable and could be cashed at any bank. The certificates could serve to some extent as crop insurance because they would be issued before harvest.

The certificates would come from a revolving fund set up by the Secretary, the money for this fund will come from processors who will purchase certificates on wheat they mill for human food in the United States. The manufactured product will thus carry the cost of the program, in other words, parity from the market place. The banker would honor the certificates presented to him by the farmer and return them to the Secretary's office to be reimbursed. Once the certificate has gone from the Secretary to the farmer to the banker and back to the Secretary, it would be canceled.

The miller would purchase wheat on the open market—recognizing quality wheat with normal price premiums—he would purchase certificates from the banker to cover the number of bushels of wheat processed into food, the value of the certificates being the same as that paid the farmer. The money received from the miller would be forwarded by the banker to the Secretary to be deposited in a revolving fund and used to pay for the certificates which had been distributed to the farmer. In this way the plan is self-supporting. The miller would not buy certificates to cover wheat processed for export, feed, or industrial uses. Farmers would be encouraged to grow quality wheat. The miller could sell competitively in the export market.

The grain buyer would buy the wheat from the farmer at the market price. Wheat would move freely into export and feed channels. A loan would be established at a level to protect the corn producer from undue competition. The market price would ordinarily be above the loan price. The grain buyer and the farmer would once again be in the business of buying and selling wheat on the basis of quality.

It is plain to me that we should be feeding more wheat to our livestock and a sizable portion of today's surplus is better adapted for that purpose. The so-called domestic parity would allow its use for that purpose.

As harvest approached last summer we had a carryover of a little over a billion bushels and a crop of some 911 million bushels.

Today we use about 490 million bushels for food, 100 million for feed, 80 million for seed, and while exports vary, some 270 million bushels for various foreign markets.

Simple arithmetic would seem to indicate that, under present conditions, it would take 15 years to eliminate the present surplus. However, as I shall indicate later, there are other factors—and things the Congress can do if we can agree—that will shorten the period.

The domestic parity plan would increase the amount of wheat now being fed to livestock by some 150 million bushels or a total of about 250 million. Today we feed some 4.5 billion bushels of various grains such as corn, oats, sorghums, barley, and rye, in addition to the small fraction of wheat to livestock. The proposal would make wheat about 3½ percent of the total, as against the 80 percent of the total feed grains now enjoyed by corn.

Farmers out my way feel that this is not a serious threat to the corn farmer and propose the establishment of a loan rate that would preclude wheat from demoralizing the feed-grain market. Corn, of course, is highly essential to livestock feeding and feeders in the Pacific Northwest find themselves paying as much as $14 a ton just for the freight to ship it in. We have not been a corn-producing area—but its production, under the circumstances is on the increase.

A similar provision was passed by this House a couple of years ago but was eliminated in conference. I believe it should be seriously considered now since it would certainly help to remove the three great objections to price supports:

First. That they distort geography and encourage the growing of commodities, especially grains, where they are not best suited to be grown;

Second. That they create surpluses; and

Third. That they hold an umbrella over the world market by making it more difficult for us to compete on world markets.

As you, my colleagues, know, I have supported price supports. I concede that a better program for our farm population is possible—but not yet here. Until that time, I shall have to oppose any program that means a "double cut"—that is, as is inherent in the basic law of 1938, a cut in acreage—and, as under flexibles, a cut in price, at one and the same time. Believe me, our wheat folks out our way would welcome a better program than the one we have. We have, as I have indicated, suggested one. We have really tried. We need your help now.

Domestic parity would at least favor the sale of wheat for what it is worth, within limits, for the purpose at hand both at home and abroad.

It would also change the base for support from acres to bushels—a contention held by many as the only safe basis.

Certain it is, if consumption is the sole purpose of production, that we should be free to feed more wheat, on the small farms as proposed by H. R. 8751 or by a proposal such as the domestic parity plan, or as an alternative, authority to channel 200 million bushels into feed channels for whatever price it will bring.

We are today moving on many bold fronts to help the American farmer out of the cul-de-sac that he is in. He needs our help and our speedy action based on our best judgment.

I think the soil-bank idea is sound—both the acreage and the conservation reserve and I suggest that benefits will accrue much faster than the doubters think. However, even though it may be expected to operate on a voluntary basis, it should be, in some way, broadly applied. Manifestly, it would be unfair for just one commodity to do all of the cooperating.

I feel, however, that the acreage-reserve program should be written with great care since we have, since 1948, seen foreign acres increase while our incentive surpluses have piled up at home. We have belatedly had to invoke the acreage-restriction penalties inherent in the basic law of 1938. Other nations have not, by established law, cut acreages as we have. Care should be used also so as not to penalize farmers who have already started growing grass or who historically use summer fallow. Certainly they should not be hurt.

I agree that our surplus-disposal program under Public Law 480 presents difficulties. Its intent was and is good—to feed the hungry who cannot afford to buy our foodstuffs.

The job of Agricultural Surplus Disposal Administrator, as proposed in President Eisenhower's message is and should be a full-time job—to sell, to barter for strategic materials or to donate wherever there is want and no funds.

It presents difficulties—but it can succeed.

The strengthening of commodity programs as outlined by the President has many ideas to commend it. It is here that the conferees—and the coming farm program will be written in conference—will no doubt find their greatest areas of debate. You and I can only wish them all knowledge and all foresight.

The President has suggested two points that can help the family-size farm and the small or part-time farmer. Certainly we can agree on some sort of dollar limit and to a program to aid the low-income farmer. We can also expand the scope of the Farmers' Home Administration in this field.

The Great Plains program, research and realistic credit policies, all of these should help.

I repeat, the farm problem is everybody's problem. It was everybody's business to win the war. Our agriculture helped to do just that. Our agriculture also helped to put the devastated areas and their people back on their feet after the war. That, too, was everybody's business as America's heart poured out through UNRRA, ECA, the Marshall plan and point 4. That work is now done. Today I insist that it is everybody's business to protect the free farmers of America and to work for their continued, even their renewed freedom. That, again, is in my mind, everybody's business. Can we not get going?

I, for one, want to assist all that I can in its speedy solution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is too modest in his very recent statement. I believe if any Member of Congress was responsible for calling to the attention of the Congress and of our subcommittee the need for reinstating a strong Foreign Agricultural Service that gentleman was WALT HORAN, of Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman. May I say right here that this was a matter of cooperation, it was a meeting of minds on this problem. I know that out subcommittee planned a trip in 1953 to visit the embassies and see what needed to be done to make stronger our forces in the foreign field for agriculture. It may have been a little late, but we did that. I made a similar trip and reported when I came back to my subcommittee. That report was very widely read. As a matter of fact, I had to mimeograph it twice in my office and distributed over a thousand copies. It was also reproduced in trade magazines. Other members of the Committee on Agriculture of the House did the same thing. As a result, by joint action we restored the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service to the Department of Agriculture. We did that when President Eisenhower signed the bill in August 1954, but we took the word "Office" out of it because we wanted a Foreign Agricultural Service. We also returned the attachés to the Secretary of Agriculture because we felt if you are going to hold any Secretary, I do not care from which party he comes, responsible for the things at home, he should have all the tools in his hand to work with when it concerns conditions abroad.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What caused the foreign production to increase was the foreign WPA program, was it not?

Mr. HORAN. Well, the gentleman has a point.

Mr. GROSS. And we are about to build a dam that will increase the cotton production down in Egypt.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman has a point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman have any charts or figures on the imports of agricultural products?

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman will find some in that booklet, if he will read it.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman knows that dollarwise our imports during the last fiscal year exceeded our exports by nearly $1 billion.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman while he is making his fine presenation, but I would like the record to show, and the membership to know, that we appreciate the very fine work our most able colleague has done for years on our committee and in the Congress. He and I have differed sometimes on the means as to how to reach an objective, but we have never failed to have the same objectives of sound agricultural programs during all the years we have worked together. I wish to commend the gentleman for the painstaking effort he has given to the study and preparation of his presentation he has made here today. As most of you know, during the years we have stood shoulder to shoulder on the House floor to protect agriculture's proper place in our economy and I anticipate we will continue to do so. I congratulate the gentleman, and appreciate very much his efforts.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Those countries are not in the International Wheat Agreement?

Mr. HORAN. Argentina is not. Canada and ourselves are the biggest part of the agreement, as exporters. Australia and France are also classed as exporters. The members of the Soviet bloc are not members of the IWA.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Australia is not in either?

Mr. HORAN. Oh, yes. It was a very interesting experience. We met at the Church House in London, which is really a part of Westminster Abbey, and we sat right down in the well, just like it is here. We sat here, France sat there, Canada over here, and Australia over there; four exporters, although France only exports about 7 million bushels of wheat, or did at that time. So they are not too important, as exporters of wheat.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I rise with considerable deference to the gentleman's greater knowledge about this whole agricultural picture, it is so much greater than mine.

There is very little wheat grown in the area from which I come, although there is some. What is the background of the law which provides that if a fellow raises wheat for his own consumption to feed to his own livestock he shall be subjected to a fine if he raises more than the permitted amount?

Mr. HORAN. I have already touched on that. I have urged support of Mrs. ST. GEORGE's bill which would allow that feeding. If a producer has a marketing quota and if he should exceed that amount and feed it on his property he is liable to a penalty under existing law.

Mr. KEATING. It just seems to me—I do not like to use the word "un-American" because I think it is thrown around too loosely—but it seems so contrary to what the gentleman and I have been taught and have been brought up to believe in this great country, that a fellow is going to be stopped from raising enough to feed his own stock, and on top of that is going to be subjected to a fine by his Government. I have had 2 or 3 instances where the farmers were aroused and I share their resentment.

Mr. HORAN. The law should be changed and I hope it is changed tomorrow because the law is not right.

Mr. KEATING. I will be happy to support such a change.

Mr. HORAN. So will I. I want to say that the domestic parity program, which is endorsed by practically all wheat-growers out my way, puts allotments on a bushel and not on an acreage base. That is another thing that should be considered if we are going to have Government controls, price supports, and that sort of thing.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that I certainly do not differ with my friend or with the gentleman from New York. May I say that this law as it now exists has had bipartisan support through the years. There is a little more background, however, than indicated, and that is the producers of wheat and the other commodities have voted these limitations on themselves in order thereby to get the support prices. If you give high prices on the basis of limiting production, and if you let the commodity

be used for different purposes or domestically at reduced prices, then you will upset the whole program and add tremendously to costs. I am not differing with the gentleman's approach to it, but there was a little more basis for the present condition than appears on the surface.

In reference to price supports on so many bushels, pounds, or bales, many farmers believe they are in favor of that. We have mistakenly tried to regulate world production by regulating the American farmers. The farmer prefers to cut down production acreagewise because by the use of fertilizer he produces the same or more. The average farmer knows he can have less acres and produce the same amount. He sees he can have controls without controls. What many farmers fail to realize each time he produces more on less acreage he cuts his acreage for the next year.

Mr. HORAN. Our wheat crop has only been reduced about 6 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. In cotton practically none. So we will have to consider the proposition of having a control program which will work and prevent our farmers from constantly increasing his overhead and reducing his acreage still further for the next year with still increasing costs. Of course, as the gentleman knows, I am fully convinced we must keep United States commodities offered in world markets at competitive prices, if any program is to work.

Mr. KEATING. In reply to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the farmers in my area voted down this limitation on production. Are they governed by the vote throughout the country?

Mr. WHITTEN. If they are in a commercial area, yes. I am not familiar enough with the situation to know as to the designation of the gentleman's territory. The law requires—I think it is a three-fourths vote. It is a tremendously large percentage, at any rate. You have individuals who vote against it, but they have to ride with the majority. That is the democratic way of doing things. I am not familiar with whether the gentleman's area is in a commercial area or not.

Mr. HORAN. I will say this: It has been recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture that the number of noncommercial areas be increased, and that in itself needs consideration and needs sincere thought.

Mr. KEATING. To establish this as a noncommercial area would solve the problem?

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in this problem, and I am anxious to have the help of everyone I can on it.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I don't know that I stressed the advantage of getting to a pound, bushel, or bale type of support. The average farmer feels that he wants controls by acreage, because by adding fertilizer and other things he can defeat the acreage reduction by producing more from the reduced acreage, but he is kidding himself, because as he defeats it one year the next year he has the acreage cut still further and he has to buy more fertilizer and other things to offset it. So you have a constant cutting back of acreage and an increase in overhead, but perhaps not any reduction in production, and acreage is moved each year from my bill section to the Mississippi Delta and even more from the Delta to other States.

Mr. HORAN. That is very true.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for a very splendid and factual presentation of the world's agricultural situation. In view of the fact that the gentleman is a member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I do hope that his subcommittee will carefully review the present status of our agricultural attachés. They were set up by the Congress to be salesmen for American agriculture commodities in foreign countries. That certainly was the intent of the Congress. It was my privilege last November to travel with the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Agriculture in South America, where we conferred with all of the agricultural ministers and all of our agricultural attachés in the respective countries we visited.

Although the agricultural attachés in their new assignments have not been functioning very long, it is my impression that they are doing a pretty good job. I am not quite sure, however that these attachés are free agents as the Congress intended them to be; I am afraid that in many instances, they are still under the domination of the State Department.

I think we should insist that they be the agents of the Department of Agriculture whose job it is to sell American surplus commodities and to find markets for American farm products in general.

Mr. HORAN. May I reply to that? I think the gentleman will be happy to read our hearings, because, without exception, the members of our subcommittee on both sides of the aisle express that same fear. We inquired as to their office space, their subsistence allowances, and so forth. And we particularly made this point, that they are there to serve the American farmer. There may come a time when they have to stand on their own two feet in that embassy in order to do that. We want them to carry dignity at all times, but we want to be sure that they are not treated as second-class citizens in any of our embassies in the world.

This is my view of an embassy—and I may be wrong—that it should reflect the Cabinet of the United States. Certainly the Ambassador is the top man. Someone should be boss and represent the President. Certainly the attachés should represent the various departments of our American Government which has rightful business abroad. They should be attached from the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Commerce, or what have you, to the embassy. They should be under the command of the Ambassador who represents, and is appointed by the President. But other than that they should be able to stand on their own two feet and defend the cause and the purpose of the Department from which they came.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Just where would the gentleman draw the line? An agricultural attaché, the gentleman says, is under the supervision of the Ambassador who represents the State Department; and that is true. But is the agricultural attaché required to do everything in conformity with the program of the State Department? If so, he cannot possibly be the free agent the Congress intended him to be.

Mr. HORAN. No; to me it means that the door of the Ambassador's office is always open to the representative of, in this case, Mr. Benson, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture. If something arises that needs solution it is up to the Secretary of Agriculture to work it out here at our home base.

Mr. HOEVEN. The only point I want to make is that the intent of Congress should be carried out.

Mr. HORAN. That is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. And the committees of Congress should see to it that such intent is carried out.

Mr. HORAN. I think the gentleman and I are agreed upon this.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a study of the International Wheat Agreement prepared by Dr. John Kerr Rose, of the Legislative Reference Service, and also to include certain tables.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTRIC POWER FOR CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, following the introduction of H. R. 9076 by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] on Monday of this week, two Washington newspapers gave front-page attention to the proposal. For the record, I believe that a few facts about the potential cost factor involved should be made clear at this time.

H. R. 9076 bears the title: "A bill authorizing surveys and studies bearing upon the possible use of atomic energy for utilities service requirements of buildings and grounds under the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes."

I want it understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am not presuming to oppose the bill at this time. It has been referred to the

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and will not necessarily go very far under its own power. I merely wish to correct some of the implications which the proposal has produced. Most readers of the Evening Star and the Washington Post and Times Herald quite likely were impressed with the possibility of setting up an atomic power plant in Washington—at least H. R. 9076 was given such prominent space that an uninformed person would assume that there is apparently some practical basis for suggesting such a project.

In my mind there are two ways of looking at this proposal. First, I question whether Members of Congress are deserving of an electrical service that would cost the taxpayers anywhere from eight times to infinity the price we are now paying for electricity.

On the other hand, is there any reason why Members of Congress and the citizens of Washington should be subjected to the risk involved in setting up an atomic reactor in this area? Of course, I realize that the matter of where the powerplant would be established is something that the proposed survey would eventually determine; but the fact remains that if the plant site is sufficiently distant from the Nation's Capitol to protect us from the fallout that would occur in the event of an accident, then you are going to have your plant so far from Capitol Hill that the whole intent of the project will be dissipated.

To me H. R. 9076, regardless of whether Congress or even the Joint Committee takes any action on it, provides encouragement and ammunition for the Atomic Energy Commission to continue to shoot the works with taxpayers' money in an attempt to develop a source of energy which is not now needed and which may become obsolete before conventional sources of power are exhausted. At the present time the Potomac Electric Power Co. is generating electricity through coal-fired boilers. The cost per kilowatt-hour is 6 mills.

Is anyone so unconcerned about the Federal budget as to recommend that the Capitol buildings convert to an electricity that is going to cost at least 52 mills per kilowatt-hour? I use this figure because a spokesman for the Atomic Energy Commission recently admitted that it is the expected cost of the power that will be generated at the atomic plant in Shippingport, Pa., where the Government has gone to great expense to set up a demonstration reactor. Actually no one knows how great an amount will ultimately be shown on the price tag.

The submarine *Nautilus* is testimony that our scientists and engineers are able to harness the power of the atom for perhaps any job they may wish to assign it. Congress has provided the funds for the development of this and other atomic-powered vessels, and we will not be reluctant to make whatever other appropriations are necessary in the defense of our country. But the *Nautilus* also makes it possible for us to realize what vast expenditures are necessary for the construction and operation of atom powerplants, and from this project Congress should take a lesson so that we will not go overboard on the uneconomic application of fissionable materials.

On page 241 of the Background Material for the Report of the Panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, there is shown these questions which were submitted by the panel and answered by Rear Admiral Rickover:

Question A. What would be the cost per shaft horsepower for a nuclear-propelled vessel as compared with one propelled by conventional power? (Both capital cost and operating cost?)

1. Capital costs: A replacement *Nautilus* powerplant will cost about $18 million. The cost of an oil-fired plant of equivalent horsepower is about $2,500,000. Therefore, the capital cost of the only presently operating shipboard nuclear-propulsion plant is about seven times the cost of an oil-fired plant of equivalent horsepower.

The machinery plant cost of a conventional ship varies, depending on the type of ship, between 15 and 30 percent of the total ship cost. Multiplying the cost of the powerplant of a given vessel by 7 would increase the vessel cost by a factor of 2 to 3.

2. Operating costs (exclusive of fuel costs): The complexity of a nuclear powerplant requires more and better trained personnel for operation, maintenance, and repair than a conventional plant. It is conservatively estimated that the total wages for engineering personnel and the cost of repair and maintenance would increase by a factor of two.

Question B. What would be the fuel cost for a nuclear-propelled commercial vessel compared with one propelled by conventional power, assuming vessels of equal cargo-carrying capacity and similar types of cargo and travel at similar speeds?

The fissionable material consumed by the nuclear plant represents but a small part of the nuclear fuel cost. When fabrication, reprocessing, and handling are included, nuclear fuel cost increases many times. The fuel cost computed in this manner for the *Nautilus* is about 50 times the cost of fuel oil for equal shaft power generation. Technology, not yet proven, is expected to lower nuclear fuel cost for reactors of this type to 15 or 20 times fuel oil cost within 5 years. Because of the extreme care in fabrication, and the special materials required to insure that radioactive fission products do not escape from the nuclear fuel elements, it is unlikely that nuclear fuel cost will compete with that of fuel oil for many years. Even if the nuclear core were supplied at no cost, it would still cost more to operate the ship than with conventional fuel.

Question C. Are there any types of ships essentially uneconomic for conventional propulsion which nuclear propulsion might put into competitive commercial trade?

Since a nuclear powerplant will increase operating and capital costs, it does not seem possible that nuclear power will place into competitive commercial trade any type ship which is uneconomic for conventional propulsion.

To get back to the atomic energy service for Capitol Hill, I think it important that we have a general understanding about the availability of coal supplies for the Potomac Electric Power Co. Once this picture is firmly established, Congress is not going to be impressed by any talk about the need for expediting development of commercial atomic-power plants.

Where Pepco obtains its coal may vary from time to time, but ordinarily it would move in from West Virginia, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. The recoverable reserves of bituminous coal in West Virginia and in excess of 50 billion tons. Pennsylvania has approximately 30 billion tons of minable reserves, and Virginia more than 10 million tons. Add to these the 3¾ billion tons of minable coal in Maryland—most of whose mines are currently inactive because they were put out of business largely through forced competition with residual oil imports—and you will find that these four States contain enough minable coal to last for more than three centuries at current rates of production. Under the circumstances, is there any justification for an attempt to rush, at the taxpayers' expense, the development of a new fuel to replace this source which has served so economically over the years? If the proposal to supply Capitol Hill with atomic-generated electricity ever becomes law, I do not know whether the plan would be extended to other Government buildings; I do know that Congress should make certain that there is adequate power to run the money presses night and day at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing if we are going to pay for such an expensive service.

What happens to H. R. 9076 is of no concern at this time; what should be prevented is its use as a springboard for advocates of excessive waste of public funds in atomic power experimentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENT IN OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an analysis of certain legislation.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for time to address the House is to discuss briefly four bills—H. R. 9180, H. R. 9181, H. R. 9182, and H. R. 9183—introduced yesterday to carry out President Eisenhower's recommendations for amendment in our immigration laws.

At this juncture of world affairs, when the people of this Nation should be firmly united, we are assailed from time to time by demagoguery and impassioned heroics on public platforms and in the press that would seek to divide us and set one race, or sect, or creed against the other. And one of the most often used sounding boards for charges of prejudice and bigotry, either rightly or wrongly, has been the immigration system of the United States. Of course, I do not question the motives, patriotism, or sincerity of any single one of my colleagues in this body. I refer merely to the known fact that frequently their remarks are seized upon by dangerous and subversive elements here and abroad and twisted about for their nefarious purposes.

The public interest, Mr. Speaker, or if you will, the enlightened self-interest of this great Nation, demands that we

throw the lie in the teeth of those elements. We must demonstrate the ever-present willingness of the United States to eliminate from our laws any possible grounds for charges of discrimination and unfairness as soon as the circumstances so require. This country has arrived at that point in our national development where reconsideration of the immigration laws has become a necessity. This is not in derogation of the attitude or work of those Members of this body which resulted in the enactment in 1952 of the present immigration code. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I say that the time has come for progress or else this country will be left behind in the present world conflict, cold though it may be.

The President of the United States has recommended changes in the immigration and naturalization laws, and, believing they are worthy of our immediate study in detail, I have introduced four separate bills with the request that each be considered on its individual merits.

The first bill would revise the present basic quota system. The total amount of the quota would be increased from 154,657 to 219,461 by use of a formula of one-seventh of 1 percent of the total population of the United States according to the 1950 census. The so-called minimum quota areas would have their quotas increased from 100 to 200, and it is proposed that subquotas of colonies shall be increased from a maximum of 100 to 200. Each quota area would first receive its present quota. The increment resulting from use of the 1950 census as a basis for computation would be distributed among the various quota areas, in proportion to the amount of immigration therefrom during the 30 years between 1924 to 1955. Five thousand numbers would be reserved, however, for assignment to skilled specialists whose services are needed in the United States without regard to their national origin or country of birth.

Mr. Speaker, this system constitutes a departure from the national-origins system because distribution of the increase in the quota is weighted by the fact that during that 30-year period there was much immigration wholly unrelated to national origins or the national-origins system, such as the great numbers of nonquota immigrants, and aliens who came here under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

Under the present law unused quota numbers, and I understand that perhaps as many as one-third are unused, are completely wiped out. This unfortunate result would be eliminated by this bill, which would permit the assignment of unused quota numbers annually to four regional quota pools, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. Regardless of the particular country of birth within the region, eligible aliens would be able to receive these quota numbers, but only if they are of the classes entitled to a preference status under the law by reason of their skills, or close relationship to citizens or resident aliens.

One important feature of this bill is the elimination of the so-called mortgage upon the several quotas resulting from the Displaced Persons Act and some special "sheepherder" laws.

I concur in the view of the President that computation and distribution of quota numbers, generally, is a matter for the legislature—in accordance with the provisions of this bill—and not the province of an administrative commission or body.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to eradicate the burdens placed upon the members of the Committee of the Judiciary, all the other Members of this body, and the President of the United States, resulting from the introduction and necessary consideration of overwhelming numbers of private relief immigration bills. That subject now approaches a national calamity, disguised though it may be, because of the time and energy it robs, when we and the President should be devoting our attention to other, more pressing matters of national importance. Adjustment of the immigration status of aliens, and the granting of exceptions from the ordinary standards laid down in the immigration laws should be a function of an administrative officer except in the most unusual circumstances. This bill proposes to vest the Attorney General with discretionary authority to admit to the United States, upon recommendation by the State Department, regardless of the grounds of excludability—other than subversive grounds—United States soldiers or war veterans, religious functionaries, or aliens having close citizen relatives. Similarly, he would have power to adjust the status of aliens already here if they are within the same categories. The total ceiling would be 5,000 per annum of cases which could be disposed of in this manner.

The third bill, Mr. Speaker, makes a number of technical changes, in addition to substantive revisions, which I believe are of great benefit not only to aliens but also to the national welfare. Among those, this bill would permit the Attorney General and the Secretary of State to waive the requirement of fingerprinting for nonimmigrant aliens. Transit through the United States of aliens from one foreign country to another would be facilitated, with proper safeguards permitted to be established by the Attorney General. Changes would be made in respect to the procedure for exclusion hearings and for the institution of deportation proceedings. The Attorney General would be vested with authority to relieve from deportation certain worthy refugees in this country who, to avoid forcible repatriation behind the Iron Curtain, misrepresented their identities and nationalities when applying for visas under the Displaced Persons Act.

A discriminatory provision in the law relating to the immigration of Asian spouses under the quota of an accompanying non-Asian spouse would be deleted. Special naturalization benefits would be provided for soldiers and veterans of our Armed Forces; extension of reentry permits would be authorized for close relatives of our soldiers abroad. Expeditious naturalization would be provided for adopted children of soldiers and other American citizens required to go abroad in the performance of their duties.

Certain illegitimate and adopted children would be granted an immigration status under the law, an additional measuse to prevent the separation of families. The requirement would be eliminated that an alien specify his race and ethnic classification in his visa application, and two technical and unnecessary grounds for exclusion from the United States would be eliminated. Deportation provisions relating to narcotic-law violators would be strengthened by this bill to remove any possible doubt as to their deportability, and provisions relating to exclusion of aliens convicted of minor offenses would be clarified. An important change would be made in the distribution of the quota by giving the fourth preference category a known percentage, that is 10 percent, of the total quota instead of the unknown number called for by the present law.

It is intended that these proposals, so briefly summarized, and the others contained in this bill should benefit the country as a whole. They would improve administration of the law and serve greatly to alleviate some of the more stringent requirements of the existing law. At the conclusion of these remarks I shall insert a more detailed description of the provisions of this bill.

While we are properly concerned with the interests of the alien, our primary duty is, of course, to the United States itself. One of the greatest problems that has faced this country is the matter of abuse of the judicial process, not only with respect to the multiplicity of reviews of criminal convictions, but also the use of judicial proceedings by deportable aliens for the purpose of delaying or defeating the proper application to them of the laws. Let it not be thought that I would advocate any measure which would deny to any person access to our courts. On the contrary, I heartily support the proposition that persons affected by administrative decisions under the immigration laws should have access to judicial review. But somewhere that review must come to an end. Somewhere the Government must be able to find itself in a position to enforce the law if right and justice so require.

Whereas, under ancient practice, habeas corpus was the sole means for review of deportation orders, aliens now have access to various forms of court proceedings. Deportation may be delayed for years while the alien racketeer sojourns peacefully among us, pending the outcome of judicial procedings instituted for no other purpose than to protract his stay.

This bill would establish a single uniform method of judicial review of deportation orders. The procedure would be expeditious and convenient for the alien as well as for the Government. Frivolous and repititious court actions would be eliminated to the fullest extent. Review of an exclusion order would be restricted to habeas corpus, a procedure which has traditionally been found entirely satisfactory. I hope that this bill

will be enacted so that the judicial process will no longer be available as a weapon to defeat the will of Congress as expressed in the immigration laws.

The President of the United States has on several occasions requested consideration and revision of the immigration laws. I am of the view that the welfare of this country demands that we answer his requests with the enactment of appropriate legislation along the lines he has recommended.

EXPLORATORY STATEMENT RELATING TO H. R. 9181 TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

A discussion of each of the provisions of this bill recommending changes to be made in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, is set forth below.

SECTION 1

Existing law requires that certain aliens who have been excluded or deported from the United States may not reapply for admission unless the Attorney General first grants permission to do so. This is an unnecessary and expensive complication in our immigration procedures and should be eliminated since there are now ample safeguards in the law against the readmission of unqualified aliens. Particularly is this true when consideration is given to the documentary requirements in the statute which contemplate a preliminary screening by a consular officer before the alien receives a travel document. Allied provisions in the statute require prosecution of aliens who have returned to this country without having obtained the necessary permission from the Attorney General. Section 1 of the proposal would provide for repeal of these requirements.

SECTION 2

The act contains provisions permitting the Attorney General and the Secretary of State to waive the requirement of travel documents in certain instances on behalf of nonimmigrant aliens. The exercise of this power in individual emergency cases is now limited to those which are "unforeseen." The quoted word is unnecessarily restrictive and should be eliminated. The provisions of section 2 of the proposal would effect this desirable change.

SECTION 3

Aliens coming to the mainland from Alaska and Hawaii are presently required to undergo the same inspection and are subject to the same grounds of exclusion applicable generally to aliens coming from foreign countries. Inasmuch as aliens entering Alaska and Hawaii from foreign countries are subject to all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, this requirement is believed to be unnecessary. Moreover, it causes added expense to the Government and occasions delay and inconvenience in travel. The necessary amendment is provided in section 3 of the bill.

SECTION 4

The law now requires that all aliens applying for visas must be fingerprinted, and that every alien admitted without a visa who is here for 30 days or more must be fingerprinted. This requirement is regarded as objectionable by many persons abroad, and is an obstacle to travel and the free exchange of ideas and cultures. Moreover, experience has not shown that insofar as temporary visitors are concerned fingerprinting has contributed materially to the national safety and security. Accordingly, authority should be given to the Secretary of State to promulgate regulations waiving fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens applying for visas. Similar authority should be conferred upon the Attorney General to prescribe rules waiving fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens already in the United States. Section 4 of the proposal would accomplish these purposes.

SECTION 5

In prescribing the procedures for the conduct of hearings before special inquiry officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to determine eligibility of persons to enter the United States—so-called exclusion hearings—existing law provides that such hearings shall be conducted by a special inquiry officer. The law does not specifically provide for the assignment of an additional officer to present evidence at such hearings. In regard to deportation proceedings the existing statute provides for the assignment of an additional officer to present the Government's case. In order to remove any doubt as to the authority of the Attorney General to assign an additional officer to perform the prosecutive functions in exclusion cases, in his discretion, where he deems such procedure to be desirable in particular cases, express statutory authority should be provided. Section 5 of the proposal would remove any doubt as to the authority of the Attorney General to make such assignments of examining officers in exclusion cases.

SECTION 6

There has been a tremendous increase in air and surface travel throughout the world and many aliens traveling from one foreign country to another find it necessary to pass through the United States. Under contracts authorized to be entered into between the Attorney General and operators of transportation lines such aliens may be exempted from certain documentary requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act. However, they must undergo the examination and inspection required of aliens generally, resulting in some instances in their exclusion or deportation. The enforcement of this requirement has resulted in severe hardship as well as loss of good will and unnecessary expense to both the Government and the operators of transportation lines where the aliens would otherwise pass through this country in direct transit. To alleviate this unfortunate situation authority should be vested in the Attorney General to dispense in his discretion with this requirement in individual cases. Section 6 of the proposal would accomplish this purpose. The guaranties entered into by the Attorney General with the aliens and the operators of transportation lines, it is believed, would provide ample safeguards.

SECTION 7

This section would amend section 241 (a) (1) of the act so as to authorize the Attorney General, in his discretion, to grant relief from deportation to certain refugees admitted under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. Section 241 (a) of the act makes mandatory the deportation of persons who gained admission by means of fraudulently obtained visas. There is a substantial number of refugees in the country who obtained visas by using false identities in order to avoid being forcibly repatriated behind the Iron Curtain. Under the present law their deportation is mandatory, and this section would authorize the Attorney General to grant relief to the alien if the misrepresentation was made to avoid repatriation to his homeland where he would be persecuted and not for the purpose either of evading the quota restrictions or preventing the investigation of his background.

SECTION 8

This section would provide that deportation proceedings may be instituted otherwise than by a warrant of arrest. Under a practice of long standing, deportation proceedings have been instituted by a physical arrest of the respondent. Such action has been regarded on occasions as being unduly harsh, particularly when the alien is a child of tender years, or is of advanced age, or for some other reason is not likely to abscond. Although section 242 (b) of the present law prescribes the deportation hearing procedure, it does not specify the manner in which such proceedings must be initiated. The Department of Justice has recently adopted the practice of commencing a deportation proceeding with an order to show cause, reserving a physical arrest for those cases in which custoday and detention of the alien is regarded as necessary in the public interest or safety. While this procedure is regarded as being entirely within the contemplation of the law, enactment of this section would afford an unmistakable statutory sanction for this less drastic procedure.

SECTION 9

This section would amend section 245 of the act, which authorized administrative adjustment of the status of certain nonimmigrants. Among those who may thus be granted permanent residence under existing law are those aliens who marry United States citizens. The law, however, forbids the granting of permanent residence if the alien has been in the United States less than 1 year before the marriage. This situation has resulted in the disruption of families and adds unnecessary expense to aliens who are forced to go abroad to obtain a nonquota visa, without compensating benefits. This section of the bill would, therefore, eliminate the requirement of 1 year's presence in the United States before marriage.

SECTION 10

This section would liberalize those provisions of existing law granting special naturalization benefits to alien members of the Armed Forces and to certain alien veterans, and would con-

solidate and codify a number of related statutes. Existing law grants special benefits in this regard to aliens who have completed at least 3 years' peacetime honorable service in the United States Armed Forces. The advantages of the law, however, are available only to those who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. These requirements have the effect of denying benefits to many worthy soldiers who, because of oversubscribed quotas, or other reasons, are unable to obtain an immigration visa, and to those who, because of service-connected disabilities, have been honorably discharged before completing the required 3 years' service. The proposed amendment would eliminate the requirement of lawful admission for permanent residence and would extend the benefits to those who were prevented from completing the necessary 3 years' service because of disabilities received while serving. In recent years the Congress has enacted a number of statutes providing special naturalization benefits for members of the Armed Forces. Separate statutes were enacted extending these special benefits to persons who served honorably in the Armed Forces during the Spanish-American War, during World War I, during World War II, and during the Korean conflict. This section would consolidate these separately enacted statutes and would make uniform the conditions for naturalization although based upon service during different conflicts in which the United States may have been involved. Proper safeguards are contained in the proposal to limit the advantages of this new legislation to those who served in an active duty status, and were honorably discharged.

SECTION 11

Section 241 (a) (11) of the act provides for the deportation of alien violators of the narcotic laws. This vital provision is needed to rid the country of a thoroughly undesirable group of aliens. It has become apparent that the act should be amended to eliminate some of the obstacles which have been encountered in the enforcement and application of the law. For example, while the act now provides for deportation of aliens who have been convicted of engaging in illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, and so forth, it does not call for the expulsion of an alien convicted of possession, in the absence of an allegation in the record of conviction itself that such possession was for one of the illegal purposes specified. Moreover, although the act provides for deportation of an alien convicted under any law relating to illicit traffic in drugs, and so forth, it does not specify that an alien convicted only of conspiracy to violate a narcotics law shall be deported. This section of the proposed legislation will appropriately amend section 241 (a) (11) of the act so as to accomplish these desirable changes.

SECTION 12

Section 241 (b) of the act provides that an alien convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude shall not be deportable if the sentencing judge has made a recommendation against deportation. The section has been interpreted as preventing the deportation of an alien convicted of unlawful trade in narcotics. This section of the proposal would make it clear that section 241 (b) does not apply to an alien convicted as a drug law violator and whose deportation is sought because of the drug law violation.

SECTION 13

Section 101 (b) of the act defines the term "child" as used in titles I and II. This section of the proposal would amend the definition by adding two further categories of children. The first would clarify the law so that the illegitimate child would, in relation to his mother, enjoy the same status under immigration laws as a legitimate child. It is believed that the drafters of this provision of the act did not intend to deprive an illegitimate child of the status he enjoyed under earlier law, but it appears that the language contained in section 101 (b) requires the interpretation that an illegitimate child may not be considered the child of his mother.

The second change would extend the definition of "child" to adopted children under limited circumstances. An adopted child may not be given the status of child under the immigration laws. This has led to hardship in many cases, particularly where a child was adopted at a young age, long before his adoptive parents contemplated emigration to the United States. If in such cases the child is born in a country with a heavily oversubscribed quota, he cannot accompany his adoptive parents to the United States since he cannot derive quota chargeability from his parents. It is therefore desirable that consideration be given to an amendment whereby a child adopted while under the age of 12, and who has lived with his adoptive parents for at least 2 years prior to the visa application may be considered a child under the immigration laws. A proposal of this type would prevent abuse through ad hoc adoptions made only for the purpose of circumventing the immigration laws.

SECTION 14

Section 202 of the act deals with the determination of quotas to which immigrants shall be chargeable. This section would revise section 202 so as to grant to an Asian spouse the benefit of the quota of an accompanying spouse, and permit the Asian spouse of a native of a Western Hemisphere country to be classified as a nonquota immigrant if accompanying, or following to join, such spouse.

SECTION 15

Section 203 of the act establishes the bases upon which immigration visas shall be allocated within the quotas. Subsection (a) (1) (B) prescribes a first preference status for spouses or children accompanying principal aliens who come within the category covered by subsection (a) (1) (A). This section of the proposed legislation would accord such preference status also to spouses and children following to join such aliens. In addition, the quota allocations would be revised by giving the fourth preference category, that is, brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters of citizens, a fixed 10 percent of the quota, in lieu of the present percentage of an undetermined left-over amount of quota numbers which the present statute permits. This change is regarded as desirable to make this preference a reality. Section 203 (a) (2) of the act provides that parents of an American citizen are entitled to second preference quota status only if the petitioning citizen is at least 21 years of age. Subsection (a) (4), which affords fourth preference status to brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters of citizens, does not limit that preference status to such kin of citizens who are at least 21 years of age. This section would amend section 203 (a) (4) so as to limit its operation to those cases in which the petitioning citizen is likewise at least 21 years of age. It would also amend the section so as to accord the same preference quota status to the spouse and child of such a brother, sister, son, or daughter of a citizen, if such spouse or child is accompanying or following to join the relative.

SECTION 16

The present act permits the Secretary of State to determine the amount of nonimmigrant visa fees on the basis of reciprocity. This section of the legislation would vest the Secretary with a desirable discretion to deviate from this rule when politically or otherwise necessary in the national interest. It would also clarify the present statute with respect to the manner of computing the amount of such visa fees.

SECTION 17

Section 212 (a) (9) of the act specifies the classes of aliens who shall be excluded from the United States because of criminal involvement. This section would amend section 212 (a) (9) so as to clarify and incorporate within the basic act the pertinent provisions of section 4 of Public Law 770, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 1145), which in effect, but not in form, modified section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens who have been convicted of or have admitted the commission of petty offenses.

SECTION 18

Section 221 (f) of the act provides in part that an alien crewman may be admitted to the United States if his name appears on a crew list visaed by a consular officer, "until such time as it becomes practicable to issue individual documents." The quoted requirement for individual documents has proved to be most difficult of achievement and unduly burdensome. This section would delete the quoted matter, thus eliminating the requirement that all alien crewmen eventually must be in possession of individual visas.

SECTION 19

Section 222 of the act prescribes the contents of a visa application. Subsection (a) deals with applications for immigrant visas and subsection (c) deals with nonimmigrant visas. Both require information as to race and ethnic classification. This section would elimnate this requirement since the terms are not susceptible of definition and have served no useful purpose in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SECTIONS 20 AND 21

Section 352 of the act sets forth circumstances under which naturalized citizens shall lose their citizenship by virtue of residence abroad. Sections 353 and 354 enumerate categories of persons to which section 352 shall not apply. Sections 20 and 21, respectively, of the accompanying proposal, would extend to veterans of World War I and II, and their spouses, children, and dependent parents, broader foreign residence privileges. The amendments would extend, first, to veterans of World War II, retroactively, the provisions of section 406 (h) of the 1940 act; and, second, restore to veterans of World War I that part of the provisions of section 406 (h) of the 1940 act which permitted World War I veterans to reside in the country of nativity or former nationality. The proviso to the proposed amendment contained in section 20 is designed to make clear what is thought to be the intent of Congress that the spouse, children, and dependent parents of such a veteran shall enjoy the same foreign residence privileges as does the veteran.

SECTION 22

Section 223 of the act relates to reentry permits. Subsection (b) authorizes the Attorney General to issue reentry permits under certain circumstances. However, such permits shall be valid for not more than 1 year from the date of issuance and may be extended for periods aggregating not more than 1 year. This has resulted in hardships to certain alien spouses and children of servicemen stationed abroad for extended tours of duty. This section would add a proviso to the subsection to provide that "the Attorney General may in his discretion extend the validity of the permit of a spouse or child of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad pursuant to official orders for such period or periods as the Attorney General shall deem appropriate."

SECTION 23

Section 323 of the act, relating to the naturalization of children adopted by citizens of the United States, would be amended by this section so as to authorize the naturalization of children adopted by United States citizens in those cases in which the parent is stationed abroad in the Armed Forces or in the employment of the United States Government, or of an American firm or international organization when it is intended that the child reside abroad with the parent until the parent's employment is terminated. The new provision would confer benefits upon adopted children similar to those conferred upon spouses of citizens under the provisions of section 319 (b) of the act. Specifically, the present requirements for residence and physical presence in the United States by the child before he may be naturalized would be waived. This amendment is regarded as necessary to avoid separation of families.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yileld?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I have been greatly interested in the gentleman's outline of the purposes and objectives of the bills he has introduced. It is my understanding that the bills are intended to carry out the excellent recommendations submitted by the President in his recent special message. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Am I also correct in understanding that in the gentleman's opinion the bills as he has drafted them, not only protect fully the interests of this country but also the interests of those people who seek to come to this country and who would become fine citizens?

Mr. KEATING. I believe the legislation which I have introduced is in conformity with the President's recommendations, and that the enactment of those measures would result in bringing to this country people who would make fine American citizens, and exclude from this country those who would not, and assist in the deportation from this country of those undesirable aliens, few in number, but who have caused such great difficulty here, and who have not lived up to the high standards that our country sets for citizenship, and would therefore bring about a more effective balance in our immigration laws and, perhaps as important as anything else, would improve our international relations with other countries in convincing them that we practice sincerely those principles which we proclaim so loudly.

Mr. HESELTON. I congratulate the gentleman sincerely for his efforts. He deserves the support of all of us who are interested in those principles.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LANE. I would like to rise at this time to congratulate and compliment the gentleman from New York on his very able statement that he has delivered to the House. I say that as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House I know that this subject matter is one that is close to the gentleman's heart. During his service on that committee the gentleman has taken a very active, sincere, and conscientious interest in all of the immigration bills that have come before us. I want to join with him in support of these measures which he has offered to the Congress, following the message of the President of the United States. Especially am I interested, as he is, in the quota system which has been in effect now since 1920. Both of us feel I am sure that at this particular time, 1956, Congress should take another look at the system due to the fact that times have changed over the years and some change in the present law is mandatory.

I want to close by stating again that I know my colleague from New York is most sincere in this matter and he may depend on my support along these lines.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts and I know in service on the committee how helpful he has been in trying to improve our immigration laws, as he has in all respects in his work on our committee. I am sincerely grateful to him for his kind remarks.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on Thursday, February 23.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 15 minutes, on Friday, February 10.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and include certain tables.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 6790. An act for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin;

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.; and

H. R. 7156. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 10, 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:

1502. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, relative to 34 reports from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force covering 61 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by authorizing payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1504. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the

admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1505. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1506. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1507. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1508. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, including the financial statement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 605, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1509. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1510. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 15, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Irondequoit Bay, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1511. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 19, 1955, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of harbor at Betterton, Kent County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

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. 101. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; with amendment (Rept. No. 1754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1755). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 101. An act for the relief of Fernanda Milani; with amendment (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 117. An act for the relief of Ana P. Costes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1212. An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing; with amendment (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 396. An act for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim; with amendment (Rept. No. 1759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 9203. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall select a site to which the naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., may be moved and report to the Congress thereon, and to suspend the acquisition of land in the vicinity of such naval magazine pending the making of such report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 9204. 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. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 9205. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 9206. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 9207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 9208. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to authorize the optional purchase of additional amounts of group life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance by individual employees in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 9209. 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. KEOGH:

H. R. 9210. A bill to remove inequities by imposing limitations on the period during which the United States may retain, without the payment of interest, overpayments under section 722 for taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 9211. A bill to preserve the wheat acreage history of farms voluntarily underplanting their allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 9212. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the criteria for determining eligibility for pension payable thereunder, and to increase the amount of pension so payable to veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9213. 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. McMILLAN:

H. R. 9214. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 so as to afford certain preferences to businesses displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment and business property owners affected thereby; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 9215. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9216. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 9217. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for the purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. R. 9218. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 9219. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of certain real property of the United States not needed in the operation of Camp Stewart Military Reservation, Ga., to the former owners of such property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 9220. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of prevailing wage-rate employees, to provide longevity compensation for such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 9221. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9222. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9223. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9224. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9225. A bill to repeal the act of August 9, 1946, providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 9226. A bill to create a Water Conservation and Planning Service in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 9227. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act with respect to transfer of unused allotments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 9228. A bill to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9229. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9230. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 9231. 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. WITHROW:

H. R. 9232. 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. JONES of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 527. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. J. Res. 528. Joint resolution to limit the spending powers of the Congress and to provide for reduction of the national debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. J. Res. 529. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the quadricentennial anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement in Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution expressing the friendship of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and expressing the hope that Italy will remain one of the free and democratic nations of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the purpose of S. 863 is approved by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, and urging that this legislation be passed or that similar legislation be passed, etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 9233. A bill for the relief of Harry Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 9234. A bill for the relief of Gus Santes, also known as August Anthony Tsantes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 9235. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Sarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 9236. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toki Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9237. A bill for the relief of Pero Corak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9238. A bill for the relief of Ljubomir Barac (also known as Ljubo Barac); 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:

506. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Frances Neccum, and other citizens, of Polk County, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

507. Also, petition of parishioners of the First Christian Church of Aurora, Mo., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

508. Also, petition of parishioners of the First Baptist Church of Aurora, Mo., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

509. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Hall, and other citizens, of Aurora, Mo., urging support of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

510. Also, petition of Henry Easson, and other citizens, of Carthage, Mo., urging the adoption of H. R. 4471 as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present program of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

511. By Mr. WAINWRIGHT: Petition of Horace J. Wells, and 72 neighbors and friends, of Riverhead, N. Y., urging the use of the powers of Congress to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

512. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the deputy city clerk, Elizabeth, N. J., with reference to the city council being in favor of selling war materials and supplies to Israel, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Anniversary of the Yalta Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Yalta Pact, which resulted in the enslavement of millions of people of central and eastern Europe and Asia.

Since that fateful day of February 11, 1945, Soviet Russia has grown in leaps and bounds as a menace to world peace, and in direct proportions the position of the United States has dropped as a leader of the free world.

The time has long passed for futile and partisan recriminations for our part in the Yalta agreement. The fact remains that, though we entered into the agreement with a misplaced faith in Soviet promises—promises which have been systematically violated—the results are a national disgrace and the time is long overdue for a formal recognition of that fact.

The sad fact is that, despite political recriminations and protestations of the errors of judgment of those who participated in the Yalta agreements, the bitterly criticized tactics and policies then used are still in force and effect in our State Department. We still continue to deal with Soviet Russia as an honest partner and not as an unscrupulous outlaw. And all this despite the fact that we know so much more about Soviet treachery now than we did in 1945, when the Yalta agreement was entered into.

Our position of free-world leadership can be maintained only if we adopt and adhere to a policy of firmness and of refusal to compromise on matters of principle. It was that willingness on our part to compromise on matters of moral rights that has helped the expansion of the Communist empire and is continuing to bring about a loss of our own international respect and prestige. We can regain it only by basing our foreign policy on moral principles and not on expediency. We have no moral right to build up the hopes of the capitive nations and then cruelly shatter them, by continuing to barter their lives and future for sham promises which we accept as a pure matter of expediency, and which we should know from past bitter experience, will eventually be broken again, as they always have been in the past, when it serves Soviet Communist purposes.

On this sad anniversary, let us soberly analyze our errors of the past and in the interest, not only of justice, but of our own national security, resolve to learn from past experiences, and deal with the