

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may the days of this Brotherhood Week, which we are now observing, be radiant with a clearer vision and understanding of the many noble and helpful things that people of different creeds and races may do together for the welfare of humanity.

May we resolve to covet and cultivate more earnestly that finer spirit which goes out in kindness and sympathy toward the members of the human family and inspires them to live as brothers on the higher levels of peace and good will.

Show us how we may acquire a larger measure of the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord who went about doing good and always sought to give help and hope to the poor and needy, the sorrowing and suffering.

Help us to practice His Golden Rule and fill our hearts with those lofty impulses and feelings which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a more brotherly social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4249. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ARABIAN AMERICAN OIL CO.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Arabian American Oil Co., the American corporation operating the Saudi Arabian oil field, has been treating its oil royalty payments to King Saud as a tax rather than as a royalty.

Under Aramco's purported agreement with King Saud, net profits of between six hundred and six hundred and fifty million dollars are divided equally between King Saud and the Arabian Amer-

ican Oil Corp. If the payments to King Saud are treated as a tax rather than a royalty, the Arabian American Oil Co. can deduct the payments made to King Saud from income taxes due the United States. The simple gimmick of arranging for King Saud to treat the royalty payments as a tax permits Aramco to skip payment of income taxes due our Government on a profit of over \$300 million each year.

How ridiculous can the business managers of our Government become?

The blood and dollars of the American people are pledged to the protection of the status quo in the Middle East, as well as the integrity of Aramco's oil contracts with King Saud which would otherwise be a meaningless scrap of paper.

What does our Government get from the Arabian American Oil Co. in return for its very costly guaranty of contract integrity—a conspired avoidance of an income-tax obligation on \$300 million of income per year?

FIRETRAPS FOR OUR AGED CITIZENS

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, Americans, not only in the State of Missouri where the tragedy occurred but throughout the Nation, were shocked by the news of the loss of 71 aged men and women in a fire which destroyed the dilapidated house in which they were domiciled. Unfortunately this is not the only tragedy of similar nature that has marked with shame our neglect of the housing of our senior citizens. The Federal Government and we in the Congress cannot escape our share of the responsibility.

Instead of providing a sound Federal program of housing in a field where private industry is not attracted, we are leaving these old men and women the victims of persons who make their profit by housing them in firetraps. It is all because there is no other place for them to go. Housing and care of our aging citizens can no longer be turned over to the tender mercies of those who take them off our hands for private profit.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress I introduced a bill to provide a real program of housing for our aged and aging. Other members of the Banking and Currency Committee joined in support of this proposed legislation as sponsors. The public response was immediate, nationwide and tremendous in its favorable volume, for men and women everywhere in our Nation realized that the neglect of housing for our senior citizens constituted a national shame.

I was bitterly disappointed that practically no progress was made in the 84th Congress, despite the almost universal public demand for legislation wiping out the cause of a shame that all good people feel in the existing neglect of the aging and the aged in the matter of livable

and safe housing within their financial means.

On the first day of the 85th Congress I again introduced a bill calculated to bring livable and safe housing within the reach of our senior citizens. Bills along the same lines were introduced by other Members. The tragedy of this week in the State of Missouri must awaken us to the immediate need for action. As I have said such tragedies are not unusual. They occur all too often because no one seems to care what becomes of these old people. Of course, people do care because these old people are their own fathers and mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers. But because in this field of housing there are no organized pressure groups to stir us up to do what should be done without urging, nothing ever happens.

For the sake of all that is decent, let the 85th Congress cover itself with glory by providing a housing program that will assure safe and comfortable roofs over all our senior citizens. It is not a matter of who gets the credit. The job of providing decent and safe housing for our senior citizens and doing it now is big enough and commanding enough to encompass every Member, with a heart, of both bodies in this Congress.

LIMITING EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL YEAR 1958

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House and Senate (section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946) now require that a joint committee—Appropriations and Ways and Means from the House and Appropriations and Finance from the Senate—prepare and submit by February 15 each year a so-called legislative budget, the primary purpose of which is to limit expenditures which may be authorized.

Since no such budget has been prepared or submitted, I am today introducing a resolution to amend the rules of the House by limiting the total which may be authorized or expended in fiscal year 1958 to \$65 billion, and which will require that receipts in excess of \$65 billion in fiscal 1958 be used one-half to reduce the national debt and one-half for tax reduction.

Mr. Speaker, the demand for a substantial cut in proposed expenditures is countrywide and insistent. We in Congress should lead that movement. I hope this resolution will have the careful attention of all Members of the House, that it will have early hearings before the Rules Committee, and that we may have it on the floor very promptly. Time is important.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary on Monday and Tuesday of next week may have the privilege

of sitting while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF OBJECTORS COMMITTEE ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the majority and minority floor leaders appointed their respective personnel of the objectors committees the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] appointing 3 members of his party, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appointing 4 members of his party. The objectors committees are unofficial committees of the House of Representatives, existing at the request and at the pleasure of the respective floor leaders of the two parties who, in order to facilitate the proper screening of legislation which may be placed on the Consent Calendar, designate Members on each side of the aisle charged with the specific responsibility of seeing to it that legislation passing by such procedure is in the interests of good government.

The rule which is applicable to Consent Calendar procedure is Rule 746 of the House Rules and Manual, found on pages 373, 374, and 375 of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The operation of such procedure is described on pages 95, 134, 135, 136, 173, and 327 of Cannon's Procedures in the House of Representatives.

For several sessions now objectors on both sides of the aisle have followed certain rules for consideration of Consent Calendar bills which they have made known to the Members at the beginning of a session. These rules are not publicized at this time to establish hard and fast procedures but rather to advise the Members of the House as to the manner in which the committee plans to operate throughout the 85th Congress. The members of the committees feel: first, that generally no legislation should pass by unanimous consent which involves an aggregate expenditure of more than \$1 million; second, that no bill which changes national policy or international policy should be permitted to pass on the Consent Calendar but rather should be afforded the opportunity of open and extended debate; third, that any bill which appears on the Consent Calendar, even though it does not change national or international policy, or does not call for an expenditure of more than \$1 million, should not be approved without the membership being fully informed of its contents, providing it is a measure that would apply to the districts of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, in which case, the minimum amount of consideration that should be given such a bill would be clearance by the leader-

ship of both parties before being brought before the House on the Consent Calendar—it has been the policy of the objectors on the Consent Calendar heretofore to put such a bill over without prejudice one or more times to give an opportunity to the Members to become fully informed as to the contents of such a bill, and the Consent Calendar objectors for the 85th Congress wish to follow like procedure; fourth, that if a bill has been placed on the Consent Calendar and the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the legislation show that it has not been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, by the respective departments affected by such legislation, or that such reports from the committee or from the department show that the legislation is not in accord with the President's program, it should not pass on the Consent Calendar but that the chairman of the House committee having jurisdiction over the legislation should either call it up under suspension of the rules with the permission of the Speaker or should go to the Rules Committee for a rule for such legislation. While the members of the objectors committees feel that a report from the Bureau of the Budget is necessary before a bill should be placed upon the Consent Calendar, they do not wish to take the position that the report from the Bureau of the Budget must necessarily show the approval of such legislation by the Bureau. However, if such approval is not shown, then in the consideration of the legislation, even if considered on the Consent Calendar, the chairman reporting the bill, or the sponsor of the bill, should be willing to accept the responsibility of stating to the Members the action of the budget and the reasons for such action.

The members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee also feel it fair to state to the membership that it is not their purpose to obstruct legislation or to object to bills or pass them over without prejudice because of any personal objection to said bill or bills by any one member or all of the members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee, but rather that their real purpose, in addition to expediting legislation, is to protect the membership against having bills passed by unanimous consent which, in the opinion of the objectors any Member of the House might have objection to.

The members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee earnestly request that the chairman of the standing committees of the House having the responsibility for bringing legislation before the House take into consideration the contents of this statement before placing bills on the Consent Calendar. While it is not absolutely necessary that the sponsors of bills appearing on the consent calendar contact the various members of the Consent Calendar Objectors Committee, nevertheless, in the interest of saving time and avoiding the possibility of having bills laid over unnecessarily, it is good practice to do so; and the objectors welcome the continuance of the procedure of getting in touch with them at least 24 hours before the legislation is called up under the regular consent calendar procedure. In many instances such thoughtfulness on the part

of the sponsors will clear away questions which the objectors have and consequently will make for the expeditious handling of legislation.

The majority objectors are WAYNE N. ASPINALL, EDWARD P. BOLAND, and JOHN J. McFALL.

The minority objectors are PAUL CUNNINGHAM, JOHN W. BYRNES, GERALD R. FORD, and PHIL WEAVER.

RULES GOVERNING COMMITTEE AND HOUSE ACTION ON PRIVATE BILLS AND IMMIGRATION AND CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a statement of policy as to the rules and procedure in the handling of private bills and immigration bills on the private calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House I wish to give a short explanation of certain policies and rules governing committee and House action on private bills pertaining to immigration and claims. First, let me include at this point the rules of the procedure which the Committee on the Judiciary applies in the consideration of private immigration legislation under the jurisdiction of its subcommittee No. 1. The membership of that subcommittee is as follows: FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, chairman; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio; FRANK CHELF, Kentucky; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, California; DEWITT S. HYDE, Maryland.

The rules of procedure read as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. The meeting of the subcommittee shall be held on Monday of each week at 10 a. m., unless otherwise ordered by the chairman.

2. All meetings of the subcommittee shall be public except on the order of the chairman or a majority of the members present.

3. A quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of 2 members for the purpose of holding hearings on private bills and 3 members for the purpose of making recommendations to the committee.

4. Requests for reports on private bills from the departments shall be made only upon a written request addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary by the author of such bill. That request shall contain the following information which shall be submitted to the committee in triplicate:

(a) In the case of aliens who are physically in the United States: The date and place of the alien's entry into the United States; his immigration status at that time (visitor, student, exchange student, seaman, stowaway, illegal border crosser, etc.); his age; place of birth; address in the United States; and the location of the United States consulate at which he obtained his visa, if any.

(b) In the case of aliens who are residing outside of the United States: The alien's age; place of birth; address; and the location of the United States consulate before which his application for a visa is pending; and the address and relationship of the person primarily interested in the alien's admission to the United States.

5. The staff of the subcommittee shall not receive nor forward to the subcommittee for action any requests for reports which do not comply fully with the provisions of rule 4.

6. The subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as stowaways, or deserting seamen, or by surreptitiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

Exemption from this rule may be granted by the subcommittee in cases where the bill is designed to prevent extreme hardship. However, no such exemption may be granted unless the author of the bill has secured and filed with the subcommittee full and complete documentary evidence in support of his request to waive this rule.

7. No favorable consideration shall be given to any private bill until a report from the proper Department has been secured.

8. No private bill shall be considered if an administrative remedy exists, unless substantial proof is presented that the subject is not in a position to avail himself of such administrative remedy.

9. Upon the completion of the filing of all evidence pertinent to the case, private bills designed to adjust immigration status shall be scheduled for subcommittee consideration in the chronological order of their introduction, except that priority shall be given to bills introduced earliest in any of the previous Congresses.

10. Consideration of private bills designed to adjust the status of aliens unlawfully in the United States shall not be deferred due to nonappearance at subcommittee hearings of the author of the bill or persons authorized to represent him.

11. Bills tabled by the committee shall not be reconsidered unless new evidence is introduced showing a material change of the facts previously known to the committee.

12. Bills which have passed the House of Representatives during a previous Congress will be ordered favorably reported to the full committee unless they have been acted upon adversely by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

Bills which have passed the House of Representatives and have been adversely acted upon by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate will not be considered unless a companion bill passed by the Senate is referred to the subcommittee.

Next I would like to include the rules of procedure which the Committee on the Judiciary applies in the consideration of claims against the United States. With each Congress over 1,500 claim bills are referred to the committee and its subcommittee No. 2 has jurisdiction over claims. The membership of that subcommittee is as follows: THOMAS J. LANE, chairman; E. L. FORRESTER, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, CHARLES BOYLE, USHER L. BURDICK, RICHARD POFF, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, WALTER R. LEE, legislative assistant.

The rules of procedure for this subcommittee are as follows:

10. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim adversely reported or rejected by it at a previous consideration, except upon presentation of new or additional evidence disclosing a material change in the facts which, in the chairman's opinion, is sufficient to warrant reopening the case.

11. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim filed with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, considered on its merits and disallowed; or any bill awarding or increasing compensation to an employee or his dependents in lieu of that prescribed by the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended; or otherwise interfering with the provisions and compensation of that act, except bills to waive the limitations of time contained in sections 15 to 20, inclusive, thereof, and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-

thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

12. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for civil-service retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity by an employee of the Government, or a member of the Armed Forces or the Reserves, or by his dependents, as the retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity to which such person may be entitled is specifically covered by general statutes, applicable to all in the same class.

13. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for injuries or damage, either to a member or to third persons, resulting from service in or activities by the National Guard maintained within the several States.

14. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim over which another tribunal, court, or department has jurisdiction, while such jurisdiction is not exhausted.

15. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim approved by the Congress and vetoed by the President, except upon a material change in the facts or written evidence that administration disapproval has been withdrawn; and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

16. In all bills carrying an appropriation, a 10-percent attorney's fee clause shall be added: *Provided*, That this rule shall not apply to claims based upon findings of the Court of Claims, court decisions, or where extraordinary services have been rendered. In such cases the committee will determine the amount of fee to be allowed.

17. The subcommittee shall not consider any claim for retirement benefits, compensation, pension, or gratuity under the Railroad Retirement Act when such claim has been considered on its merits and disallowed, or otherwise interfering with the provisions and compensation of that act, except bills to waive the limitation of time, and this rule may be waived only upon order of two-thirds of the entire subcommittee, present and voting.

18. The subcommittee shall not consider a bill which has twice passed the House and been rejected by the Senate Judiciary Committee, unless and until the bill has first passed the Senate. Such rule shall be waived only upon a vote of two-thirds of the subcommittee.

Approved by the Committee on the Judiciary March 8, 1955.

The following statement, governing procedure on all bills on the Private Calendar, has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress and is submitted herewith:

A CALENDAR OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (PRIVATE CALENDAR)

Introduction: This calendar, to which is referred all bills of a private nature, is better known as the Private Calendar; the procedure is very interesting; and nearly half, or more, of the laws passed in each session of Congress are printed on and considered from this calendar. This rule aids the House in the expedition of business. Should the House debate each private bill, most of each session would be consumed debating and voting on them.

Nature of calendar and its business: All bills and resolutions on the calendar may be called up 2 days each month for a hearing. The consideration of this calendar on the first Tuesday of each month is highly privileged; the rule makes it mandatory unless determined to the contrary by a two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, the Speaker is free to use his own discretion, and he may entertain other privileged business instead. The rule prescribes that the bills shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Debate must be confined to the subject of the motions permitted under the rule. Motions to strike out the last

word, to reserve objections, to obtain time for debate by unanimous consent, and to request for recognition to make statements are not entertained by the Speaker.

The Presiding Officers had rendered many decisions concerning the old rules defining the procedure for consideration of private bills, but, obviously, most of them became obsolete with the adoption of the present rule.

Procedure under rule: The rule in its present form was adopted on March 27, 1935, setting aside the first and third Tuesdays of each month for this business. On these days immediately after the disposition of business on the "Speaker's table as requires reference only," the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. He announces that today is the first or the third Tuesday, as the case might be, and "Under the rules today is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar." After the first bill is reported by title, he inquires if there is objection to the consideration of the bill. If no objection is heard the Clerk reads the bill (* * * with the following committee amendments). The period for amending a private bill is generally very short, after which the Speaker announces that the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Should objection be heard by two or more Members to the consideration of a measure when it is first called up, "it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker." The standing committee is free to hear these bills and report them back to the House as an omnibus bill and on the third Tuesday of each month the Speaker is authorized to give preference to consideration of omnibus bills. The omnibus bills are called up in the same manner described for individual private bills, but they generally consume much time for consideration. They are read by paragraph for amendments. After a paragraph has been read it is in order to offer amendments to that paragraph but the amendment is not in order unless it strikes out, reduces, or places limitations on the amounts of money stated in the original bill. The common practice to offer an amendment to strike out the paragraph which in effect destroys the private bill may be included in another during the same session of Congress. All issues are decided by a majority vote just as in the case in regular legislating. The omnibus bill, consisting of two or more private bills, when passed is resolved into its original parts and engrossed as if they had passed in the House severally.

Where a House bill included in an omnibus bill is similar to a Senate bill on the Speaker's table, it is in order to call up the Senate bill for consideration and substitute it for the House bill.

Unfinished business: Unfinished business from this calendar does not come up the next legislative day; it must wait until a Tuesday on which such bills are in order. If the previous question has been moved on the bill to final passage, it becomes the unfinished business of the House and may be completed on the next legislative day.

Official objectors. Generally speaking, the individual Representative is concerned only with the private bills introduced by himself. Consequently, seldom are more than 50 Members present at a time during the consideration of private bills. To the observer there seems to be no interest in these bills passed by the House, but the political parties are very much interested, and they see to it that some check is placed on the number and nature of private bills to be enacted. If no check existed, many billions of dollars would be drawn from the Treasury to pay off al-

leged claims. To prevent this each party has three or more "official objectors." The majority floor leader designates 3 to 5 official objectors; the minority leader to check the majority party does likewise. In each case these objectors are charged by the leaders of their party with respect to what they should oppose and what they should approve. These men are obligated to read all of the measures carefully and pass judgment by remaining silent or objecting when each bill is considered. These men stay on the floor constantly while the Private Calendar is under consideration, and when a bill is called up they readily object if it fails to meet their test.

Objectors on the Private Calendar appointed by the Speaker of the House and minority leader are as follows: KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama, chairman; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, South Carolina; TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Illinois; WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, Wisconsin; WILLIAM H. AVERY, Kansas.

THE PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, February 27, 1957, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of the Republic of France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Allen, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Pillion
Anderson, Mont.	Gubser	Polk
Baumhart	Harden	Powell
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Boggs	Hébert	Rains
Bow	Heseltun	Reece, Tenn.
Bowler	Hillings	Scott, Pa.
Carnahan	McCarthy	Scudder
Chiperfield	McIntire	Sheehan
Corbett	Magnuson	Shelley
Cretella	Mason	Sieminski
Dies	Meador	Sisk
Engle	Morrow	Thompson, La.
Gordon	Miller, N. Y.	Tollefson
Gray	Morano	Weaver
	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the

United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and one half by myself.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Virginia, I would prefer to let debate run along at least for a period of time and not place a 3-hour limitation on debate at this time.

Mr. GARY. May I suggest I think we ought to have some limit. Will the gentleman agree that the debate shall not continue beyond today, and that the first paragraph of the bill should be read today.

Mr. CANFIELD. I should be happy to agree to that.

Mr. GARY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I so request. I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall not continue beyond today and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill should be read today.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4897), with Mr. THORNBERRY 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. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

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

Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been a member of the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee, our committee has stirred up what appears to be a real controversy in the House. All I ask is that you bear with me while I try to explain to you just exactly what our subcommittee has done. I am certain, if you will follow the debate on this bill, you will agree that the committee has acted wisely. I have stated time and again on the floor of this House that I am very proud of this committee. We have an excellent committee. I have paid tribute time and again to the ranking minority member of this committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who when the Republicans are in power in the House serves as chairman of the committee. Usually, we have agreed. Unfortunately, today we do not agree, but I will say that has not lessened by one iota my respect for Mr. CANFIELD. When opponents cannot disagree agreeably, it is a sad situation indeed. I do not agree with my friend, but I know he is doing what he considers to be in the best interests of the Nation and I, certainly, am trying to do likewise. In addition to Mr. CANFIELD, we have on this

committee Mr. OTTO E. PASSMAN, Mr. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, and we were very glad this year when the new member of the Committee on Appropriations were assigned that Mr. TOM STEED was assigned to our subcommittee. We also have Mr. EARL WILSON and Mr. BENJAMIN F. JAMES. I want to say that all of them have contributed immeasurably to the deliberations of the committee.

I know practically every Member of this House has been bombarded with telegrams. I have a few of them here in my hand now. They come from my district. They come from men who know absolutely nothing whatever about this bill. Our committee has been studying this bill day after day, week after week, from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and we have heard witnesses from every division of the departments involved. We have gone into every item of the appropriation, and we have presented to you our report. Here we have telegrams that come from all over the United States, from men who never have seen the bill, who have no idea what is in it, and yet they try to influence your vote on the bill.

Now, at the outset I want to set at rest any doubts which any members of this committee may have as to the recommendations of our subcommittee, particularly with reference to the Post Office Department, because that seems to be the target of the telegrams.

The bill actually provides for an increase, not a decrease, in postal services. It would appropriate \$207 million more to the Post Office Department than was available in the current fiscal year. Of that amount it is true \$162 million is for contributions to the civil service retirement and disability fund, within-grade promotions, and for an extra working day in the fiscal year 1958, which are compulsory increases. But that leaves \$44 million of increase over the current fiscal year for services above the present level.

In postal operations alone, for instance, our committee recommends the appropriation of almost \$18 million more than was available in 1957, specifically to take care of the expanding volume of mail and the growth of rural and metropolitan services.

How, then, can anyone logically claim that the fact that we have reduced the budget request, while increasing last year's appropriations, will displace employees now on the payroll? That claim is obviously ridiculous.

If we are going to cut the Federal budget, we must do it bill by bill, item by item, as the testimony justifies. We present a bill which cuts the Treasury-Post Office, Tax Court budget requests only 2 percent. The \$58 million cut in the Post Office is a reduction of 1.7 percent from the budget request, yet it provides an increase of \$44 million for new services.

Citizens from one end of this Nation to the other are clamoring for a reduction in the inflated Federal budget. The question before the House today is whether the Congress is going to exercise its prerogative and cut the budget or let bureaucracy run wild. I hope the House will sustain us in this case and

not be fooled by unsupported claims reaching us in the final minutes before voting.

I will return to a more detailed discussion concerning the post office later.

At this point, I want to take up with you this bill item by item. Let us consider first the entire bill. The request for 1958 is for \$3,965,291,000—nearly \$4 billion.

The committee recommended \$3,884,927,000, which is a committee reduction of only, may I say, only \$80,364,000, approximately 2 percent.

The amount appropriated for 1957 under the entire bill was \$3,634,274,850. The recommendation of the committee is, therefore, an increase of \$250,652,150 over and above the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year. It is fair to say that a part of that increase is made up of mandatory increases. You will find those mandatory increases listed on page 2 of the report on this bill. They are itemized as follows: For employer contributions to the Civil Service Retirement Fund \$154,600,000. Let me explain that is not actually an increase of expenditure. That item represents the Government's contribution to the Civil Service Retirement Fund. Heretofore the contribution was appropriated in a lump sum for all of the departments and agencies and was carried under another bill. Under the law adopted during the last session of Congress those payments are now charged to each department; and \$154,600,000 is charged to the departments contained in this bill. So it is neither an increase nor a decrease in appropriations.

In addition to that the postal employees' automatic pay increase amounts to \$24,500,000, and the Post Office Department has to pay that because the Congress ordered them to do so last year.

Then, somehow or other, there is an additional working day next year. It seems that we have one more working day in 1958 than in 1957, and that additional working day costs the departments, just the two contained in this bill—I do not know what it costs the Government in its entirety—but it costs the departments which are in this bill \$8 million for that one additional working day.

In addition to that, there is an amount for increase in retirees of the Coast Guard of \$1,500,000.

Employer contribution to social security for military personnel, \$1,400,000.

Reimbursement to Post Office for registry fees, \$700,000; and biennial payment of fidelity bond premiums on behalf of the Post Office, \$400,000.

That makes an addition which I have called to your attention of \$191,100,000 for mandatory increases. But this bill carries \$59,552,150 more than the mandatory increases.

I might add that this bill carries lots more than that.

This is the second largest bill that will be presented to the Congress during the present session. Instead of the \$3,884,927,000 which our committee recommends, there is an item in here for permanent appropriations of \$8,086,000,000. The largest part of that sum is for interest on the public debt, which has now

reached the staggering sum of \$7,300,000,000, an estimated increase of \$100,000,000 over last year.

In addition to that, we have certain payments from trust funds in the bill amounting to \$10,278,000,000. The bulk of these are Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust-fund payments, which for 1958 are estimated at \$7,504,000,000. Therefore, the total amount carried in this bill is \$22,329,000,000. The permanent appropriations and the trust-fund payments are fixed by law. The committee can neither deduct from nor add to them. The Treasury pays out what the law requires. Therefore, the only part of the bill that we can operate on is the request for \$3,965,291,000.

Of the total appropriation request, \$713,831,000 is for the Treasury Department.

The committee recommended for the Treasury Department \$691,467,000, which is a reduction of \$22,364,000, or 3.13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very frank. Let me say, therefore, that this is going to strap the Treasury Department. In my judgment, and I say this without hesitation, the Treasury Department is the most economically run Department in the entire Government of the United States. Several years ago when our subcommittee recommended a management study of that Department, they set up a management committee and they have continued that committee in existence to this day. It was established when Mr. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury and I am happy to say that the present Secretary, Mr. Humphrey, has continued the committee in effect. Time and again he has paid tribute to its efficiency.

That committee is composed of employees of the Department who are charged with the duty of studying from day to day the way in which the Department can modernize and reduce expenditures. Consequently in the various bureaus of the Treasury Department they are using modern machines and electronic devices that speed up the work. They have done a magnificent job in management improvement. You may ask, Why, then, did we cut their appropriation \$22 million? Well, although we cut it \$22 million, we have allowed them \$42,897,150 over and above the appropriations for 1957.

Of that amount \$23 million is for the retirement fund, so that it will reduce the amount that they have for expansion by that amount. And, there are several other items of compulsory increases. But, excluding all of the compulsory increase, we have allowed the entire Department more than they have for the current year 1957.

Let me add, although we cut the Treasury budget 3.13 percent, I have not heard one iota of criticism from the Secretary of the Treasury. So far as I know, it is their purpose to accept that amount. They have not complained to me and no one has mentioned to me any complaints from that Department.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished chairman would yield to me.

Mr. GARY. I will be delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman has just described the \$22 million cut in Treasury items. I am sure that he will want to state that the \$8.4 million cut in the Coast Guard aviation account is not merely a cut, because we are awaiting a report and undoubtedly will have to restore the full amount if not appropriate more funds.

Mr. GARY. That is true, and I was going to discuss that item when I came to the Coast Guard. If the gentleman does not mind, I will delay that until I come to the Coast Guard.

There are many divisions of the Treasury Department. Some of them are so small that I do not believe it is necessary for me to bore you with a discussion of all of them. For example, the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury: we cut that \$36,000, but that still allows him some little increase for new office equipment but not very much.

The Bureau of Accounts requested \$3,155,000, and we allowed them \$3,125,000. That was a reduction of \$30,000.

In the Division of Disbursements we allowed an increase. Their request was for \$17,595,000, and we allowed them \$17 million, which was a cut of \$595,000. Part of that was for retirement, but the increase over and above retirement is for an additional workload brought about by the increased number of checks they have to issue for the social security program.

Bureau of the Public Debt: as a matter of fact, their budget is below the current year. That is the only bureau in the entire group that we cut below this year, and the reason we did that was because they told us that they are planning to substitute a new method for handling bonds beginning May 1 and they expect that it will save them \$500,000. They had not taken that \$500,000 out of the budget, so we felt it was a good thing to take it out for them, which we did.

Office of the Treasurer: we had an increase in that office, but it was due largely to the procurement of United States currency. In our times of inflation and prosperity people are using more money. Money becomes damaged more rapidly, and they have to print more money next year than they did this year, and we did not want anybody to run out of money in the United States, so we allowed them an additional amount for the printing of currency.

The Bureau of Customs has done a magnificent job of modernization. Very frankly, the committee hated to cut them at all. We allowed them a little bit more money last year and they brought in custom duties of \$2 million more than the year before.

There are three major bureaus of the Department of the Treasury. Two of them are revenue-raising bureaus and you have to be very careful how you cut them lest you reduce your revenues. One is the Internal Revenue Service and the other is the Bureau of Customs. The third one is the Coast Guard which is a national defense unit. We have to watch

that from the standpoint of national defense.

The Bureau of Customs asked for \$49,650,000. We allowed them \$48 million. That is a reduction by the committee of \$1,650,000. But their appropriation for fiscal 1957 was only \$44,250,000, so there is an increase of \$3,750,000 over 1957. Their retirement contribution takes up \$2,654,000 of that, so they have approximately \$1 million left over.

We cut out some new buildings along the border that they want and need. But if we are going to cut this budget we have to be careful to restrict appropriations to absolutely essential items because the Federal budget has grown to such proportions that, as the Secretary of the Treasury has warned this Nation, if we do not cut our Federal expenditures, sooner or later we are going to have a recession that will "curl your hair."

The next agency is the Internal Revenue Service. Their request was for \$331,500,000. The committee has recommended \$325,500,000. We cut them \$6 million, but their appropriation for 1957 was \$305,750,000. So the increase recommended over 1957 is \$19,750,000, nearly \$17 million of which is taken up by their retirement fund contribution. There is \$2,865,000 over the increase for retirement.

The Bureau of Narcotics we did not cut a penny and the reason is because the narcotics situation is becoming extremely serious throughout the United States. We have had several studies in the Congress of that situation and there have been recommendations to increase the staff of the Bureau of Narcotics. Very frankly, I think we have to be careful because we do not want to make the Bureau of Narcotics another police agency in the United States. Our committee feels that what the Bureau of Narcotics should do is to look after the international situation. And they have done a magnificent job of that. We sent some agents abroad to prevent shipments of narcotics into this country. That is where we can make our greatest progress.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Anslinger, the Chief of the Bureau of Narcotics, in my judgment, is one of the very able officers of the Federal Government. He told us of the tremendous job that the United Nations is doing in the control of narcotics. From time to time we hear that organization is not accomplishing anything, that we had better abolish it. But he tells us that it has been a great factor in the control of narcotics internationally.

Insofar as the national problem is concerned, we feel that the Bureau should work with the local and State police officers but that the enforcement should be left largely to the local officers because, if the Federal Government undertakes to take it over, the local officers are not going to bother themselves. We just cannot put enough Federal agents in the field to enforce the narcotic laws of the Nation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If the United Nations is doing such a marvelous job of controlling the flow of narcotics, why could not this appropriation have been cut somewhat? We are contributing one-third of all the expenses of the United Nations.

Mr. GARY. The head of the Bureau of Narcotics did not ask for all of the money or all of the personnel that congressional committees have recommended. Since he himself has taken the same view as our committee of the enforcement problem and the relation of his Bureau to it, we thought that we ought to leave it to his judgment. He said he thought that although the number of agents which this appropriation will permit is not as large as has been recommended by congressional committees, he feels that it is ample; so we left the appropriation just as it is.

The United States Secret Service:

We made slight changes in that, but we specifically provided that the reduction should not be applied so as to lessen to any degree the security of the President of the United States or the other persons whom that Bureau is required to protect.

The Bureau of the Mint:

There is a slight increase over the appropriation for the current year but that is due to the fact that, just as we have to have more currency, we must have more coins. The mint asked for an increase in the appropriation for 1958 for minting coins, and we have allowed that increase.

Now we come to the United States Coast Guard which, as I have previously stated, is a defense agency. As you know, it is under the Treasury during peacetime but in wartime it is switched over to the Navy. Therefore, it has to be kept in a state of readiness for peace and for war.

They requested \$172 million for operating expenses. We allowed them \$169 million, which was a reduction of \$3 million. Their appropriation for 1957 was \$164 million. The increase over 1957 is \$4,150,000, but a large part of that is for compulsory increases. However, there is an allowance of about \$700,000 over and above the compulsory increases which the committee allowed, because we know that they are facing a tremendous problem in handling the increasing number of small boats throughout the Nation. You would be surprised at how many people today are getting small boats and running around our rivers and streams. The Coast Guard has certain duties to perform in connection with those small boats.

In addition, offshore oil well sinkings have increased very greatly, which presents additional problems.

The \$8 million to which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] referred was in their request for acquisition, construction and improvement. They asked for \$16 million in that item, which would include such vessels as they may need, such airplanes as they may need, and other items of capital outlay.

Included in that was an item of \$8,205,000 for airplanes. Our committee has felt for a long time that the one thing the Coast Guard needed was a proper replacement program for aircraft. Therefore, in the previous administration, we urged them to formu-

late a program for replacement of their aircraft, for two reasons. In the first place, so that the aircraft would be safe for the boys to fly; and in the second place, so that they could spread replacements more uniformly over the years instead of coming in 1 year and asking for a large amount and the next year a smaller amount. They had worked out a program of that kind when this administration took over 4 years ago. The new administration did not ask for the planes that that program called for, and they said very frankly they wanted to study the program. Our committee felt that was entirely reasonable. Consequently, we did not object, but we did ask them to make a study. Four years have passed by now and we still do not have a program for replacement of aircraft for the Coast Guard. There was a request in this bill for \$8,205,000 for a blank check for aircraft replacement. They said very frankly to us, "We do not know what airplanes we are going to buy because we have not worked out our program, but we hope to work it out before the next year." So we are saying to them, "You work out the program and then come in and we will look it over before we appropriate the money."

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does the lack of funds to which the gentleman just referred in any way impair the work of the Coast Guard in their air-sea rescue operations?

Mr. GARY. In no way whatever.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The whole thing is a question of replacement. We know that they need a replacement program. I am frank to say I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey that a part of this money is going to be needed, but how much we do not know because they do not know. They told us that they do not have a program. I do not believe this Congress wants to appropriate money to give any department a blank check for them to go out and buy, as they see fit, on a program that they work out after they come before our committee.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is discussing a subject in which I have been very much interested for several years. I am delighted that he is discussing it in this manner. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has jurisdiction over the Coast Guard. So I understand from the distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee that he feels that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries should hold hearings on this subject and report legislation authorizing the Coast Guard to expand its aviation?

Mr. GARY. No; it is not a question of expansion, it is a question of replacement. They have a lot of old planes. No legislation is necessary.

Mr. BONNER. There is no doubt that the aviation of the Coast Guard does need expansion. That has been shown

in many instances. That is true, and it is true that the Coast Guard aviation has been and continues to be fed by the crumbs that fall from the other armed services, getting the planes that have been discarded by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, which have been turned over to the Coast Guard.

Mr. GARY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. They have kept their planes in the air by cannibalizing discarded planes and by rebuilding planes. So, as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I do feel responsible and I have discussed it with the Coast Guard. But the Coast Guard, as you say, being under the Secretary of the Treasury in peacetime, I doubt sometimes whether the Treasury really realizes the service that the Coast Guard renders. They render service in war and in peace that is very similar. While the Navy is sitting like ducks on a pond in peacetime, enjoys all the prosperity from these great appropriations, the Coast Guard is continuously being beaten down and when the time comes when they are called on, they do not have the equipment that they should have.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. What the gentleman says is absolutely correct. That is the thing that our committee has been trying to correct for a long, long time. Not only do they not have the necessary number of planes, in all probability, but those that they do have are hand-downs mostly from the other services and in many cases the equipment is inadequate.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I must say I feel there is a certain temerity in the commanding echelon of the Coast Guard to approach the Treasury on this matter.

It will be my purpose shortly to hold hearings and bring officers of the Coast Guard and the Treasury Department down to throw a little light on this matter. If you will bear with me 1 minute, I am delighted that you mentioned this matter of small boats. The expansion of the small boats in this country over the last few years has been enormous. There are 25 million people floating in small boats. The Coast Guard, through this economy that has been practiced against them, has been reducing its shore installations. They are the installations that protect our coast and inland waters, due to the fact that the emergency at sea has decreased. Now, with this tremendous expansion of pleasure boating by our citizens, these installations that the Coast Guard has been reducing are now necessary to protect the citizens of America who indulge in pleasure boating. It is one of the biggest businesses in the country today, the building and utilization of small boats. I am delighted to know that you have taken cognizance of that in your appropriation.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is one of the best informed Members of this body on the Coast Guard. He has studied it for years, and I agree with what he has to say.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In connection with the statement that the gentleman made earlier regarding a cut in the funds for operating expenses—I am leaving aside for the moment the reference to the aviation program—but in cutting the operating expenses, will that cut in any way affect the program of the Coast Guard not only for air-sea rescue but rescue work which they have been providing during the floods and hurricanes which we have experienced in the past and are now experiencing?

Mr. GARY. No. It will not. Although we cut their request, we did allow them \$700,000 more than they had for the present year. That is true all through this bill. We have not cut the amounts that they are spending. We are cutting their requests. We have cut the additional amounts asked. They came in this year and asked for increases over the present fiscal year and we have cut those increases. In every single instance the amount allowed in this bill is more than the amount had for the current year 1957.

Next, Mr. Chairman, is the Coast Guard retirement pay. We cannot touch that, of course. It is fixed by law.

One of the large items in this bill is the Coast Guard Reserve training program. Under the Reserve Training Act, passed by the Congress 2 years ago, the Coast Guard is covered. Certain standards are prescribed to which they must conform. Therefore they have asked this year for a rather large increase over 1957. They requested \$16 million, which even then would not carry out the program recommended by the Congress. But the committee felt there should be a slight cut in that. We cut it \$1 million. However, that is an \$8 million increase over 1957. We believe we allowed them as much as they could use properly.

We have in this appropriation two small corporations; one, the Public Facilities Corporation, which has been operating the synthetic oil and the tin smelting programs of the Government. We are closing out all of those programs. Therefore their work load is down considerably. They ask for only \$50,000, and even that is not an appropriation; it is an authorization for them to spend \$50,000 of their own funds.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much longer do you think the RFC will go on?

Mr. GARY. It is down pretty well now. RFC is the other corporation I mentioned. They requested \$915,000. That is a liquidating process. The committee recommended \$800,000, a cut of \$115,000. They are liquidating their operations. When you liquidate an organization as big as the RFC was, the more of the good securities you liquidate the harder it is to liquidate the remainder. They are down now to the cats and dogs; they have gotten down to the bottom of the barrel and I think probably within the next year there will be a program to divide the unliquidated assets

up among other agencies, and close out the RFC.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so. That has been in process now about 4 years. Is not that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How many offices are they operating presently? Surely they are operating more than one.

Mr. GARY. I think they have pretty well cut them down now. They may be operating several offices but they have cut down very materially. They ask for less and less money each year. They have \$1,060,000 for this year, for example, and we are giving them only \$800,000 for next year, so you see we are cutting them substantially.

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the Post Office Department. At the outset let me say that the Post Office Department asked for \$3,250,000,000. The committee recommended \$3,192,000,000, which is a reduction of \$58 million, or 1.78 percent.

The appropriation for 1957 was \$2,984,340,000. The committee recommendation, therefore, is an increase of \$207 million over and above the 1957 appropriations. Let me say, however, there are certain compulsory increases in the bill: The increase for retirement of \$131 million; for the extra workday \$6 million; for within-grade promotions \$24 million; for the biennial bond premium \$400,000. The exact total of these items is \$162,957,780. This means that we have recommended for the Post Office \$44,702,000 over and above the mandatory increases for the current year, 1957; and in the language of the boys in the street, "That ain't hay."

I ask you to look at the table on page 183 of the hearings. The suggestion has been made that we might have to cut services. I do not think we will have to cut any services at all because we are allowing more money than for the current year. But suppose we do, are the people paying for the services they are getting? Let us look at that table on page 183 of the hearings. Do you realize that the Post Office has paid its way only 10 years during the last 56 years?

The largest deficit in any one year was in 1952 when we had a deficit of \$719,544,091. Right after that we increased the parcel-post rates. The Post Office Department was complaining, and I think properly so, because it thought that certain items that were being charged to it should be charged to other agencies. Our committee agreed with the Department. One was the airmail subsidy. We switched that over to the CAA so we would know what subsidies we were paying. Another was the franked mail. Another was the penalty mail. Still another was the registry service.

Let me say that during the past few years there has been tremendous progress made in modernizing the postal system in the United States. That was started during the previous administration and this administration has carried it on very, very satisfactorily.

I have had people say to me, if you would operate the post office like you would a regular business, you would not have this deficit. I want to say that

absolutely is not true. By modernizing the Department we have made some savings. However, there is not a single business in the entire United States today that I know of that is operating on 1932 receipts and 1957 expenditures and making a profit. It just cannot be done.

The estimated deficit for 1955 was cut by transferring the different items just enumerated to other departments and by modernization and other economies. The Post Office Department is doing a good job on that and I want to pay my respects to them for it. We dropped that deficit to \$362,673,636 in 1955.

Do you know what is happening now? It is estimated that the deficit will be up again to \$651 million in 1958. In addition to that, there is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition for an increase in railroad rates for transporting the mail which if allowed by the Commission will cost an additional \$101 million. That will run the deficit up to \$752 million. There is a bill pending in the Congress today that will increase postal salaries \$1 billion, the passage of which would give us a \$1¾ billion deficit. Where will this end? But without anything else, just taking it as is, the deficit will be \$651 million in 1958.

Do the people of this country want service? If so, let them pay for it. If we will increase the rates and make every classification of mail pay its own way, then I say give the Post Office Department the money and let them go ahead. The people are entitled to any service for which they are willing to pay.

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

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

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In discussing the budget with officials of the Post Office Department was there any reflection made as to the amount of money they have saved by discontinuing post offices and combining rural routes?

Mr. GARY. Yes. I think you will find a table in the hearings on that. We inquired into that question.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I keep getting these letters from the regional director of my district saying that we have executed a saving of so many thousand dollars by closing one of my small post offices and by combining two of my rural routes. Yet I see their request for general services, not mandatory increases, continues to rise. I wonder why, if they are making such great savings in this field, that would not be reflected in their budget requests?

Mr. GARY. It is not equal to the increased salaries.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is part of the mandatory increases.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But I am talking about general increases, not the mandatory increase of \$162 million.

Mr. GARY. But we do have these additional increases in salary.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask him this: If this \$58 million cut is sustained, would it encourage the Post

Office Department to further eliminate these small post offices that are giving such great service to our small communities, which would result in combining them into rural routes?

Mr. GARY. It will not affect them particularly.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. How will the \$58 million cut be sustained by the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. That is up to the Post Office Department. It will be sustained by additional economies in operation.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. But I fear, though, that the only economy that has been called to my attention by the Post Office Department recently is the one just mentioned.

Mr. GARY. The closing of these post offices is a comparatively small item. And I might say to the gentleman that the Post Office Department has changed its policy with respect to that. They were closing them indiscriminately. I understand now that they have changed their policy so that they are only closing them when there is a vacancy in the office and some special reason otherwise.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Regardless of why they are closing them, it still eliminates the postal service for these small communities.

Mr. GARY. The situation is that those post offices were established during the horse and buggy days, and we are now in an automobile and airplane era, and they do not need as many post offices as they did back in those days.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Down in Tennessee we still would like to see these small post offices maintained, and I would have to see this \$58 million cut if it would further encourage the Post Office Department to eliminate these post offices and continue to combine them into rural routes and cause delay in the service to the people of the country in getting their newspapers and in getting their morning mail.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to say, apropos of the questions of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass] that the Post Office Department closed some post offices in my district. There was some objection to some of those closings. There were a few that I thought were not too well advised, but I am sure that a number of them were very well advised, and if that is one way to make the Post Office Department more efficient and save some money and still allow the people to get their mail and get good service, then I commend the Post Office Department for the courage they exhibited in tackling some of these difficult problems.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman, not only is that true, but I have had a number of these cases in my own district. In every single instance the patrons have gotten better service at less money, and by closing some of these small post offices and increasing the rural routes we can give the patrons better service and at less money, and for that reason I favor it. I have favored it,

and I have commended the Post Office Department for it time and again.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. As an example of the great harm that is being done, the Post Office Department is planning at this time to close a small post office in my congressional district with 23 patrons. But yesterday I received a petition from 311 patrons of that post office protesting it, and my mimeograph machine is replying to that petition today. That may clear it up. I think they got everybody within 20 miles to sign the petition. If there is any question about the accuracy of my statement, I will be very happy to send you a copy of it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], that in some cases these offices need closing, and I have agreed with the Post Office Department on some of them in my own district. But, at the same time, it is a very small item, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, in your statement, that it is very small, but at the same time it is a matter of community identity. These post offices, of course, do not perform the service for which, maybe, they were intended to perform, but they are a vital part of the community, and if it is such a vital part and if it is so vital to the people of the community, I think if we can afford to send \$200 million over into the Middle East and to some of these other foreign countries, we can spend \$1,000 a year to keep the post office open in a community that really wants it.

Mr. GARY. I should like to read from the hearings before the committee. The witness testifying is Mr. Abrams, Assistant Postmaster General in charge of operations, and on the subject of the closing of fourth-class post offices, he said this:

In the matter of discontinuing fourth-class post offices, consideration will only be given hereafter to discontinuance when it is clear that equal or better service to patrons can be provided by rural delivery and one of the following conditions also prevails:

1. There is a vacancy in the office of postmaster;
2. There is local public support for the closing or at least no significant public opposition;
3. The post office can be satisfactorily replaced by a rural station;
4. The postmaster is eligible for an annuity under the Retirement Act.

I hope that will satisfy the gentlemen.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he would advocate charging each category of mail a rate commensurate with the cost of operation of that category of the service?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman would boost the rate for second-class mail, for instance, to a point where the revenue will meet the expenses of operating the second-class mail?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir; and the third-class and the fourth-class and any other class. I see no reason why the taxpayers of this Nation should pay for services received by patrons of the post office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further briefly?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What provision would the gentleman make, then, for nonprofit and charitable mail?

Mr. GARY. I think that is a matter for the legislative committee to consider; but I am not certain, even, that mail should be carried free in view of the fact that the Post Office Department is a service rather than a charitable organization.

Mr. GROSS. It is not today being carried free, but it does have a very substantially preferred rate.

Mr. GARY. There might be some consideration given to a preferential rate for religious, charitable, and educational organizations. The dissemination of their literature might well be considered a public service.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Will the gentleman tell us whether first-class mail is now paying its way?

Mr. GARY. According to the latest information we have, it is not. Our committee did not go into that question because there is no question of rates in this bill. We felt that was a matter for the legislative committee and, consequently, although we made some inquiries about it and were told that recent statistics indicate that it is not paying its own way, we did not explore the question extensively.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the gentleman prevailed upon me not to introduce an amendment, in full committee, to cut this bill further by \$100 million on the basis of a 5-day mail-delivery system? The gentleman was successful and his point was that we had not heard full testimony on the subject, that we should wait another year.

In view of that fact, how can the Post Office Department come in here with this barrage of wires about closing post offices when we were going to keep them open? What we wanted was this. If acceptable, when the people went to their shopping centers, their Food Fairs and to town on Saturdays, or went to do their other shopping, they would be willing to pick up their mail, if convenient, at the same time. And we were going to allow a special consideration by way of special delivery service for the ill or the invalid and others on that day. So now, how can they come in here with this barrage of letters to us, when we were going to give further consideration to the matter? But the amount in this bill is saved by at least \$100 million due to the chairman's persuasiveness, together with Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct. May I say this further, that during

the past administration this committee recommended a very substantial cut in this bill and as a result the Post Office Department eliminated two-delivery-a-day service in residential areas. A hue and cry went up for the time being. As chairman of the committee at that time I took the entire responsibility for that, either credit for it or blame for it. I thought there should be credit for it. Some people thought there should be blame for it. But let me say to you that saved the Post Office over \$100 million, and it probably runs to \$150 million today, and nobody has been hurt by it. I believe that by going to a 5-day week we can save additional money and nobody would be hurt.

We might do this, which was suggested to me. I do not want to take credit for this myself, may I say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI]. If I had thought about it I would have mentioned it to him at the time we discussed these matters. One of the top officials of the Post Office Department later on in discussing this matter with me said that the Department might cut out the delivery of everything except first-class mail on Saturday. Certainly nobody would be hurt if they did not deliver junk mail on Saturday. He said by that alone they could save \$10 million.

Let the Department scratch around and find some of these places where it can save some money.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and apologize to him for not yielding to him earlier.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman need not apologize. I wanted to ask certain specific questions at this point, the answers to which I think would be helpful to me, and I feel to some of the other Members.

First, does this \$50 million cut, to which attention is directed here, cause any present employee of the postal system to have his salary reduced?

Mr. GARY. I see no reason why there should be any reduction in employment or salaries because, after taking into consideration all of the compulsory increases, we are allowing the Post Office Department \$44 million more than they are receiving during the present year.

Mr. LANDRUM. Can we understand from that statement, then, that present employees will not have their present salaries reduced?

Mr. GARY. The salaries cannot be reduced because they are fixed by law.

Mr. LANDRUM. I am talking about what the effect of the appropriation would be.

Mr. GARY. The salaries are fixed by law, so you cannot reduce them.

Mr. LANDRUM. The annuities, the sick leave, the annual leave of present employees will not be affected in any way by this reduction?

Mr. GARY. I cannot see how present permanent employees will be affected by this bill in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. LANDRUM. One other question: will this prevent the Post Office Department from having sufficient funds to fill vacancies to carry on necessary services?

Mr. GARY. It will not.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I should like to ask some questions about the overall employment figures. I noticed in the report on the Treasury Department that there will be an increase of 17,500 in the number of employees. I have figured out that this is roughly an increase of about 3 percent. What is the justification for an overall increase by that number of employees with the population increase being less than 1.2 percent?

Mr. GARY. Most of those are in the Internal Revenue Department. There they need some additional employees for the enforcement of the tax laws. The increase in the Coast Guard is an effort to put them on a proper defense basis. There is some increase in the Bureau of Customs, which will be reflected in an increase in Customs receipts. There is some increase in the Mint, necessitated by the fact that we must have additional coins.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would comment there that the amount of revenue we are collecting has not increased to the same percentage. It would seem to me that any increase in personnel to handle these services for our people should reflect somewhat the same increase in our population. Actually, the increase should be a little bit less because of our productivity and the ability of men to do more is being increased with the new devices that we have. It just seems to me that the overall figures are entirely out of line.

Mr. GARY. One of the things that I have been trying to tell the Members here for the last hour, and then I am going to quit because I have already talked too long, is that our committee has been overgenerous. I hope you will help us sustain this appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If I may ask the gentleman one further question. I was leading to one other thing. I was talking of the Treasury where you do have the overall figures.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But, when I turn to the Post Office I cannot find any overall figures of the total employment. Do you know or do you have those figures? It is not in the hearings, that I can find.

Mr. GARY. I do not have them available at the present time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I hope the committee can get them because I think those figures, I suspect, would show an increase. On page 136 of the hearings, we have the increase for the city. There is a table which shows the increased growth of delivery service from 1954 to 1958. It shows a considerable increase way beyond the population growth. Although I recognize that refers to city deliveries and we do know there has been a great deal of increase there as opposed to our rural areas.

Mr. GARY. There would be a substantial increase there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And one other comment, if the gentleman please, if I can get these overall figures, I notice on page 154 and I am very disturbed about this that your productivity figures, which should be increasing—I do not

agree with Mr. Stepper in his statement there where he says I think we all recognize that at some point we will reach a saturation point on productivity—not if we are continuing to do a good job in research and development and in the utilization of new machinery and new techniques. The Post Office Department is planning on using them and, yet, the productivity figure is the lowest in 5 years. It is at the lowest rate.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is it not true that that 17,500 figure to which the gentleman referred applied to the total bill and not just to the Treasury Department?

Mr. GARY. It does apply to the total bill.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the many inaccuracies in the telegrams that Members have received from certain officers of the national association. They enumerate many losses that will be suffered in the event this very small cut is sustained by the committee, one of them being that they would get tri-weekly rural deliveries. The rural delivery cost estimate for the fiscal year 1958 is \$221,334,000 which is a very small part of the overall appropriation for postal operations, and yet they set forth in their telegrams, and I guess all Members have received it, that if we sustain this cut, you would have to go to triweekly deliveries in rural service. I think this statement is just as inaccurate as some of the other claims they set forth in their telegrams. May I ask the distinguished chairman just one question? Is it not true that certain constituents and Members of this body feel that this reduction is entirely too small and that it should have been more?

Mr. GARY. I have just stated that one point I have been trying to tell my colleagues is that we have been over-generous and, I think, many Members will agree with me in that statement.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman address himself to the logic of the argument that in considering the pending supplemental request that actually there will not be an average of \$44 million, but a deficit of \$8,297,780?

Mr. GARY. There has been, so far, no supplemental request.

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

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten the House on the question of the change in policy in the construction of new post offices, which has been carried out under the so-called lease-purchase arrangement, which has recently been abandoned by

the Department or by the General Services Administration.

Mr. GARY. This bill has absolutely nothing to do with that subject. That is handled separately. There is no request for funds in this bill dealing with that program. This bill will not affect it in any way.

Mr. PHILBIN. And the gentleman has no information about it?

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will look in the hearings, he will find some discussion of the program and the present status of it. I regret that time does not permit me to go into it now.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. How is it that the post offices are under the supervision of the General Services Administration rather than the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. Some of them are and some are not. That is a rather long story and I could not answer it in a minute.

Mr. GAVIN. I realize that, but do you not believe that the post offices should be under the supervision of the Post Office Department?

Mr. GARY. The chief reason for it is that in some of the post office buildings there are other agencies of the Government in addition to the post office.

Mr. GAVIN. And in many instances we find that these post offices are sadly in need of repair. They need to be rehabilitated. Other buildings are being neglected. They cannot get any action from the General Services Administration. They go through the Post Office Department and that goes to the General Services Administration. The plaster is falling off the walls and the water is coming in the roof.

Mr. GARY. We are making considerable progress in that program.

Mr. GAVIN. The question I asked you is, do you believe that the post offices should be under the supervision of the Post Office Department rather than under the General Services Administration?

Mr. GARY. In general; but when the post office is in a building that houses a great many other Federal agencies, then the General Services Administration has control.

Mr. GAVIN. They had better give some thought to rehabilitation of those post offices before many of them fall in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has again expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I always dislike to use the word "hate." I see our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] looking at me. He does not want me to use it now. It is never a good word. But I measure my phraseology when I say to you today, "I hate to have to disagree with my good friend, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]." Ever since he came to our subcommittee I have had a profound affection for him. The first year I discussed this bill with you, when he came to us as a Member, I referred to him on this floor as "the salt of the earth." I have never

changed my appraisal. I know he is very honest and very sincere in the statement of his position on this bill today, but I disagree with him and I shall tell you why.

I am proud, too, of the fact that in our complement we have other very dedicated Members of this House, seven Members, all of them serving as best they can on this grassroots committee, which down through the years has gone out into the field, into the Pacific and into the Atlantic respecting the Coast Guard, to get the true facts of life to help us in these appropriations.

I regret no end that this bill providing funds for the Treasury and Post Office has to be the first appropriation bill to be considered by this body, and I am mindful of the climate that prevails during this consideration, so many of our Members asking for, yea, demanding economy; yet I say to you that historically down through the years the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill has never lent itself to severe or drastic cuts. In the twenties the average appropriation cut ranged from \$1 to \$3 million. During the thirties and the forties, yes, even into the fifties, the rate was between seven and twelve millions of dollars. And when I think of these figures I am talking about the cuts in finality, not as the bill passed this House or as it passed the other body but as it was worked out in conference and finally sent to the President.

No; this bill does not lend itself to serious cuts. Year after year more and more people, millions are being added to our population, the people of our country are growing more literate and making more use of the mails; I venture to say that during the years I have worked on Capitol Hill some sixty-five or seventy million people have been added to the postal patrons of our country. Year after year the volume of mail increases percentagewise, 1½ to 5 percent. The increase for this year, fiscal 1957, is considerably more than the Post Office Department anticipated a year ago, and that is where we come to the crux of this whole problem.

Today, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] asked the \$64 question; he asked about \$8 million. I say to you that our consideration today neglects bearing in mind the fact that the Post Office Department of the United States is currently asking the Bureau of the Budget for a supplemental appropriation of \$53 million to carry it through fiscal 1957.

And how, may I ask, Mr. Chairman, are they normalizing their postal activities? The answer is just this, with the concurrence of the Director of the Budget, the Post Office Department is borrowing millions and millions of dollars from its fourth quarter apportionment; and unless they have substantially the \$53 million, I may say to the gentleman from Florida, that they request for 1957 to carry them through June 30 of this year, they will then have to prescribe payless workdays for the 526,000 employees of the Post Office Establishment.

Our distinguished chairman tells you today that the post office workers of the

Nation, who are currently concerned about this cut and are wiring their representatives in the Congress to do something about it, know nothing about the bill. I challenge that statement, because when they read in the press of the country that this bill projected as it is for fiscal 1958 involves a cut of \$58 million, they know that that dollar figure represents the biggest cut in post office operations in all the history of the Department. That is, if that cut is sustained and goes to the President as \$53 million.

Mr. Chairman, I served as chairman of this subcommittee in the 80th Congress, also in the 83d Congress. We effected cuts at that time. We had economy demands presented to us by our people. As a matter of fact, we were known as the economy 80th Congress. But we did not cut this bill \$58 million. We imposed a lesser cut and saw every dollar of it returned through supplemental appropriations because of the ever-increasing volume of mail.

I wonder how many Members of this body are on record as asking for extensions of delivery from their cities and towns into suburban areas? I have made 8 or 9 requests myself within recent months. I venture to say that most Members of this body have done the same thing.

In this bill providing funds for the fiscal year 1958 we ask for money for 5,000 additional carriers and routes to take care of suburban demands. This bill if passed with the \$58 million cut will not provide a cent for such extensions. The gentleman from Florida posed the question and that is the answer. We are millions under our 1957 appropriation if we bear in mind we have got to provide money for the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see my distinguished chairman make a correction in a figure which appears on page 11 of the report. You will note that first table there. It was made to appear before the full committee at least that the only mandatory item required by action of this body or any other body was the \$131 million extra for retirement contributions. But look down in the lower table and you will see \$31 million more, part of it for that extra payday for 526,000 postal workers, part of it for upgrade promotions required by law and part of it for premiums on security bonds, all the result of congressional action.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my colleagues in the House should fully understand what this bill means. I believe that you will want to know how the postal service will deteriorate if this \$58 million cut in the 1958 postal budget is allowed to stand.

This is an arbitrary reduction in what I believe to be an honest budget, carefully prepared by an economy-minded business-type management. Furthermore, this proposed cut was made without any relation whatsoever to the ever-increasing workload of the Post Office Department which is constantly growing as reflected in a doubled mail volume in the past 20 years.

This proposed cut of \$58 million in a total budget of \$3¼ billion may seem

like an intelligent effort to economize. Some may be misled since it is a modest percentage of the total. Its effect, however, is most drastic because the Post Office Department budget submitted to the committee had already been reduced to the workable minimum. Nowhere in the committee's report is there any suggestion how these economies may be made.

Furthermore, the Post Office Department differs from most Government agencies in one fundamental aspect in that it provides daily services essential to the social and economic well-being of 170 million Americans.

May I say right there that I believe, next to the military budget, the 170 million Americans I am talking about are more sensitive to this budget than any other budget. I believe this budget is extremely important to the well-being of the 170 million postal patrons.

The Post Office Department cannot reprogram its activities like most other Government agencies. In fact, the only way the Post Office Department can operate on less money is to reduce the present mail services available to the public.

And, I was glad to see the distinguished chairman of our committee be so frank on that point.

I asked the Post Office Department what it would have to do to meet this budget cut.

The Department informs me that it would have to curtail service in these ways to operate at \$58 million less and that these drastic measure are those that would cause the least possible deterioration of the postal service:

First. Restrict Saturday mail deliveries in cities to first-class mail only—\$10 million.

Second. Reduce mail deliveries in business sections to two a day—\$5 million.

Third. Eliminate the sale of money orders by all except country post offices—\$15 million.

Fourth. Eliminate postal savings—\$1 million.

Fifth. Defer buying \$5 million worth of trucks to replace 6-year-old trucks—\$5 million.

Sixth. Defer painting and lighting improvements badly needed in large post offices—\$12 million.

Seventh. Fail to provide any new city delivery routes in cities and suburbs—\$11 million.

Eighth. Defer buying new mechanical and other equipment badly needed in post offices—\$10 million.

Now, that is the program. You can vote for it today if you want to. I will not.

Additionally, the Department advises it might also have to give consideration to reducing the frequency of rural free-delivery service to 35 million Americans now depending upon it for the daily delivery of mail and parcel post.

My friend and colleague from New Jersey would add \$100 million more to this cut.

In doing these things, and perhaps others, it would have to reduce the Department's present and projected employment force by about 10,000 necessary jobs.

Why, you may ask, is the Post Office Department in this predicament?

It is in this predicament, first because it submitted an honest, pared-to-the-bone budget.

Secondly, the 1958 estimates were constructed on a 1957 base. With half of 1957 now gone, it is apparent that the 1957 volume will be much greater than anticipated. This unexpected added increase in volume, together with the effect of accelerated growth in city delivery service necessitated by our rapidly expanding suburban regions, has required the Department to seek a supplemental appropriation for this year that may run as much as \$47 million for operations.

With this change in base, the estimates for 1958 as submitted now provide for only a 1.5-percent increase in mail volume over 1957. This is less than half of the present rate of growth in volume and less than the growth experience of any year since 1947. It is certain, therefore, that time is proving that the Department's estimates have, if anything, been understated for 1958 and there is no possible way by which cuts of \$58 million could be absorbed without curtailment of services to the public.

I have been talking about the overall effect of a \$58 million reduction which the committee proposes.

Let me now cite some specific details relating to the appropriations of three of the Department's major bureaus—operations, transportation and facilities.

The reduction of \$36.6 million in the bureau of operations appropriation for 1958 proposed by the committee would actually provide the Department with \$27 million less for 1958 than the Department says it will require for 1957.

Since 97 percent of funds in the appropriation are for personal services this cut would require a reduction of 8,500 man-years of estimated needs for clerks and city carriers, despite an increase of 1.5 percent to 4 percent in workload. It is obvious that the 1958 mail volume cannot be handled by a reduced level of employment.

Next, the committee has proposed a cut in the appropriation for the Bureau of Transportation of the Post Office Department of \$9.7 million. The resulting available funds, after excluding the unavoidable costs added for 1958, would be \$700,000 less than those required for 1957. The report of the committee—page 13—in stating that the cut would still leave an increase of \$1.3 million over 1957, failed to take into account the fact that the Department has had to transfer \$2 million to this appropriation in 1957 from the accounts to meet current transportation requirements—see hearings, page 152. And currently, Mr. Chairman, the railroads are asking for increases in mail rates aggregating \$103 million.

A cut of \$9.7 million in the transportation appropriation would necessitate a reduction of 2,000 man-years of PTS clerk employment from that requested for 1958. None of the cut can be absorbed in common or contract carrier costs since all possible economies in this area were already allowed for in the Department's request. The resulting man-

years of clerk time available for 1958 would then be less than those actually required for 1957 by 1,700, or a reduction of more than 4 percent. By no possible stretch of the imagination can the Postal Transportation Service handle even today's workload with a reduction of 4 percent in employment, let alone the increased volume that can certainly be expected for 1958.

Next, this reduction in appropriations would mean that the Department would have to materially reduce its research and mechanization programs which are expected to speed up mail deliveries by from 30 to 50 percent through the Nation's badly overcrowded major post offices. The Members of this body who come from the New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago areas should read the hearings to see what this will mean to those areas of the country.

The Department would have to greatly reduce its modernization program to provide light, color, ventilation, and other related benefits to improve working conditions in obsolete buildings.

Mr. Chairman, let us have no mistake about this matter.

Whenever an essential service is curtailed to which the people are accustomed, the Congress is deluged by complaints from irate citizens.

If the Post Office Department is forced to curtail its essential services to the American people because we do not grant it the funds it needs to provide them, no Member of this Congress can pass the complaints of his constituents on to the Postmaster General to answer, for he cannot be blamed for poor mail service.

If we permit the mail service to deteriorate as I have indicated, it will be the responsibility of the Congress—and rightfully so—because the solution lies with the Congress.

There is no one in the House who believes in economy more than I do. I do not, however, believe in capricious or false economy, achieved by curtailing essential services to the American people, and, neither, I am certain, does any Member of this House.

I am convinced that the present management of the Post Office Department has taken every possible step during the past 4 years to make the postal service efficient and economical. The record speaks for itself, in better service, in a complete reorganization of the Department, in economies, in efficiencies.

I have right here the statements of 19 Senators who took the floor to speak out for our Postmaster General on the day he was confirmed for a second 4 years in office. They were led by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Read the RECORD and see what he had to say about Arthur E. Summerfield, his dedication to his assignment, and the type of job he is rendering the American people with his team downtown.

Perhaps the achievements of this team are best summed up in the fact that in the year 1956, the Department handled 11.5 percent more mail than in 1953 at an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in expenditures.

The Committee on Appropriations, on both sides of the aisle, has commended

the Postmaster General for his effective administration of the Post Office Department. I invite a reading of this record so that all members of this House may fully appreciate the improvements made in all phases of the postal management.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with one inescapable fact—postal costs cannot be cut \$58 million without cutting out essential mail services for 170 million Americans. It is up to the Congress to face the facts and decide what we want to do.

I, for one, want no share of the responsibility for curtailing the delivery of the mails.

I feel confident, once this situation is fully understood, once the facts are known, that the vitally needed \$58 million will be restored to the Post Office Department's 1958 postal budget.

I ran across some interesting copy as I recapped what I was going to say here today, sitting in my office this morning. I delved into the Republican Party platform adopted on August 21, 1956, and the Democratic Party platform adopted at its national convention on August 15, 1956, on this subject of mail service for our people. The Republican platform said in part:

We pledge to continue our efforts for a financially sound, more nearly self-sustaining postal service, with the users of the mails paying a greater share of the cost instead of the taxpayers bearing the burden of huge postal deficits.

We pledge to continue and to complete this vitally needed program of modernization of buildings, equipment, methods and service so that the American people will receive the kind of mail they deserve, the speediest and best that American ingenuity, technology, and modern business management can provide.

Now may I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Democrats in national convention assembled put more real punch lines in their platform on this subject of mail delivery for our American people, some real punch lines. I am going to give you the plank in full, and I want you to digest it as undoubtedly you did when it was made part of the platform. This is it:

The bungling policies of the Republican administration have crippled and impaired the morale, efficiency, and reputation of the United States postal service. Mail carriers and clerks and other postal employees are compelled to work under intolerable conditions; communications by mail and service by parcel post have been delayed and retarded with resulting hardships, business losses and inconveniences. Their false concept of economy has impaired seriously the efficiency of the best communications system in the world. We pledge ourselves to programs which will:

1. Restore the principle that the postal service is a public service to be operated in the interest of improved business economy and better communication as well as an aid to the dissemination of information and intelligence.

2. To restore postal employee morale through the strengthening of the merit system—promotions by law rather than caprice or partisan politics; payment of realistic salaries—reflecting the benefits of an expanding economy.

3. Establish a program of research and development on a scale adequate to insure the

most modern and efficient handling of the mails.

4. Undertake modernization and construction of desperately needed postal facilities designed to insure the finest postal system in the world.

May I say to my colleagues on the Republican side and may I say to my colleagues on the Democratic side, did you mean—did you truly mean what you said in these platforms adopted only a few months ago?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. May I defer to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]?

Mr. CANFIELD. No; I prefer to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who asked me to yield previously.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am not asking the gentleman to yield; I will speak on my own time later.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I shall do the same inasmuch as the gentleman from New Jersey did not yield to me when the figures were mentioned.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey that when our distinguished chairman was speaking and making his main presentation, I did not interrupt him and I tried to be very courteous and very polite. I thought you would try to be a little helpful to me, also. The gentleman from Virginia took more than an hour. I do not intend to take that much time.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I did not know what time the gentleman wanted to take.

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman now who a few moments ago made the statement that this budget ought to be cut \$100 million over the \$58 million cut.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. The gentleman is loose with the words when he says "ought to be cut." That is point No. 1. Point No. 2, I rose to correct you when you said that never has the Post Office been cut as much as \$58 million. When the gentleman was chairman of the committee in 1954, was it not true that a cut of \$78 million was offered by the gentleman from the Truman budget?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, that is not true, that is not true.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. All right, the gentleman has answered the question; let it rest there.

Mr. CANFIELD. The statement I made is a fact. If this \$58 million cut is sustained, it represents the biggest Post Office Department cut in the history of the United States. If the gentleman has figures in books or anything to show me otherwise, let him show me. I want the gentleman to show me.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Good; that point has been brought out.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman know? Does the gentleman know that I am in error? Does he insist that I am in error?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have the figures here.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. He has the figures. I am asking him for help.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. According to the RECORD, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, in 1954, he reduced the Truman budget by \$74,550,000. Then again in 1956, this House in its wisdom reduced the Eisenhower budget by \$69,117,000. I think you will find both of those figures in the records.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this time?

Mr. CANFIELD. No, I want to ask my friend if he has the volume and the page where that appears. I challenge those figures. But, I must say you are not getting down to the figures in finality—you are not getting down to what figures were finally approved by the Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman says that it is the largest reduction that was ever made. It is true that when you go over to the other body, then at times you have to agree to things in conference. You reduced the Truman budget by \$74,550,000.

Mr. CANFIELD. I challenge that statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall furnish the gentleman the page in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. But, the gentleman is not being responsive. In my statement, I talked about the figures in finality. I talked about supplemental bills.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to make a statement. I do not subscribe as a member of this Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the subcommittee handling Treasury and Post Office funds to this premise that we have to make severe cuts, unrealistic though they may be, on the understanding that the other body always restores all or part of such cuts. I do not think I am discharging my responsibility as a Member of Congress in proceeding under that premise. I want to do a real, honest, factual job.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. GARY. You say you are dealing with figures in finality. Do you consider this figure in finality? Do you think what we do here is going to be the final figure?

Mr. CANFIELD. What do you say about that?

Mr. GARY. I say "No."

Mr. CANFIELD. I say "No," too.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. Now, why can we not compare this cut with previous House cuts? What my colleagues were saying is that the House has cut these figures for the post office in the past more than we are now recommending. We do not know what the other body will do. I hope they will cut it still further, but I have no idea that they will. There is certain discretion that we have to use on this floor.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to my good friend, he knows Mr. Bruce, of the Post Office Department. He has been working in the Post Office Department—I do not know how many years, but we in our committee refer to him as "Mr.

Post Office Department," because if anybody down there has the answers, Mr. Bruce has them. I had him go back into the records of these cuts, and here is a little notation from him:

I have gone back to 1938 and I have found no instance where there has been a reduction by Congress in excess of \$33 million made for 1956, which did stand up because there was a supplemental of \$17 million.

Those are the words of Mr. Bruce whom we know in our considerations in committee as "Mr. Post Office Department." I see the gentleman from New York [Mrs. Sr. GEORGE]. She knows Mr. Bruce. She knows what he knows about the Department.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is it the gentleman's intention to offer an amendment that will restore the \$58 million cut?

Mr. CANFIELD. I believe that amendments will be offered by other Members of the House. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee may have some amendment to offer.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I will support such an amendment, but I wanted to find out, if I could, if a member of the Appropriations Committee intended to offer such amendments.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all frankness, I offered an amendment in full committee the other day, and I was turned back. But I do not believe the full committee, when required to act on my amendment was possessed of all the facts. In all frankness, I am sure the gentleman from Virginia will agree with me. In his report the other day the projected increase over 1957 was \$76 million, but today it is \$44 million, because he gave consideration for the \$31 million in mandatory requirements imposed by the Congress of the United States over and above the \$131 million required by contributions to the civil-service fund.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield, as a matter of fact the report said there was \$76 million over and above the retirement fund contribution. On page 2 of the report are the mandatory items which totaled the amount the gentleman has referred to. That makes a net cut of \$44 million.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am referring to the gentleman's summary table at the very beginning of the report.

Mr. GARY. Yes, but on the very next page we call attention to and list the other mandatory items. There was no intent to deceive anybody in the House. If you will look on page 2 you will find the other details of the mandatory items. All of the facts are shown in the report.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from Virginia he knows I never would charge him with making an effort to deceive anybody; he just is not that kind of fellow, but I do want to point out that apparently there was an error made on page 11 in the original summary of this bill, because if the Members will turn to the table you will see that we show an increase for retirement fund contributions of \$131 million but when the comparative changes for

1957 are considered the amount for mandatory increases should be more like \$162.9 million.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I should like to direct the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey to the fact that "Mr. Post Office Department" whom we refer to as Mr. Bruce, is one of my fellow Louisianians, and we are very proud of him down there.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If this proposed cut is sustained does not the gentleman believe that it would probably stop the building of a branch post office that has been authorized?

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman mean under the Lease-Purchase Act?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. No; a branch office which is established, a branch office. Would not that be affected if you curtail these funds?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not see how it could help being involved in this item.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It would involve the increase of any activity, it could not help doing so.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is right, and already in the supplemental request for \$53 million for 1957 the Department is being urged by some members of our committee to leave out capital improvements to the amount of some \$6 million.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Before I make just a little statement on the gentleman's time, if I may, I want to state that my friend is most compassionate and considerate of others. I express the hope that his bill to provide a pension for the widow of the member of the Secret Service who was killed at the time the attempt was made on President Truman's life, goes through. I have not met a more sentimental man in this House than the gentleman from New Jersey. However, that is sentiment. I think the gentleman agrees with me that we are both shooting at the same target, and that is to give our people of this land a tax reduction and to try to hold postage rates down.

Does the gentleman think that by restoring the \$58 million he is working toward a tax reduction or holding the price of stamps down?

Mr. CANFIELD. First I would like to say to my friend from New Jersey that I am not holding the postage rates down. I stand with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], in his pointed statement that the patrons ought to pay the freight, and I stand for realistic rates. But I do not think we should proceed any further in trying to finance 1957 and 1958 costs on 1932 rates.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think we are in accord. The gentleman had endorsed a tax reduction. Are we correct in drawing the conclusion that with the restoration of this \$58 million the people of America cannot look to this subcommittee to help them in their effort to se-

cure a tax reduction in the next 2 years or 4 years?

Mr. CANFIELD. I will cross swords with my friend from New Jersey in any forum of this country on that very subject.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI], whose heart now is bleeding for the taxpayers, will deny that he voted for \$200 million to be given away in the Middle East on a blank-check account.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I should like to preface my question by the statement that the record seems to show that the gentleman voted for every increase for postal employees and voted consistently for even the highest increases. I do not quarrel with the gentleman's right to do so but are we not now in the position of paying the piper?

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to express my high regard for the gentleman from New Jersey, who is an able Member of this body and a staunch advocate of economy in Federal expenditures. I always listen to him with great interest and respect for his views.

He has pointed out here what he believes will be certain curtailments of service if this cut is permitted to stand. I want to make a statement for myself, not undertaking to speak for anybody else. Like every other Member of this body, since the overall budget has been announced I have been besieged with letters from the people, communications, telegrams, and personal interviews, complaining about the terrific cost of the Federal Government. I have tried as patiently as I could to explain to those people that the more service they demand from the Government the greater the cost of Government will be. The only way I know to keep that cost of Government down is to reduce costs whenever you can find a way to do it. Obviously, once in a while it will result in some curtailment of service, some of the things people might like to have from the Government.

I want to make a further observation in order that I may not be misunderstood. I have the same high regard for Postmaster General Summerfield as has been expressed here in the House of Representatives. We all understand that this cut may put him and his Department and the able people working with him to some rather difficult propositions with respect to operating the post office. But I am quite sure that they would not be retrenching as a result of these cuts in ways designed just to make the Congress look bad. I think they would try to do the best with them that they could.

What I am trying to say is this: It has been my personal observation over 22 years as a Member of this body and dealing with the matter of Federal

expenditures and taxes, that everybody is for economy if you will take "me" out of it. You cannot economize in that fashion.

Now, I have listened to the gentleman. All of the argument is not in as yet and I shall hold an open mind until all of the argument is in. But as things stand now, I want my position understood. As far as I am concerned, if an amendment is offered to restore this cut I shall not support the amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend from Indiana that I sense the predicament he describes here today. In this connection I want to tell the Members of the House an interesting story. The distinguished Governor of my State, Mr. Meyner, came to Washington 2 weeks ago to address 650 businessmen from the State of New Jersey meeting here under the auspices of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce. In his remarks before that group of businessmen he lashed out at the Eisenhower budget. The next morning he gave the New Jersey Congressmen, Republicans and Democrats, a breakfast at the Congressional Hotel. The whole tenor of his remarks at the breakfast was different. He had some papers from different State agencies that were insisting upon federally budgeted funds, with no cuts, in some instances increases. I had a letter from him. Every member of the New Jersey delegation received that letter, which came 2 days after we had the vote regarding the \$2 million cut in funds allocated to the States for the administration of social-security benefits. He was against it.

At night he was telling the businessmen one story, he was indicting the present administration because of its budget. At our breakfast the next morning he was telling us these Federal allocations and grants had to continue.

Now, that is what we are up against. Governor Meyner at this time is projecting in the State of New Jersey a record peacetime budget for that State. But he is not alone. Governor Harriman, of New York, is doing the same thing. Governor Ribicoff, who sat in this body as an able Congressman, is doing the same thing for Connecticut. Governor Mennen Williams, of Michigan, is doing the same thing.

I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that somebody has got to take the bit and do something about this. I know what the gentleman wants to do. But let me ask the gentleman this question: He has had letters from his constituents, he has had talks with his constituents. Has he talked with them about what this bill will do to their postal service back home and has he had their reaction to that?

Mr. HALLECK. No. I must say to the gentleman that I have had a number of communications, and I think all of them, with two or three exceptions, have come from people who are representing the employees of the post office. Of course, I am glad to hear from them; I have had solicitude for them; I have supported legislation through the years of benefit to them, and they realize that.

But I did get one letter from a very estimable gentleman, a businessman in

my district, who complained about what these cuts would mean; and what was obvious to me from reading his letter was that the dire things that he thought were going to happen would not happen; maybe some things, but not what he had in mind. And then in the last part of the letter he upbraided me about the size of the budget and asked, "Why don't you do something about cutting the cost of Government down there in Washington?"

Now, we cannot have it both ways, and that is the only point I am making. As I say, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury have said to the Congress, "Do what you can to cut this budget."

I hear proposals for a cut of \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion. I do not know whether we can do that or not. I know in my heart that if we make some of these cuts, the people must understand that they cannot have everything that they would like to have from the Government.

And, you refer to the States. The States have to recognize the same thing. All of our people who pay the bills must recognize sooner or later that you cannot have the fancy frills and all of the things you would like to have without paying the bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. I beg to disagree with my friend from Indiana, and I think when the 170 million postal patrons catch up with the facts of life, they are not going to approve a cut of this kind. Now, time will bear you out or time will bear me out. And, I want to say this, too. I noticed over the weekend that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, presumably on TV, projected cuts in the Federal budget, but he was good enough to document just where those cuts should take place. Did he mention the postal service of the United States? No, he did not. I noticed also on the TV program conducted by our distinguished friend and colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. McCORMACK], he spoke out on Federal cuts, and he gave some documentation. But, did he mention the postal service of the United States? No, he did not.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have had mail, like our distinguished friend from Indiana and as the gentleman from New Jersey has. We have all had it. And it is our conscientious duty here to cut down on this budget at every place we can. I must say in all frankness I have had some people pick out spots where cuts should be made. I have not received a single letter which has said "Reduce the postal service" or "reduce the service which is given to the patrons." Now, I have not heard all of this debate yet, and I have an open mind, like the gentleman from Indiana, but I want to ask the gentleman from New Jersey in just exactly what way—and he may have covered this before I entered the Chamber—in just exactly what way does the gentleman feel that this \$58 million cut will be

carried out in specifics in the delivery of the mail.

Mr. CANFIELD. In all earnestness, I covered that, and it took some 10, 15, or 20 minutes to do it. But, I shall be glad to huddle with the gentleman later and inform him.

Mr. KEATING. I will be glad to read that part of it in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD. And go into it in detail.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey is not going to ask the gentleman from Indiana the obvious question. I want to do it. How much is the gentleman from Indiana prepared to cut the foreign aid budget?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know. That has not come before us. Now, I have voted for cuts. You call it the foreign aid budget.

Mr. GROSS. I call it the foreign giveaway budget.

Mr. HALLECK. Just a moment. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor at the moment? I have been asked a question, and I understood the gentleman from New Jersey yielded.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Since the gentleman has brought it up, maybe this is as good a time as any to say a word or two about it. I happen to believe that the national defense of our country requires us to maintain some offshore operations. I happen to believe that the national defense of our country—of Washington, Iowa, Indiana—is made more secure if we have some friends around the world. I do not believe to call it foreign aid is right. That is not the right term. I think it is a matter of national defense. It is a matter of a balance between what we do at home to defend ourselves and what we do to maintain some of these offshore operations.

I have said this before, but some of the new Members have not heard it and I think it will bear saying again: I feel a little safer in my home at night because some of these American planes are based around the world. I do not know whether the gentleman would bring them all back or not; he has never said. But I also know that the national defense of our country is the largest item we have.

I want to go along on a basis of the best balance that can be worked out between what we do at home and what we do overseas. We want to maintain a strong economy and at the same time maintain our Armed Forces in the field, and we want to achieve a balance between the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, and all the other branches of the service. The problem is something that I am perfectly willing to meet any place on the road when the time comes. But I do not think it has anything to do with the matter presently before us.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, on the other hand I am glad the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised that question, because at the outset of my remarks, speaking extemporaneously, I wanted to emphasize this fact. There

is not 1 cent in this bill for foreign aid. I would rather see this \$58 million restored for necessary postal services for the patrons of the United States, for the 170 million Americans, than give \$1 to Tito and his government. I have never voted to give any money to Tito and I am not going to begin now. But we have given him more than \$58 million by plenty. It may approach \$1 billion.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have been a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service for the past 2 years. I think this debate will probably be refreshing to the American people. Here we are discussing whether \$58 million shall be restored to the Post Office Department. I recognize that there are some real problems in the operation of this Department. But there has been very little said about the \$600 million and some deficit. We are talking about restoring \$58 million. I think it is an indictment upon the Members of this body that we have allowed the postal rate situation to exist as it is today. From 1932 to 1956 there has not been an increase in the first-class mail rate. If we are going to go along with that, we are going to have to give 1932 service in 1956. If you want 1956 service you are going to have to pay for it.

I recognize the problem so far as the \$58 million is concerned. I think probably there are some areas of the Department where they can economize. But I hope that our committee will bring before this body the kind of a postal rate bill that will do something about this deficit. That is long, long overdue. Then I would like to see how many people are going to stand up and be counted in behalf of doing something for the patrons of this country, the taxpayers of this country, when we deal with the postal deficit, which affects every one of them. We can start talking about better service when we meet that issue.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to make one further observation. I am glad the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] said what he did. Of course, he knows that whatever position I held here was shoulder to shoulder with those who have tried in recent years to get some increase in the rates. In connection with that what we are trying to do is to eliminate the deficit in the post office, which has such an impact on the overall budget. Here on one side is a decrease, if it stands, in respect to certain expenditures. As far as I am concerned, I am ready to support a reasonable rate increase bill which, on the other side, will tend to eliminate the deficit which must be made up by the taxpayers generally.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I intend to support the gentleman's position in regard to the \$50 million because I think it is time we waked the people up. If we have to curtail service to do it, then they will wake up their Congressmen.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey understands that I have a very deep affection and a very high regard for him. We are very close personal friends now as we have been in the past and will be in the future. I know the gentleman desires to be fair. A moment ago he named 4 or 5 Democratic governors that had inflated or increased budgets. I wonder if the gentleman meant to imply that it is only the Democrats who operate their States that way.

Mr. CANFIELD. No. The reason I mentioned those governors is that I live in New Jersey, New York is contiguous, Connecticut is right on top of us, and all that. I did mention Mennen Williams because there was recent publicity about him. The Democrats do not have a monopoly on that by any means. It applies to governors everywhere. It is due to the demands of the people, no question about that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the Democrats on this side of the aisle are doing everything in their power to make some very small reductions in this overall bill.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am so glad the gentleman has brought that up.

Mr. PASSMAN. I knew the gentleman would be.

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

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

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has been on this subcommittee for a good many years.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am the senior member of this subcommittee.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to get the gentleman's estimate of the future. The gentleman says the Post Office Department has come in with a request for a \$53 million supplemental appropriation for this fiscal year. What is the gentleman's estimate as to what the Committee on Appropriations will do with that?

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the Department itself, because of the climate of this hour, will proceed to suggest that the figure of \$6 million for capital items be deleted, but the Department insisted no later than this morning that the \$47 million, the balance of that figure, is needed for postal operations, and they do not see how that can be cut.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman also said that if they did not get that supplemental appropriation, it would mean payless days for postal employees?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is what the Department says.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe his committee or this Congress will go through June 30 and not pass supplemental appropriations to provide authorized pay for our postal employees?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not believe it will, yet I am mindful of the fact that the people of the country are demanding economy. Unfortunately, this bill, which has never, never, never lent itself to severe cuts, is the first appropriation bill to be brought before the House, and the elections of last November are not so far

removed. I wonder what we would do on a bill with this cut next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is to provide funds to operate the Post Office Department and Treasury Department and agencies under the Treasury for fiscal 1958.

After the excellent presentation by our distinguished and able chairman, my contribution doubtless shall be small. The gentleman from Virginia, J. VAUGHAN GARY, is a gentleman in every respect. He is able and courageous; and in my considered judgment, pressure, propaganda and persuasion will never cause this good man to do anything other than what he believes to be right and proper. Those of you who have served with him for many years know that I speak the truth.

Therefore, nothing affords me more personal pleasure than to pay tribute to a great leader, a fair leader and, without a doubt, one of the most able men to serve in this body or in the body of our coequals on the other side of the Capitol. I know you have observed in the presentations of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that he deals with actual facts and substantiating statistics and documentation.

The Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill is considered nonpartisan and handled by a nonpartisan committee. Therefore, it is to be regretted that the entire membership of the subcommittee handling this bill is not in accord as to the amount necessary to operate the agencies involved for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a congressional district with more than 115 post offices and a larger number of rural routes and star routes, and several cities have city delivery service. Certainly this would indicate that there is an unusually large number of postal employees in my district. I am their friend, and the majority of them are my friends; and I hope that this mutual friendship may continue. However, let me say, here and now and for the record, that persuasion from any of my friends among the postal personnel, including their national officers, will not in any way, shape, form, or fashion cause me to act in any manner other than what I think is absolutely right and proper. Therefore, I enthusiastically support the bill before the committee and back my able chairman on the cuts that his subcommittee made and in the truthful and fair statements he has made in presenting the bill to you.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know the gentleman from Louisiana has the interests of the postal employees at heart from the way he has spoken. I also have their interests very much at heart. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman feel, as a result of this cut, that the salaries of postal employees would suffer in any way?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think I can assure the distinguished gentlewoman from New York that in no way will salaries be affected. I think our distinguished chairman pointed out in his discussion of the bill that there are funds provided for the ingrade promotions and other benefits to postal employees. I may state further that the overall cut is only 1.7 percent, which is very small when it is considered on the basis of a request for in excess of \$3 billion. In my considered judgment, no services will be greatly curtailed; and certainly reductions will not apply to personnel, unless it should possibly be to fringe personnel such as perhaps part-time employees.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. I was under the same impression since these salaries were enacted by act of Congress, and certainly nothing in this appropriation could change them.

Mr. PASSMAN. I may also state that there have been similar cuts in the past. I do not know why there is such a fight at this time to keep this Subcommittee on Appropriations from doing its duty and making small cuts in these money bills. If we are not going to consider these bills, and make cuts where we think we can make them, then why not bring the budget directly to the floor and not waste the time of the members of the committees in conducting hearings for weeks and months?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. GARY. I would like to point out one paragraph from the report which reads as follows:

The budget provides an estimated average employment for fiscal year 1958 of 638,200, including military personnel of the Coast Guard as compared with a presently estimated average for 1957 of 620,700 an increase of 17,500. The amounts recommended in the accompanying bill should result in reductions of approximately 9,500 in the estimated average employment for 1958.

So, rather than reducing the number of employees, this bill would still allow for a substantial increase in the number of employees.

So that it not only will not reduce any salaries, but it will provide for some increases in employees.

Mr. Chairman, the time has finally arrived when the Congress must take into its own hands the job of bringing expenditures in line with revenues. For example, during the past 4 years, a period when our revenue reached an all-time high, may I point out that the present administration with the aid of the Congress has spent all of the revenues collected by the Federal Government and, in addition thereto, expended an additional \$10 billion. Putting it another way, during the past 4 years, the public debt has increased by \$10 billion.

Therefore, we must, as businessmen and elected Representatives of our people, take hold of the situation and do something about it. Unless we act with a determination to reduce expenditures, then to some extent we will have placed

the economy of this great Nation in jeopardy.

Would it be true and fair to say that at heart Congress knows what is wrong, but does not dare correct it? While expenditures have grown to new and dizzy heights, we have refused to raise revenues sufficiently to offset the increased expenditures. More particularly is this true with respect to the postal operation. It has been said there is not a group, a faction or a party in Congress that dares to go on record in favor of cutting unnecessary expenditures. Well, I want the record to show that I am in favor of reducing expenditures promptly and drastically so that we may not only have a balanced budget but a reduction in the staggering public debt.

I am beginning my 11th year as a Member of Congress and my 9th year as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I would be less than honest not to admit that the pressure groups are so powerful within and without the Government, the explanations of the need are so plausible and so polite that if the Member of Congress is not careful, he receives a terrifically effective selling job, regardless of the weaknesses or sound merits of many of the presentations.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to again pay tribute to the Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield. In my opinion, General Summerfield is one of the outstanding Postmasters General of this age. I doubt if any President in recent history has had a Cabinet member who excelled Mr. Summerfield in astuteness and downright business ability. To pay tribute to this man who has done a great job for the American people affords me much satisfaction.

The bill before you does not provide as much money as the Postmaster General and members of his staff would like to receive; but General Summerfield is a businessman, he knows how to cut corners, he knows how to control expenditures. I am sure if we provide the Postmaster General with the sum recommended in this bill, he will do an excellent job and at a subsequent date commend the committee for its forthright action in making a small reduction in the Department's request.

As pointed out by our chairman, the postal deficit estimated for fiscal 1958 is \$651 million. If the application for an increase of railroad transportation costs is granted in the amount of \$103 million, that will bring the estimated deficit to \$754 million. If everything should be taken into account in the operation of the postal service, then the deficit would be, in all probability, double that amount.

Mr. Chairman, if the Post Office Department were forced to operate on the same basis as business in our great free-enterprise system, then the story would be far more unfavorable. Do you realize that the postal establishment uses thousands of buildings rent free? It does not have to pay any income tax; it operates free of county or State ad valorem and other property taxes. It does not have to pay occupational license fees. Neither does it have to carry various types of insurance on buildings and contents. In other words, the postal establishment

gets a free ride as compared to the manner in which private businesses operate. I point this out so that you may better understand that the deficit, in all probability, would be a billion plus if it were not for the many advantages that the postal establishment enjoys which are not afforded to private enterprise.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Such is a matter of fact, and it is true also of all other Federal agencies.

I do hope that this Congress will increase postal rates so that the Post Office Department can operate on a self-sustaining basis. It is not right to continue demanding greater services from the postal operations and at the same time refuse to increase postal rates. May I again remind you that letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932. Without any intent of offense, I say for the record that this is gross neglect and positively political.

May I also say that it costs a certain amount of money to operate the postal service, and the difference between the revenue and the cost of operation is withdrawn from the Treasury and paid for by the taxpayer. Tens of millions of our poorer American families are having to pay taxes to subsidize the heavier users of the mails. Inasmuch as the difference between the expenses and the revenues must be borne by the taxpayers, why should not the Congress muster sufficient courage to do the proper thing and increase postal rates. Let those who use the mails pay for the cost, rather than force 165 million of our 170 million Americans to subsidize the other 5 million.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. PASSMAN. I certainly do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that this House last year performed its responsibility in the matter of rate increases.

Mr. PASSMAN. And I may say to the gentleman that I supported the rate increase and will do so very enthusiastically this year. It is a privilege for me to follow the Postmaster General's recommendation in this important matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Will the gentleman yield further to clear up one or two other points?

Mr. PASSMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHANSEN. We appreciate, of course, the gentleman's splendid remarks regarding the Postmaster General, and it is a typical display of fairness on the part of the gentleman. There is one question I would like to ask as a member of the legislative committee. Is there anything in this budget either as originally presented or as reduced which contemplates any increases in pay for the postal employees in the next fiscal year?

Mr. PASSMAN. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that this is an appropriations committee. Certainly we cannot legislate. Any legislation of that type would be subject to a point of order. Such legislation would have to come, of course, from the legislative committee. If they can make a justifi-

able case on the floor of the House I shall support a pay increase. Is that what the gentleman wants to ask me?

Mr. JOHANSEN. My only point—and this does not apply to the gentleman—is that I have some difficulty in reconciling some of the new-found interest in economy on a certain side of this House on the part of those who voted for very substantial pay increases two years ago.

Mr. PASSMAN. I say to the gentleman that I voted for the pay increases; I have voted for every pay increase bill presented on this floor for the postal employees; and I stand ready to support an increase in postal rates to offset some of the increased operating costs.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I want to say that I agree with what the gentleman has to say about economy, but I think he will agree, too, it is absolutely essential that we maintain an excellent postal service in the United States. I see on the report that the gentleman has referred to that it is estimated for 1957 the amount of mail handled will be 58,024,000 pieces. This, as I see it, cost as far as the postal operations are concerned \$2,126,730,000. That is without any supplemental appropriation. Your report says it is estimated there will be a 2.8 percent increase in the amount of mail handled for the fiscal year 1958 and your committee is proposing that this be done for \$17 million, is that right?

Mr. PASSMAN. This committee proposes to try to effect some economies. I say to the gentleman that there will doubtless be some cuts in the postal operations. But it should be borne in mind that there is transferability of funds. If you will read the entire report you will discover that in the past certain funds have been transferred out of one division into another, more especially in new operations. I do not know what the total amount would be which might be transferred out of any one department into another, but it is a substantial sum. If the gentleman will read the report in its entirety, the gentleman will doubtless agree that we have reported a sound bill.

Mr. Chairman, we should, we must, and I believe that we will, muster sufficient courage to reduce expenditures, remembering, if you please, that almost every year after the Congress effects a small reduction in the President's budget, we actually conclude the fiscal year by spending billions of dollars more than the budget called for.

For example:

Fiscal 1956:	
President Eisenhower's original budget estimate submitted 2 years ago.....	\$62.4
Fiscal 1956 closed last June 30 showing actual spending of.....	66.5
The actual overrun was.....	4.1
Fiscal 1957:	
President Eisenhower's original budget estimate submitted a year ago.....	65.9
His revised spending estimate for 1957 (as shown in the 1958 budget last month).....	70.1
The overrun now estimated....	4.2

Another example:

The Congress is again granting authority to draw money from the Treasury by various devices other than through appropriation bills.

In recent hearings, Secretary Humphrey and Budget Director Brundage said that in the last session of Congress, while cuts of \$300 million were being made through the appropriation bills, the Congress enacted into law in bills other than appropriation bills, various authorizations to draw on the Treasury to the extent of \$1,700,000,000 more than was recommended by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree that the time has come for every Member of this House, be he a member of the Appropriations Committee, a legislative committee or a special committee, to associate himself with the figures with which the members of the Appropriations Committee must deal continuously. I am sure that any member who will devote sufficient time to go as far into such matters as a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee necessarily do, will reach the conclusion that a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee have long since reached, which is that we must bring Federal expenditures under control in this day of great general prosperity. You and I know it is not right to continue indefinitely the spending year in and year out of billions of dollars in excess of our revenues, and winding up each fiscal year by spending several billion dollars more than the President asked for in the beginning.

Mr. Chairman, let us face the issues fairly and squarely, and start reducing every appropriation bill that reaches the floor of this House, if we can justify the reductions. We must not succumb to propaganda or pressure groups or to persuasion for selfish reasons. Sooner or later we are going to have to face up to the facts; and so far as I am concerned, this is a good place to start.

I trust that you will remain on the floor and support the committee's action on this bill. The committee has submitted to you facts and statistics that you can take back to your respective districts and justify your favorable vote.

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

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First, I should like to commend the Members on both sides of the aisle who have been discussing this subject, because I think they have given us much information in the public interest that the public needs to know about and understand more fully than they have. Now, coming from a rural district, as I do, I am somewhat disturbed about the statements made about the curtailment of rural service, of which I have so much in my district. My question is this: Was there any testimony before your committee and/or in your opinion will there be any definite curtailment of rural route service if the committee report is sustained?

Mr. PASSMAN. In my candid opinion, certain adjustments will have to be made somewhere to absorb the \$58 million cut, if the position of the committee is sustained; but I think I can answer the

gentleman's question a little better by reading a telegram, which I will be pleased to show to you. I quote from the telegram:

It was noted in today's news that the House Appropriations Committee cut the Post Office appropriation \$58 million. It is urgent that you vote for the restoration of that amount when the bill comes before the House next Tuesday. The Post Office up to now has been operating on such a strenuous economy program it is getting to the point that it is almost impossible to give your constituents the mail service they deserve. This cut may mean a cut in personnel, discontinuance of delivery route extensions, no Saturday delivery, and the placing of rural routes on a triweekly basis. Your support will be appreciated in advocating the kind of mail service the people deserve and the better working conditions of the postal personnel.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is the gentleman's candid opinion, then, that there will be no substantial curtailment of personnel or rural mail service?

Mr. PASSMAN. If I thought there would be a substantial curtailment of personnel or rural mail service I certainly would not have supported this amendment in the committee to make certain small reductions, small percentage-wise—only 1.7 percent.

I think our distinguished chairman pointed out that there are increases in the funds for personnel, rather than decreases. Please keep in mind that we are appropriating for the postal service \$207 million more than was appropriated last year. If the mandatory items in the bill are removed from this consideration, the appropriation is for \$44 million plus more than was available for the current year for operating the postal service. So, if there is some curtailment of unessential services, if that has to be done to effect some economy in Government, let us recognize the facts and act accordingly. My hope is that I may be helpful in bringing about some way of checking this trend toward giving away money and spending money for nonessential services we cannot afford.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has a good point and, with his permission, I should like to pursue this just a little bit further.

Mr. PASSMAN. This may not be politically favorable for me a year or so from now, but I am going to stick by it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In the matter of the building program, we have been told that it will be necessary to curtail some of this building program. Is it not true that many of the building programs in progress now are not being carried on at the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not think there is anything in this bill for any building program. The building program comes under the jurisdiction of the legislative committee and carries a different authorization.

I might say here to the gentleman that I wasted several hours of the time of several hundred constituents down in Jonesboro, Jackson Parish, La., telling them we were going to provide them a beautiful lease-purchase post-office building. They have been 1 year now trying to find some architect to draw the plans and specifications, but they cannot even agree on the architect. Now, lo and

behold, just as my election is approaching about a year from now, I notice the decision that they are not now going to build these lease-purchase buildings.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, for whom I have such a high regard.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I believe I heard the gentleman make the statement quoting the Director of the Budget that although the Committee on Appropriations had decreased the suggested budget by approximately \$500 million at the same time the gate was open whereby \$1,700,000,000 extra authorization was granted.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. AVERY. That rather intrigued me. Just how does the Congress appropriate money except through the Committee on Appropriations and the action of the House?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is done in many instances through granting contract authority. There is the highway program, for example, concerning which some enthusiasts have estimated that gas tax revenues would bring in \$2 billion annually and the expenditures would be at some other figure. I do not know what the deficit would be. If it should cost \$2 billion annually to carry on the highway program and only half a billion dollars should be received in revenues for the program, the other \$1½ billion would necessarily come from the United States Treasury. That would be accomplished without coming before the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, today's vote on appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments comes at a time of mounting public opinion against the size of the Federal budget. It is no exaggeration to say that men and women throughout the country, of both political parties, were shocked at President Eisenhower's recently announced \$72 billion budget for fiscal 1958—largest ever in our peacetime history.

Subsequent statements by both the President and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey have made it clear that this administration has abdicated its responsibility with respect to this budget. We are told that Congress has the responsibility for making cuts in the President's budget but neither he nor his Department heads give the slightest indication of where these cuts should be made.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that Congress will conscientiously endeavor to accept the responsibility for effecting economies. But to do this intelligently we must not succumb to the pressure of public opinion which quite naturally has been aroused by the administration's irresponsibility.

We are all aware that the most controversial item before us today is the committee proposal to cut \$58 million from the proposed Post Office Department appropriation for fiscal 1958. We are also aware that the biggest single cut would be a \$36,637,000 reduction from the proposed funds for postal operations. The Committee on Appropriations is recommending that Congress make available \$17,825,000 more than was available in 1957 to care for the constantly expanding volume of mail and the continuous growth of our metropolitan areas which require ever-increasing service additions. In other words, the committee is only recommending an increase of funds for postal operations for fiscal 1958 of eight-tenths of 1 percent over the amount appropriated for fiscal 1957.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot effect a real economy by impairing the operational efficiency of the Post Office Department for the sake of a bookkeeping "saving." Yet this is precisely what the proposed cut would accomplish.

In a period of intensifying industrial activity and a record-breaking population increase, more mail is being handled now than ever before. Last year the volume of all mail handled increased by 2.2 percent, and there is no reason to suppose that the volume will not continue to increase similarly in the immediate months and years ahead. What this figure means, Mr. Chairman, is that our postal clerks and carriers last year handled 1,207,000,000 more pieces of mail than they did in the preceding year.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the way to effect real economy is, on the one hand, to encourage efficiency of operation by instituting long overdue reforms to protect the employment rights of Federal employees and to create incentives through programs of promotion based upon merit; and on the other hand, to base postal rates of first-, second-, and third-class mail, respectively, on the actual cost of handling the distribution of each.

Personally I find it difficult to cry economy and vote for a \$58 million cut in post office operations while at the same time acquiescing in the overt subsidization of large firms and other heavy users of second and third class mail.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote to restore the \$36 million reduction for postal operations. To do otherwise would mean curtailment of an essential service and a crippling of the Post Office Department's program of modernization which is so long overdue.

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

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything of which I am proud in my membership in this House over and beyond that membership, it is my membership on this subcommittee that brings you here today the appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

In his opening remarks, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], our able chairman, took occasion to laud collectively and individually the members of his subcommittee. I know that we all appreciate those remarks, and in return I know that we shall all

extend to him our highest fraternal affection, our esteem and respect.

That also goes, I know, from the Members on the other side of the House as well as on this side of the House for the alternate chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and I know, too, that that feeling of deep friendship and companionship extends throughout and to each and every member of this subcommittee.

I have been a member of this subcommittee now for 8 years, and during that time I have seen this same bill brought before the House for debate and discussion, but this is the first time in those 8 years when there has been a division of essential opinion between the membership of the subcommittee. I almost said between the two sides, between the two party memberships, but that, even in this instance, I am sure does not exist because we have never operated since I have been a member of this subcommittee on a partisan basis.

Our interrogations of the witnesses who came before us to justify their requests for funds have always been of the highest order. We have had full and complete response because of the nature of the interrogations we made. I feel that on every occasion we have had complete information, complete justification, and everything else needed for our committee to sit down and make a wise and proper determination concerning what this bill should contain when presented to the House.

In the 8 years I have been a member there were three Democratic postmasters that came before this subcommittee. I am going to say to you here and now that when those men came from the other side of the House they were no less dedicated and devoted to their work than has been the Republican postmaster who has come before us in the past few years. But I do recall this, that in each and every session of this subcommittee we have finally marked up the bill to provide for what are called cuts. I remember, too, that in each and every case supplemental estimates were brought before the House to restore a substantial part and practically the total amount of the cuts that we made. We are putting in this day-to-day friendly debate but we are not getting anywhere, in my opinion, because the cut that is being made will most assuredly about this time in 1958 be brought before us and enacted in the form of a supplemental appropriation bill.

I think it has been a very, very good thing for the subcommittee itself, and long may it live, that we have some disagreement. We have gone along for too many years in the highly polished Alphonse and Gaston attitude. This time we have had for several brief moments what might have seemed to some of the members a near riot among ourselves. I can assure you that when this is over, when we finally dispose of our bill, we will go back to doing whatever we have to do in our subcommittee with the same spirit of confidence in each other, with a great and true friendship, and that our work will continue in that vein.

If we do have a movement here of some kind, and I do not know where it is going to come from and I do not care where it comes from, to restore to this bill an amount of money that can be reasonably justified, I am going to vote for it because I feel on my own behalf, and I am speaking for no one else, that when the Post Office Department came before this subcommittee they fully, completely, and absolutely justified every cent of money that they requested. I believe it probably is true that a careful scanning of these requests—although I think we gave it that—might divulge here and there a few dollars that we will not have to restore in a supplemental appropriation bill at about this time in 1958. However that may be, I am not going to go into figures. We have heard plenty of figures today. We have heard all the figures that are necessary. We have heard all of the reasons for those figures. We have heard all of the reasons why these figures should be higher and also why they should be sustained. But, I am going to devote a few of the remaining minutes of the time I am taking to say that we are never going to satisfy fully the requirements of the Post Office Department insofar as their needs and their funds are concerned. We will have to do it by principles. By doing it by principles, we will have to charge the people who use the services of the Post Office Department at least what it costs to operate that Department.

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

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask the distinguished member of the subcommittee if a cut applied to the Post Office Department appropriation at this time, in view of the fact that they have a certain deficit coming, is not a false type of economy because they will be back here for a supplemental appropriation. They will have to extend the services. This is not analogous to a cut, let us say, in the armed services appropriation where there would be a limitation on their spending. This would not be a limitation on the spending of the Department, would it?

Mr. JAMES. I undertook to say that very thing a little while ago. Perhaps I did not express it clearly.

Mr. CORBETT. I am sorry I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. Let me put it this way. Whatever amount is cut now will be restored about this time next year in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. CORBETT. In other words, if we were to make this cut stick, we would just be increasing the deficit rather than decreasing the cost.

Mr. JAMES. Deficit would not be the word, of course, because the Post Office Department does not operate on a balanced budget. What you are referring to as a deficit is that sum of some \$651 million of real deficit which comes, of course, through the services the Post Office Department renders to other parts of the Government.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. We in the end, of course, will have to pay the bill. We cannot have payless paydays. Everybody knows that. So the money must be provided and it will be provided without a question of a doubt.

Mr. Chairman, to come back to what I wanted to say. I do not know that it should be said here again today and yet, I think, it cannot be repeated too often. We have to in common conscience and in commonsense make rates for the postal service commensurate with the cost of the postal services. Unless a bill is brought in to do that very thing by the legislative committee, we can look forward certainly in another year to higher expenditures and greater requests for funds, budget cuts, and other supplemental bills. But, if we can put the Post Office Department in a position where it collects for its services in the sale of stamps and other documents and services that the Post Office Department renders; if we can do that, then we will avoid in the future any question of whether or not the Post Office Department has justified its position. They have justified their position with respect to their request this time, in the minds of some of us, to the fullest extent, and in the minds of others they have not. We can avoid all that by seeing to it that the Post Office Department increases the cost of postal rates. If there is a movement to restore a portion of what has been cut by the committee, I shall vote for it. If there is not such a motion and the bill is passed with the cut, I shall not lay the blame or make fault against any person or persons. I shall not weep. I shall not even say, "I told you so."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there is little I can add in behalf of this bill after the explanations which have been given by our distinguished chairman, VAUGHN GARY, and the distinguished ranking minority member, GORDON CANFIELD. However, I would like to express my own complete confidence in the economy-mindedness of the heads of the two Departments affected—the Treasury and Post Office.

Treasury Secretary George Humphrey and Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield are among the most competent and conscientious Cabinet members this country has ever had. Their objectives are completely sincere as they seek to give our people the best service possible for the least amount of money. They certainly are not men who would attempt to pad their budget requests. We can rest assured that they have already cut their requests as low as they think the requests can safely be cut without impairing the services of their Departments.

Let us not forget that theirs are Departments of service to our people. Service is their entire function. No one can dispute that the cost of such functions has increased greatly, as has the cost of similar services throughout the country. Any material reductions made in this

bill will necessitate supplemental appropriations before the fiscal year is ended.

If we expect the Post Office Department to continue the service it is giving the people, to make rural route extensions, which are going to be necessary in these growing communities and outlying areas, we must appropriate the money for them. Otherwise we are going to be hearing from the people. They are used to having the service and they will expect it to continue.

There might be just a little politics involved here. Sometimes we go out and attempt to cut an appropriation bill and if we cut it a few million dollars it will make headlines across the country. Of course it will be welcomed by the people. We have cut expenditures. We are economy-minded. If people would only realize that there is no real economy being effected by the cut, because it simply will be restored in a supplemental appropriation bill later on, that we are only kidding them, then I gather there would not be as much political gain by the headlines. Before the fiscal year is ended we have restored the cut, and probably more.

I therefore think it would be wise for us to consider seriously the budget requests when we vote on this bill rather than to try to kid the people and make them think we are easing the tax load for them but at the same time carrying on the services they have a right to expect.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, coming from one of the greatest agricultural States of our Nation, and one that depends a great deal on corn in its farm economy, I would like to address a few remarks to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in an effort to impress on them the vital necessity of immediate action on the corn base acreage problem. In many areas of our Nation corn planting will begin within a few weeks. Furthermore, the deadline for participation in the acreage reserve program for corn in 1957 is April 15.

I am sure that the Members of the House are familiar with the Agricultural Act of 1956 dealing with corn and the corn farmers' participation in the soil bank. I am sure that you are aware that 61.5 percent of the farmers voting in the referendum held on December 11, 1956, said that they favored the farm base acreage approach rather than to return to the corn acreage allotment program. I think it was unfortunate that the Congress required a two-thirds vote in this referendum. A clear majority—59.5 percent—of the corn farmers voting in Iowa favored the base acreage approach, and in my district 65.6 percent favored the base acreage approach.

Under the provision of law as it now stands farmers in the commercial corn area will not comply with the 37.3 million acre allotment, and I think we will see roughly 58 million acres of corn planted in the commercial area in 1957. This

simply means a continuation of a surplus position in corn, with consequent adverse effects on livestock production and prices, and this will have an effect on the whole economy of the Nation.

It is contended by some that giving corn growers a corn base acreage of 51 million acres, for purposes of participating in the soil bank and price support, is unfair in relation to cotton and wheat farmers.

There does not seem to be much disagreement that: (a) the acreage taken out of wheat and cotton has mainly gone into feed grains, (b) as a result, feed grains produced on these diverted acres have been substituted for corn and (c) this has resulted in the feed grain surplus appearing in the corn carryover which (d) has caused the decline in corn acreage allotments.

Farmers in the commercial corn area as determined for 1957 have continued to plant approximately 58 million acres, even though allotments have decreased in the past few years, until now the allotment is 37.3 million acres.

Without a change in this situation, most commercial area corn farmers will not participate in the soil-bank program and thereby will not contribute to bringing supplies into line with demand. As a short run proposition, farmers can make more money growing corn for livestock. They cannot afford to cut 37 percent from their normal corn planting to get down to their corn allotment in order to begin to participate in the soil bank. On the average a corn farmer with 50 acres of corn would be required to cut to approximately 32 acres and then be paid an average of \$43 per acre for each acre he cut below the 32 figure.

Surplus feed grain, estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture at 800 million bushels, was grown on acreage diverted in 1954 and 1955, most of which was taken out of wheat and cotton for which cotton and wheat farmers received price supports. Both directly and indirectly Government price supports have subsidized the production of surplus feed grain. Surplus feed grain has resulted in surplus livestock which has weakened livestock prices. Therefore, farmers everywhere are paying heavily for uneconomic price supports which are causing shifts into livestock production.

Corn farmers do not have a minimum national corn allotment or base similar to the minimum for wheat and cotton. If the allotments for wheat and cotton were to be determined on the basis of what is needed to keep supplies in line with demand, as is done in the case of corn, the national cotton allotment would be 3.9 million acres instead of 17.6 million acres; the national wheat allotment would be 12.4 million acres instead of 55 million acres.

From the foregoing, it is logical to assume that if cotton and wheat are to be treated the same as corn, if corn is given a minimum base of 51 million acres with the requirement that an acreage of cropland equal to 15 percent of the farmer's allotment must be taken out of

cropland and put into the soil bank, you would have the following equation:

	Corn	Wheat	Cotton
(a) Present acreage needed to keep supplies in balance with demand (millions of acres) ¹	37.3	12.4	3.9
(b) Percent increase to bring corn to 51 million acres and wheat and cotton to a comparable basis.....	36.8	36.8	36.8
(c) Acres increase on a comparable basis (millions of acres).....	13.7	4.5	1.4
(d) Farmers would begin to earn soil bank acreage reserve payments when they cut below the following acreage (millions of acres) (a) — (c) if corn, wheat and cotton were on same basis.....	51.0	16.9	5.3
(e) Minimum allotment for 1957.....	0	55.0	17.6
(f) Advantage of wheat and cotton over corn on the basis of each commodity keeping supply in line with demand (millions of acres).....		38.1	12.3

¹ Supply and demand formula in present acreage allotment and marketing quota laws. See AAA 1938 and amendments in other acts down through the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, statement Jan. 29, 1957, before the Senate Agriculture Committee.

This clearly shows that wheat and cotton farmers would not be treated unfairly if the proposed 51-million-acre soil-bank base is used. In addition to the advantage minimum allotments give cotton and wheat those farmers are not required to contribute to the soil bank such as is required of corn farmers.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] has introduced a bill that could very well be adopted at this time that I think might hold the solution to this very real problem that exists in the farm economy.

I have been waiting patiently for the Democratic-controlled House Agriculture Committee to come out with some kind of a proposal that would be acceptable to corn farmers. If I understand the situation in the House Agriculture Committee, currently there is little likelihood that constructive legislation can be worked out before corn-planting time. This, I think, is very regrettable and I would plead with my colleagues in the House Agriculture Committee to come forward with a simple proposal such as provided in H. R. 4589 or H. R. 4555—the Harrison bill introduced February 7, 1957. The two Senators from Iowa—Senator HICKENLOOPER and Senator MARTIN—have joined in a similar bill, S. 1125.

These compromise bills simply provide that each corn farmer in 1957 will have the same choice as he had in the referendum that was held on December 11, 1956. Why not let the farmers vote with their corn planters? Let us not forget that 61.5 percent of those voting last fall voted for the base-acreage approach. If those voting for the continuation of acreage allotments at 37.3 million acres want to choose this program—well and good—but how in good conscience can the Congress refuse to give the farmers of the commercial corn area this clear choice.

Individual farmers already have both their base-acreage and allotment figures which would be applicable under this proposal. There would be little administrative work to be done by the Department of Agriculture or the local ASC offices. Therefore, immediate consideration and passage of a temporary corn program for 1957 is urgently needed and I, for one, will find it difficult to explain to the corn farmers in my district why the Congress was reluctant to pass this very badly needed legislation, other than to simply observe what the thinking farmer knows too well—he is being used as a pawn politically. In my mind, it is high time to quit playing politics with the farmers and farm economy. Time is running out. If we honestly want to do something for the farm economy, let us get at it now.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I only joined this subcommittee this present year, I have not sought to take part in the general debate on the bill here today. I rise only for the purpose of publicly expressing the high esteem and appreciation I have developed for my colleagues on that subcommittee and for the fine, conscientious job that I know they have done in bringing this bill here today.

I also want to take this occasion to say that I have followed this bill and the leadership of my colleagues on the committee as closely as I know how and that I am here today supporting the bill as it was reported by the committee. I have full confidence in its soundness and I hope the House will see fit to sustain the committee in the work it has done.

I yield to no one in the House in my devotion to giving the American people a good postal service. If I honestly felt this bill as it now stands would do any harm or violence or result in any unnecessary curtailments in the services that are provided for, I would not take the position I am now taking.

I believe it is a sound bill, I think it will give the people the service they want and I hope the House will support the committee in what it has done.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department has wisely set up its budget on the basis of anticipated services for an increasing population.

There is an apparent provision to take care of salaries and fixed obligations with no intent to detract from employee benefits.

The Post Office Department unavoidably operates in the red because of postage rates insufficient to sustain its regular routine services.

In the light of the usual demand for annual deficiency appropriations the proposed cut of 58 million from its request seems futile.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, namely:

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. METCALF] having assumed the chair, Mr. FLYNT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] what he has in mind for the program regarding the pending bill.

Mr. GARY. I will state to the gentleman that it is my understanding that we will take it up first thing tomorrow morning and continue on with it until it is completed.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

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. POWELL (at the request of Mr. BOYLE) for one-half hour on Wednesday, February 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HEMPHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GRANAHA in two instances and to include a letter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. GARY) and to include a statement and a newspaper article.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. BOYLE) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.), the House adjourned

until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 1957, 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:

503. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on an overobligation of allotment under "Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia," relating to funds allotted to the regional commissioner, region 4, Atlanta, Ga., pursuant to title 31, United States Code, section 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

504. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a Regular component of an Armed Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the quarterly report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

507. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensai"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

508. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 16, 1957, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on John Day River, Oreg., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted November 22, 1937, and February 10, 1938, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

509. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

512. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 293. A bill to authorize settlement for certain inequitable losses in pay sustained by officers of the commissioned services under the emergency economy legislation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1544. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 52. A bill to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 259. A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2781. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval installations and defense production plants in such area," approved October 11, 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3025. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the city of New York certain rights of access in and to Marshall, John and Little Streets adjacent to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANKFORD: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4285. A bill to authorize the sale of degaussing equipment by the Department of the Navy to the owners or operators of privately owned merchant ships of United States registry; with amendments (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2460. A bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; with amendments (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2797. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to furnish stevedoring and terminal services and facilities to commercial steamship companies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1315. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; with an amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1316. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1324. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.; without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1325. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha K. Martensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1375. A bill for the relief of Otto B. Haufler; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1390. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1419. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1431. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Bingham; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1441. A bill for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley and husband, Jack Conley; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute; with an amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1536. A bill for the relief of Allison B. Clements; with amendments (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1575. A bill for the relief of Col. Adolph B. Miller; with an amendment

(Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond; with an amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn H. Wallace; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1689. A bill for the relief of George S. Rldner; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1693. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Albi; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Sansone; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Gentile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shiro, and Samuel Stackman; with amendments (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1772. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; amendments (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1831. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lidie Kammauf; with an amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Jack Carpenter; with an amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2046. A bill for the relief of August J. Strigga; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2116. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2269. A bill for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Irmgard S. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; amendments (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2654. A bill for the relief of the Martin Wunderlich Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of June Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Knox Corporation of Thomson, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2963. A bill for the relief of Edwin L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3283. A bill for the relief of William Badinelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3288. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schlegel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3440. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3468. A bill for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3687. A bill for the relief of Paul Levitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3921. A bill for the relief of Helmuth S. Heyl; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4159. A bill for the relief of Z. A. Hardee; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4230. A bill for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Birmingham, Ala.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie B. Prescott; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Ralph Landolf; with an amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2753. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Franz Krudewig; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). 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. ABBITT:

H. R. 5002. A bill relating to marketing quotas and price supports for Virginia fire-cured and sun-cured tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5003. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in Italy and other oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5004. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5005. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5006. A bill to direct the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the production of concentrated iron ore and steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 5007. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities

in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa:

H. R. 5008. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to raise the limitation on the total amount of voluntary contributions for additional annuities which members and employees may make; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5009. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide for furnishing the Coast Guard Academy and the United States Merchant Marine Academy with surplus dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5010. A bill to amend section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5011. A bill to grant a pension of \$100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5012. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Texas among the States which may obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5013. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, to provide that the Federal Government shall improve or participate in the improvement of certain navigable waters affecting drought areas if the benefits exceed 80 percent of the estimated cost; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 5014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain automobiles furnished without charge to schools for use in driver-training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 5015. A bill to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5016. A bill to provide for the establishment of rates of compensation for positions in the Federal Government in appropriate relationship to local prevailing rates for similar positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is permanently disabled, and an additional exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5018. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5019. A bill to raise the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5020. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5021. A bill to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the public employment service for the District of Co-

lumbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5022. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to permit an individual with 40 years' service to retire regardless of his age, and to increase certain annuities by providing a new alternative base for computing monthly compensation in the case of service before 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5023. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5024. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,500 the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5025. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5026. A bill to provide for the issuance of not more than 25,000 special non-quota immigrant visas annually to certain persons who escape from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be urgently needed in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIMTZ:

H. R. 5027. A bill to provide overtime pay for service of postal employees on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5028. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing only food, clothing, medicines, or drugs sent by mail for relief purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 5029. A bill to establish an effective student-exchange program with Latin American countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5030. A bill to increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commission of Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 5031. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5032. A bill to allow civil actions on certain claims arising out of injury to, or loss of, property caused by shock waves emanating from aircraft flying at a rate of speed equal to, or greater than, the speed of sound, to be brought in district courts of the United States and certain other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5033. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River

at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5034. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to authorize agreements with State banking authorities for the elimination of duplicate examinations of banks which are insured under such act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 5035. A bill to amend Public Law 598, 81st Congress, to provide for a further extension of patents under that act for certain veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 5036. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Klamath County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 5037. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide that the Boards for the Correction of Military or Naval Records shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5038. A bill to amend the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law No. 280, 83d Cong.), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with any State or political subdivision to share in the cost of criminal law enforcement within Indian country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5039. A bill to amend section 2 (a) of the Federal Airport Act, so as to provide that periodic application of surface treatments to airport pavements to avoid ultimate reconstruction shall be deemed to constitute repairing of the airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to broaden its coverage to include all natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5041. A bill to prohibit insurance companies doing insurance business of an interstate character from issuing group health, hospitalization, and accident insurance which may be canceled after a period of 18 months for any reason other than nonpayment of premium; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 5042. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5043. A bill to establish a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice, and to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5044. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to increase the penalty for transmitting false distress signals by radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5046. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry in the waters adjacent to New York City by prohibiting the dumping of certain materials in such waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5047. A bill to aid navigation and protect the fishing industry by prohibiting the

dumping of certain materials in the coastal navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5048. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the frigate *Constellation* and to provide for her rehabilitation, berthing, and restoration within the area of Fort McHenry National Monument and historic shrine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5049. A bill to amend titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to further assist the States in extending aid for medical care to persons eligible for public assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5050. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5051. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5052. A bill to increase the annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5053. A bill to repeal the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954, to require certain distribution and approval of new public building projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5054. A bill to establish a pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5055. A bill to authorize the flood-control project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. R. 5056. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 20, 1957, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday of February of each year as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 169. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 168; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to limit expenditures for fiscal year 1958; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: Senate Concurrent Resolution F of the 35th Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, memorializing the Government of the United States not to recognize the Kadar regime as the present Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Montana seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to viewing with alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States relating to the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:
H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5059. A bill for the relief of Katherine S. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:
H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Landow and Irina Landow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:
H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:
H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Ruppard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:
H. R. 5063. A bill for the relief of Ching-Hsien Chiang and his wife, Chun-I Chiang (nee Wang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:
H. R. 5064. A bill for the relief of Oel Swan Nio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5065. A bill for the relief of Raimundo Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5066. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosario Cecere Santolanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:
H. R. 5067. A bill for the relief of Angelos Karydis and his wife, Maria Karydis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5068. A bill for the relief of Claudette Yulin Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of Mary B. B. Sherwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Maria M. Haderecker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Elenora Polifione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Johan Karel Christoph Schlichter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Costa Monroe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Col. Fred E. Dueker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Masako Myakoshi Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5076. A bill for the relief of Dr. Milorad V. Dordevich and his minor son, Dusan Dordevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Antonio Hernandez-Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Stepan Amravan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Crociffa Sparacello Beltempo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Maria Domenica D'Angelo Padovani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5081. A bill for the relief of Capt. Thomas C. Curtis and Capt. George L. Lane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Maria Alma Dizon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of George Kuosing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 5086. A bill for the relief of Azzam Issac Rafidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eloisa Rodriguez de Monterrosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5088. A bill for the relief of David Mark Sterling and Judith Kobudeh Sterling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5089. A bill to authorize the award, posthumously, of Congressional Medals of Honor to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Pashupati Adhikary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt W. Gutowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Tomas Enciso Dy Liacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Joseph Diana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Julia Mateo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annamaria Eibl Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Vasilios Kavalieratos; 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:

87. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of the New Rockford, N. Dak., Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February of each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

88. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Ottumwa Aerie No. 114, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging that the first Sunday in February of each year be set aside as Chaplains' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

89. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in respect to the setting aside of the first Sunday of February each year as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of David H. Johnson, Draper, Utah, stating a grievance relating to case No. 3651, *State of Utah v. David H. Johnson, defendant*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Regina E. Kane, Washington, D. C., transmitting material in support of a Federal lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Divided Policy in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 19, 1957

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the President has repeatedly warned against the constant increase of the elements

of a depression. Secretary Humphrey warns that unless we stop inflation we shall have a depression "that will curl your hair." I believe he is right. The President is right.

On the other hand, what do we find? The Bureau of Engraving is about to install a new currency printing press that is, so it is said, capable of turning out currency twice as fast as the old press. Apparently the Bureau of Engraving is looking ahead and preparing for the future.

More bills will have to be printed if we can come anywhere near keeping up with the appropriations intended for foreign countries. The only thing that has stopped a further rise in inflation is that the old press couldn't turn out the bills fast enough. Now, with the advent of this new press the way is cleared for the foundation of one of those depressions that, as Humphrey says, "will curl your hair." How you can stop inflation by turning out bills faster is a mystery I cannot solve.