United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, grappling with problems which confound us in a world which could be so fair, but which by human folly has been made so ugly, we ask that Thou wilt forgive our foolish ways, and that where we have erred in our judgments, Thou wilt reclothe us in our rightful mind. May the coolness of Thy balm breathe through the heats of our desires.

Drop Thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace, who says, "My peace I give unto you." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 21, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, August 22, 1957, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 993. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land by the United States to the Cape Flattery School District in the State of Washington;

H. R. 1259. An act to clear the title to certain Indian land;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of John J. Fedor;

H. R. 1365. An act for the relief of Elmer L. Henderson;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of Sylvia Ottila Tenyi;

H. R. 1595. An act for the relief of Vanja Stipcic;

H. R. 1636. An act for the relief of George D. LaMont;

H. R. 1826. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the United States in Wyoming to Bud E. Burnaugh;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of Dezrin Boswell (also known as Dezrin Boswell Johnson);

H. R. 1953. An act to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases;

H. R. 2224. An act providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of the estate of William V. Stepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3025. An act 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;

H. R. 3184. An act for the relief of Gordon Broderick;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace C. Hill;

H. R. 3818. An act to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States;

H. R. 3819. An act to amend section 331 of title 28, United States Code, to provide representation of district judges on the Judicial Conference of the United States;

H. R. 4098. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California a portion of the property known as Veterans' Administration Center Reservation, Los Angeles, Calif., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 4230. An act for the relief of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.;

H. R. 4344. An act for the relief of Malone Hsia;

H. R. 4447. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company, of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5288. An act for the relief of Orville G. Everett and Mrs. Agnes H. Everett;

H. R. 5894. An act to amend the laws relating to the endorsement of masters on vessel documents and to provide certain additional penalties for failure to exhibit vessel documents or other papers when required by enforcement officers;

H. R. 5924. An act relating to the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter;

H. R. 6080. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States in Gulfport, Miss., to the Gulfport Municipal Separate School District;

H. R. 6709. An act to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7051. An act to stimulate industrial development near Indian reservations;

H. R. 7914. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide incentive pay for human subjects;

H. R. 8076. An act to provide for the termination of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board established to review certain determinations and actions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in connection with education and training for World War II veterans;

H. R. 8531. An act to provide interim system for appointment of cadets to the United States Air Force Academy for an additional period of 4 years;

H. R. 8705. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the St. Lawrence Seaway celebration, to be held at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8821. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to facilitate the provision of social security coverage for State and local employees under certain retirement systems.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 807) for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind., with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1944) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to make inapplicable, in the case of the survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces, the provisions which presently prevent the payment of benefits to aliens who are outside the United States.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2842. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of certain tanning extracts;

H. R. 8753. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include California, Connecticut, and Rhode Island among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage;

H. R. 8755. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social security coverage under its agreement separately for those of its employees who are covered by a retirement system and who desire such coverage; and

H. R. 8892. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social-security purposes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7900. An act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to individuals land in Ottawa County, Mich., which was acquired pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; and

H. R. 9379. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7900. An act to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to individuals land in Ottawa County, Mich., which was acquired pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 9379. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SMATHERS, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, under the rule, there is the usual morning hour today. On yesterday an order was entered that during the transaction of routine business in the morning hour, statements by Senators be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVERALLOTMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on overallotment of appropriations within the Department of Defense (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS, CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, relative to a preliminary examination and survey report on the feasibility of channel control dams on the lower Rio Grande River (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on its operation under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period March 31, through June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF A U. S. S. "ARIZONA" MEMORIAL AT PEARL HARBOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of George Washington Williams, of Baltimore, Md., relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Carolyn Jones, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the proposed civil-rights legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF BETHEL AIR BASE, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the citizens of Minnesota have a great interest and concern in the earliest possible development of the Bethel Air Base for military operations.

On August 9, 1957, the city council of Minneapolis adopted a resolution urging early completion of this project. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING OF BETHEL AIR BASE WITHOUT DELAY

Whereas the City Council of the City of Minneapolis has on a number of occasions urged Federal and State authorities to take all steps necessary to remove military operations from the commercial Wold-Chamberlain Airport; and

Whereas the hazards and specific incidents connected with military flying at Wold-Chamberlain have amply demonstrated the justification of the city council's position; and

Whereas the Minnesota State Legislature in its 1957 session provided for financing the acquisition of lands suitable for a military airport in the vicinity of the Twin City area; and

Whereas the expense of such land acquisition is a relatively small part of the total governmental expenditure required for the development of this military facility; and

Whereas the major consideration of the Bethel Airport project is its earliest possible completion so as to remove conflicts and improve safety in both military and civilian air traffic around the Twin Cities; and

Whereas controversy over the matter of financing acquisition may be used to delay the completion of this most important military airport project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis:

1. That we reaffirm our position that military flying should be completely separated from commercial flying at Wold-Chamberlain Airport.

2. That the relatively small portion of the total financing required for land acquisition should not be allowed to develop to a controversy endangering the main objective of separating military and civilian airport operations.

3. That the city council urge Congress of the United States and Federal agencies involved in the Bethel project to take all steps necessary for the earliest possible completion of the project without unnecessary controversy.

4. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota and to the Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Passed August 9, 1957.

GEO. W. MARTENS,
President of the Council.

Not approved by the mayor.

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

REVISION OF FEDERAL FIREARMS REGULATIONS—RESOLUTIONS

My HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 18, 1957, the Minnesota Conservation Federation at its fifth annual State assembly at Minneapolis, Minn., adopted resolutions opposing the proposed revision of the Federal Firearms Regulations.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA CONSERVATION FEDERATION,
Hopkins, Minn., August 19, 1957.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am instructed to transmit to you the following resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Conservation Federation at its fifth annual State assembly at Minneapolis, Minn., on August 18, 1957, referring to the Internal Revenue Code:

We oppose section 177.50, Identification of Firearms, because:

(a) It will add expense to the manufacture of firearms, which expense will be passed on to the consumer;

(b) It will raise questions as to the status of the thousands of sporting weapons now on dealers' shelves and in private hands and which carry no such serial number as that proposed; and

(c) Its imposition, where collectors' guns are concerned, designed for import into this country, stamping of serial numbers, as proposed, will materially reduce their market and historical value.

We oppose section 177.51, Firearms Records, because:

(a) It will impose a hardship on many dealers; and

(b) It will create for them a tremendous record-storage problem.

We oppose section 177.52, Ammunition Records, because:

(a) It imposes another intolerable burden upon dealers in that it requires them to keep and maintain voluminous records; and

(b) It accomplishes no useful purpose in crime prevention or deterrence.

We oppose section 177.54, Over the Counter Sales to Individuals, because it violates what appears to have been the will of Congress in the Federal Firearms Act of 1938, since Congress did not and probably could not legally have written into the act such a provision in view of the constitutional guaranties of individual liberty and State sovereignty.

We oppose section 177.55, Authority to Examine Records, because:

(a) It is arbitrary and capricious and could be used to deny constitutional guaranties against unreasonable search; and

(b) Search seems neither reasonable nor necessary to carry out a law requiring only importation, shipment and disposal records to be kept.

The Director of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service has also been notified of this action.

Sincerely yours,

AGNES L. NELSON, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, protesting against the enactment of legislation to prohibit nonlawyer practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there have been introduced in Congress H. R. 3350, H. R. 3349, H. R. 7006, and S. 932 which were prepared by the special committee on legal services and procedure of the American Bar Association, and which would practically prohibit any nonlawyer practitioner now licensed by the Interstate Commerce Commission from representing any party to a hearing before such agency; and

Whereas the utility section of the American Bar Association, composed of attorneys who practice before administrative bodies and who appreciate the value of nonlawyer practitioners in practice before such bodies, have opposed legislation of this type; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission is also opposed to this legislation because it recognizes the value of the technical knowledge possessed by the nonlawyers in assisting them in arriving at a proper solution to matters under consideration; and

Whereas eminent attorneys experienced and skilled in procedure before the Interstate Commerce Commission also are opposed to this type of legislation; and

Whereas it has been the experience of this Commission that nonlawyer practitioners experienced and skilled in matters coming before us, have assisted this Commission immeasurably in bringing facts to our attention and can and usually do represent the people as ably as most attorneys, if not more so, in the technical aspects of certain types of cases; and

Whereas the passage of this legislation would require the sending of an attorney, along with our director of traffic in all cases participated in by this Commission, even though it usually is not necessary, particularly in matters being considered by the Interstate Commerce Commission, said director of traffic being now admitted to practice by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas this would lead to greater expense and inconvenience and be wholly unnecessary and inadvisable: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Commission go on record as being opposed to all legislation of this type, and that we urge our Senators and Congressmen to not only oppose the passage of this legislation but aggressively work for its defeat.

Dated at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 12th day of August 1957.

By the Commission:

ELMER OLSON, *Secretary.*

REDUCTION OF VETERANS' COMPENSATION ROLLS—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the Honorable Ralph H. Stone, Chief of Benefits Division, the Veterans' Administration, relating to the reduction in veterans' compensation rolls.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 16, 1957.

Hon. RALPH H. STONE,
Chief of Benefits Division,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STONE: This is in reference to the resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans of Ohio, alleging, among other things, that due to new rating regulations, more than 40,000 service-connected veterans have either been taken off the compensation rolls entirely or have been drastically reduced.

I am very gravely concerned over this matter and consider it of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of all my colleagues, so I introduced it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, and suggest that you see page 14819.

Now in line with what seems to be the Veterans' Administration's new policy of elimination and reduction, I have just received a report from your Wichita office on the case of Mr. Robert R. Morford, C–803393, of Topeka, Kans., copy of which I am enclosing. As you will see from this report, this veteran since 1941 has had a condition of deafness, held to be service connected. In February of 1953, he was deemed to be 40 percent disabled and awarded compensation at the rate of $66 per month. Yet in October of 1956, it was determined he was only 20 percent disabled and his compensation reduced to $33 per month.

It may be that new miracle drugs have caused this miraculous partial recovery. I should be very grateful if you will cause a further review to be made of this case and advise me just what did cause this change in rating.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 9379. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1080).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627; 48 U. S. C. 486, and the following) to clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to convey federally owned land utilized in the furnishing of public works (Rept. No. 1084);

S. 2603. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1896 (Rept. No. 1089);

S. 2676. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of a water route from Albany, N. Y., into Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt., with ultimate connection with the St. Lawrence River (Rept. No. 1085);

H. R. 2580. An act to increase the storage capacity of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir and to make available 50,000 acre-feet of water from the reservoir for domestic and industrial use (Rept. No. 1087); and

H. R. 6363. An act to amend the act of May 24, 1928, providing for a bridge across Bear Creek at or near Lovel Point, Baltimore County, Md., to provide for the construction of another bridge, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1088).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 1587. A bill authorizing the construction of protective measures in the city of New Bedford and the town of Fairhaven, Mass., to afford hurricane tidal flood protection for New Bedford, Fairhaven, and Acushnet, Mass. (Rept. No. 1081); and

S. 2531. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes (Rept. No. 1083).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1726. A bill authorizing certain construction for the protection of the Narragansett Bay area against hurricane tidal flooding (Rept. No. 1082); and

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to provide for the relocation of the Ferry County, State of Washington, highway by the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 1086).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 4609. An act to further amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes", approved September 5, 1950, as amended (Rept. No. 1108).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 628. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located at Boston Neck, Narragansett, Washington County, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island (Rept. No. 1109).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 230. An act to require the Secretary of the Army to convey to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain portions of a tract of land heretofore conditionally conveyed to such county (Rept. No. 1107); and

H. R. 1214. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict (Rept. No. 1106).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia; with an amendment:

S. 1040. A bill to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (Rept. No. 1110).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 3468. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co. (Rept. No. 1090).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1224. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Massachusetts (Rept. No. 1091);

S. 2832. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio and one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio (Rept. No. 1092);

H. R. 110. An act to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code (Rept. No. 1094);

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Thomas P. Quigley (Rept. No. 1095);

H. R. 2136. An act to amend section 124 (c) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to transfer Shelby County from the Beaumont to the Tyler division of the eastern district of Texas (Rept. No. 1096);

H. R. 4992. An act for the relief of Michael D. Ovens (Rept. No. 1097);

H. R. 5811. An act to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, when granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1098);

H. R. 6868. An act for the relief of the estate of Agnes Moulton Cannon and for the relief of Clifton L. Cannon, Sr. (Rept. No. 1099); and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by H. Res. 104, 85th Congress (Rept. No. 1093).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of the Knox Corp. of Thomson, Ga. (Rept. No. 1100).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 5061. An act for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft (Rept. No. 1104);

H. R. 5810. An act to provide reimbursement to the tribal council of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation in accordance with the act of September 3, 1954 (Rept. No. 1105);

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln (Rept. No. 1102); and

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution designating the week of November 22–28, 1957, as National Farm-City Week (Rept. No. 1103).

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 7654. An act for the relief of Richard M. Taylor and Lydia Taylor (Rept. No. 1101).

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HENNINGS), from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 215. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain public hearings; without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 2835. A bill to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and first assistant physician of the hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2837. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of Indian tribes, bands, and groups, and individual Indians in Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2838. A bill for the relief of Tamae Koonce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 2839. A bill for the relief of Felipe Uriondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 2840. A bill to create a new and separate judicial district in California and to create a new division for the northern district in said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the indictment this week in New York City of 7 teen-agers for first degree murder in the fatal stabbing of a crippled boy and the indictment of 7 others for first degree manslaughter starkly emphasize the importance of making an all-out national attack on juvenile delinquency and youth crime. It is symptomatic of what is going on in other cities.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the report on this subject contained in the August 19 issue of Newsweek, detailing the situation in other cities.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE YOUNG KILL: PROWLING THE JUVENILE JUNGLES OF THE BIG CITIES

The man considered the greatest judicial authority on delinquent children in Massachusetts is Judge John J. Connelly of the Boston juvenile court. Judge Connelly said last week:

"If we could get the same public cooperation that the Salk vaccine got, we'd lick the problem. At the time that the vaccine was introduced, we had 7,000 cases of polio in the country, but we had 700,000 cases of juvenile delinquency."

In 1940, Judge Connelly's court handled 450 cases; in 1956, 1,030 (including 407 girls, whose chief offenses were stealing cosmetics, tight sweaters, and toreador pants from local stores). "Juvenile delinquency is growing four times faster than the juvenile population," Connelly said grimly.

In Seattle, which prides itself on its handling of delinquency, crimes involving juveniles have nevertheless quadrupled since 1939.

In Detroit, police reported that in the first 6 months of this year, juveniles committed 6 killings, compared with 3 in the same period in 1956; 50 rapes compared with 33; 247 robberies compared with 186.

In Los Angeles, 4,174 youths were arrested in 1941; in 1946 there were 8,051; in the past year there were 14,392.

Though the FBI reports that juvenile crime is on an alarming upswing in rural areas (due largely to the automobile), the problem is at its worst, and most uncontrollable, in cities of more than 100,000. Here occur most of the serious crimes of murder, rape, robbery, theft, and vandalism—and for them, the sociologists blame what they term another major flaw in American society today: The breakdown of authority.

"The parents, the community, the courts, the police, the moral standards of mankind itself, fail to give these children the thing they need most," said one noted sociologist, "and that is guidance. There is no authority to tell them what to do, to show them. In their world, no one is minding the store. There isn't enough tax money in the world to pay professional social workers to supply this guidance. The parents don't supply it. It's a miracle the problem isn't 10 times worse than it is."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the problem is national in scope. Earlier this summer, for example, a teen gang in Chicago brutally beat to death an honor student who had just won a college scholarship. The vicious senselessness of this is highlighted by the fact that the group did not even know the victim.

Mr. President, this is a subject with which I dealt as the attorney general of the State of New York when, during my incumbency, we strengthened the New York Youth Commission and allowed the New York State courts to cope more effectively with juvenile offenders. I believe the continuing serious nature of the situation also shows the need for some Federal Government cooperation to assist the States in developing countermeasures.

Mr. President, I have said that the problem is national in scope. The latest uniform crime report issued by the FBI shows that the juvenile crime rate in 1956 soared to still another record. According to this survey, covering more than 1,500 cities of over 2,500 population, arrests of juveniles under 18 years old rose 17 percent over 1955, although in terms of total population, the juvenile-age group increased by only 3 percent.

Therefore, the rate of juvenile crime increased more than five times the relationship of the increase in juvenile population. Last year, about 46 percent of all persons arrested for major crimes—or nearly one out of every two—were under 18. Juveniles arrested on charges of criminal homicide also increased and today almost one out of every ten persons arrested for murder is under 18.

We must, in dealing with this problem, think in terms of the enormous percentage of youth—the 98 percent—who are unaffected by juvenile delinquency and yet who suffer under the cloud cast by the lawless and irresponsible among them.

I say 98 percent, Mr. President, because 47.4 million Americans, representing 34 percent of the population are under 18 years of age. It is estimated that 1 million will this year in some way come to the attention of the police.

Mr. President, I have three suggestions in this regard. First, I suggest a national awakening to the seriousness of the problem.

Second, I suggest attention to the administration bill pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], of which I have the honor to be a cosponsor, with my senior colleague [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

This bill would strengthen and improve State and local programs with Federal allotments to demonstrate and develop improved methods for the control of juvenile delinquency, train personnel therefor, and help finance State and local youth programs. I call this to the attention of the Senate at this time in the belief that we should turn our thoughts to this vitally serious problem, that hearings should be scheduled on this measure. Also major attention should be given to the work and hearings of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Judiciary Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], with participation by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and other members.

My third suggestion, Mr. President, is a concurrent resolution which I am submitting today, with the cosponsorship of my colleague the senior Senator from

New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], calling upon the President to proclaim the second week in January as National Youth Week, to mobilize the resources of the United States to fight against juvenile delinquency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in this regard, I invite attention to the terms of the concurrent resolution, which calls upon our people to have a National Youth Week so as to recognize and acknowledge the constructive achievements of the overwhelming majority of American youth as good citizens today, and to encourage them to prepare for a future of even better citizenship; second, to mobilize the spiritual and material resources of all the people of the United States in the struggle against juvenile delinquency and youth crime in individual American communities; and, third, to grant recognition to and strengthen the voluntary organizations—civic, fraternal, religious, veterans, service, and the instrumentalities of Federal, State, and local governments—which are working for the full development of the youth in the national interest.

Mr. President, speaking for myself and from my experience in New York, I favor two methods of attack, which are mainly community methods, but which can use a great deal of Federal help.

The first is the establishment of community centers, staffed with personnel trained in youth work. Indeed, the schools in our large cities need to be kept open the year around to furnish physical plants for such centers.

Second, Mr. President, on the corrective side, I favor taking the aggravated cases of delinquency out of their environment and into minimum security centers, like the CCC camps of the 1930's where the work of rehabilitation can be predominant. I am proud to say that in my home State of New York we are proceeding along that line at the present time.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say the importance of taking a broad scale, coordinated national attack on this problem cannot be overemphasized, for we are dealing with our most precious resource, our youth, the generation to whom we shall turn over the destiny of our country, indeed the destiny of the whole Free World. We will hand them a tremendous burden, Mr. President, and therefore it is our duty to do everything within our power to equip them mentally, morally, and physically to carry it through, successfully, We cannot allow them to get a bad name or to get into grave difficulties, such as are indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) to request the President to proclaim the second week in January, beginning in 1958, as "National Youth Week," submitted by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas some 47.4 millions of all Americans comprising 24 percent of the population are under 18 years of age; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of American youth lead constructive lives making their full contribution to the improvement of their communities and the security of the Nation; and

Whereas, 18 States and the District of Columbia and some 10 cities have special Commissions or other bodies dealing with problems of youth; and

Whereas, the marshaling of the national resources to deal with the problems of youth is essential in the national interest: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (The House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating the second week in January, beginning in 1958, as "National Youth Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week by—

(1) recognizing and acknowledging the constructive achievements of the overwhelming majority of American youth as good citizens today and preparing for a future of even better citizenship tomorrow;

(2) mobilizing the spiritual and material resources of all the people of the United States in the struggle against juvenile delinquency and youth crime in individual American communities; and

(3) granting recognition to and strengthening the voluntary organizations, civic, fraternal, religious, veteran and service, and the instrumentalities of the Federal, State and local governments working for the full development of youth in the national interest.

RULE TO GOVERN CORRECTIONS OF THE REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT OF SENATE DEBATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the course of the debate on July 16, 1957, on the question of changes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I stated that I would prepare and submit a resolution which would propose a Senate rule to govern corrections of the reporters' transcript of Senate debate. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who participated in that debate, agreed that there ought to be a precise standard governing the practice of editing the transcript, if one could be drafted. In preparing my resolution, therefore, I have taken account of suggestions of the Senator from Colorado, and he has agreed to cosponsor it. I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 193) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"Reporting of proceedings in the Senate in the Congressional Record

"Except as provided herein, the remarks of Senators in proceedings of the Senate shall be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as actually made. Changes in the recording of such remarks shall be permissible only to correct grammar and syntax, and to correct actual errors made in the reporting of such remarks. No changes of a substantive nature or changes concerning remarks of another Senator made in the proceedings shall be permitted."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Senators will remember that the matter arose on July 16 when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] took the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to task for adding the word fiscal to the transcript of certain remarks he had made in the Senate on July 15 concerning President Eisenhower's understanding of monetary affairs. The Senator from Indiana challenged the propriety of this addition to the transcript made by the Senator from Oklahoma on the ground that it affected the significance of the colloquy which had taken place between them.

When this matter was discussed on July 16, I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the editing, by Senators or their staffs, of the transcript made by the official reporters has been a common practice in the Senate, and that many of these changes are often very extensive and even involve substantial additions to what has in fact been said and taken down by the reporters. I said that it was hardly fair to single out the Senator from Oklahoma for adding one single adjective to the transcript of remarks he had made on the preceding day, when every day Senators add, change, or remove whole sentences in the transcript made by the official reporters.

Surprising and disturbing as this practice has seemed to me ever since I came to the Senate 2½ years ago, we know that it has been the universal custom. It is unfair and prejudicial to make an issue of it and to criticize one particular Senator for one instance of adding a single adjective, when year in and year out Senators rewrite whole sentences and paragraphs in the RECORD for the purpose of conveying their thoughts more accurately or elegantly than they actually expressed them in the heat of debate.

Mr. President, my own view is that if there is to be a rule for one there should be a rule for all. I believe it is in the interest of the integrity of Senate debate, and in the interest of historical accuracy, that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be what it purports to be—a record of congressional debates as they in fact take place. This would be the purport of the Senate rule I propose. Our official Senate reporters do a remarkable job of reporting the debates on the Senate floor, often under conditions which must be very difficult and tiring. The transcript is well edited for grammar, continuity, and syntax, by the official reporters of debates. I am quite willing to trust my grammatical reputation to the able and impartial Mr. James Murphy and the other official reporters. If occasionally a word or a phrase is actually misunderstood by a reporter or some error creeps into the transcript, my proposed rule would permit its correction. The text of the rule plainly shows that only substantive changes would be excluded.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should adopt such a rule, or else Senators should refrain from criticizing one of their colleagues when they do not happen to like some specific word which that particular colleague may have added or subtracted in the transcript.

In closing, I want to mention that, in accordance with my remarks on July 16, I wrote the Senator from Indiana on July 19, to offer him an opportunity to join the Senator from Colorado and me in introducing this proposal. I have not heard from the Senator from Indiana about this, but I ask unanimous consent that my letter to him of July 19, 1957, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 19, 1957.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: You will recall that in the debate on July 16 concerning editing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senators or their staffs, I discussed with Senator ALLOTT the need for a Senate rule which will define what changes may or may not be made.

I have now had prepared the following draft rule, which I intend to introduce in the Senate:

"Resolved, etc.—

"RULE XLI

"Reporting of proceedings in the Senate in the Congressional Record

"Except as provided herein, the remarks of Senators in proceedings of the Senate shall be recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as actually made. Changes in the recording of such remarks shall be permissible only to correct grammar and syntax, or to correct actual errors made in the reporting of such remarks. No changes of a substantive nature or which affect the remarks of other Senators made in the proceedings shall be permitted."

I have asked Senator ALLOTT to join me in introducing this proposal, and I should be very pleased if you should decide also to join as a cosponsor of it. I believe that this proposed text leaves plenty of room for the kind of corrections in grammar or in the accuracy of reporting which may be necessary for clarity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD while avoiding any changes in substance which might possibly give rise to subsequent controversy over what was said or not said in the Senate.

If you should decide to cosponsor this resolution, I hope that you will have someone on your staff call my office by Monday morning, July 22.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVISION OF BASIC COMPENSATION SCHEDULES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRODUCTION OF STATEMENTS AND REPORTS OF WITNESSES—AMENDMENT

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by Mr. O'MAHONEY, to the bill (S. 2377) to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2377) to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939, RELATING TO CREDIT FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN ESTATE TAXES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for Mr. CAPEHART) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART to the bill (H. R. 8887) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

USE OF INFORMATION MEDIUMS GUARANTY PROGRAM FUNDS IN ISRAEL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the supplemental appropriation bill which the Senate passed on August 19, provided funds for educational, scientific, and cultural purposes in Israel under the informational mediums guaranty program. The importance to the United States of these prospective expenditures in Israel is underscored in two letters to Mr. Bernard Katzen, a distinguished New York attorney who went to Israel, as the representative of the Secretary of State, to determine the best uses of this money. These letters to Mr. Katzen are signed, respectively, by our Ambassador to Israel and the United States representative to the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Tel Aviv, Israel, April 17, 1956.

Mr. BERNARD KATZEN,
Special Consultant, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KATZEN: Thank you very much for your letter of March 30. I was delighted to learn of the progress you are making in planning constructive uses of the accrued information mediums guaranty funds and hope that all will continue to go smoothly in the Washington phase of the work.

As I told you before your departure from Israel, the work on which you were engaged here I regard of the greatest importance for the furtherance of closer relations and broader understanding between the United States and Israel. At a time when so much public emphasis has been placed on political and military matters, I think it very beneficial that your mission demonstrated our great and tangible interest in the cultural and educational aspects of the national life of Israel. I am confident, furthermore, that the very remarkable, and to my knowledge wholly favorable, public response to your visit was due in no small part to the high order of negotiating skill and public relations ability you brought to the task.

Your work here has left a lasting impact, and in these difficult times has made my own burden much lighter. I wish you every success in bringing your mission to a speedy conclusion and join you in hoping that you will soon return to Israel and see for yourself some of the results of the allocated grants.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD B. LAWSON,
Ambassador.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., February 21, 1957.

BERNARD KATZEN, Esq.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KATZEN: Many thanks for your letter of February 18 enclosing a copy of your report on your mission to Israel.

I am much impressed by the creative contribution to future relations between the United States and Israel which you have made, and which this report so clearly summarizes. At this time when the news is so full of conflict, it is a pleasure to read of these brighter prospects, and I congratulate you on what you are doing. I am sure that, as you say, your experience will have value as well for our cultural relations with other foreign countries.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.

THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Jugoslav National Home, Inc., of Ely, Minn. The letter was signed by Mr. Andrew Pirtz, secretary; and he enclosed a resolution passed by this organization.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUGOSLAV NATIONAL HOME, INC.,
Ely, Minn., August 19, 1957.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Enclosed find a resolution passed by Jugoslav National Home, Inc., at our July meeting.

Yours truly,

ANDREW PIRTZ,
Secretary.

Whereas a bill known as S. 1176 has been introduced in the Senate of the 85th Congress and also in the House of Representatives which is titled, and known as the wilderness preservation bill; and

Whereas provisions in the said S. 1176, particularly in section 3, subdivision B,

would permanently and completely restrict the further development and use of our natural resources of our Nation contained within the limits of the National Wilderness Preservation System to the grave detriment of large segments of our population dependent upon development of such use, which restriction is without reference to the proper conservation practices which recognize the conservation of natural resources for continued use, benefit, and enjoyment of all the people; and

Whereas provision of the said bill S. 1176 relating to future administration of the Superior National Forest through a proposed National Wilderness Preservation Council is such that it usurps and restricts rights of citizens to effect improvements by giving such council too much power where anything the said council may propose, even if it be detrimental to public good, may be approved by Congress through default; and

Whereas present regulations governing the Superior National Forest are such that new legislation calling for further restrictions is not necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jugoslav National Home meeting in its building this 28th day of July 1957, does hereby go on record that the proposed legislation known as S. 1176 and its companion bill in the House of Representatives, be withdrawn from all consideration because such legislation is too restrictive in its application and is not consistent with good conservation practices to do benefit from our natural resources for the majority of our people.

Dated this 14th day of August 1957.

JUGOSLAV NATIONAL HOME, INC.,
JOHN MEHLE, *President*.
ANDREW PIRTZ, *Secretary*.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the administration's immigration bill this year, which was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I was very much gratified, as were others, by the vote last night of 65 to 4, by which the revised immigration bill was passed by the Senate.

While many of us who wanted to see the President's recommendations enacted into law were disappointed by the limited coverage of the bill as passed, nevertheless I feel that the bill is a worthwhile step ahead, and will help us in the development of a really just and sound immigration policy.

One omission from the bill which was passed last night was, in my judgment, particularly serious. The bill failed to alleviate the plight of the Hungarian refugees who have come to this country because of the Communist cruelties, and who have been admitted on parole. The total number is in the neighborhood of 27,000; and the uncertain status of these courageous people is a source of great concern to many of us. I realize full well there may be dangers of Communist infiltration through this route. However, the great bulk of these visitors are obviously brave Hungarians who risked their all to oppose the outrageous situation in Hungary which had been brought about by the Soviet cruelties, and who ultimately were able to break away and come to the United States, to enjoy the freedoms of our country.

I hope this omission will soon be corrected by legislative means, so the status of these people can be firmly established once and for all.

My warm congratulations go to the members of our Judiciary Committee, and especially to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], whose leadership in this cause has been outstanding.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

DECOMMISSIONING OF THE BATTLESHIP "NEW JERSEY"

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for over 14 years the citizens of New Jersey have been proud of the gallant 45,000-ton battleship which has borne the name of our State in the service of our country. Yesterday, at the Bayonne, N. J., Naval Supply Depot, this mighty ship was decommissioned, and was placed in mothballs, to stand in readiness for any future call to our defense.

The battleship *New Jersey* has served the country with distinction and great effectiveness. During the Second World War, she won nine battle stars in the Pacific theater. Following the end of the Second World War, she was decommissioned, only to be called forth to join in the support of our forces and the United Nations in the Korean war. She was the flagship in the siege of Wonsan Harbor.

Mr. President, the *New Jersey* is now temporarily at rest in her native State, standing by for whatever contingency may necessitate her reactivation. The citizens of New Jersey are proud to have her back home and are more secure in the knowledge that she will be ever ready to come to our defense, if need be.

JOHN TATSEY, OF THE GLACIER REPORTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as we come to the end of the session, I think there is time for a little humor.

Washington, D. C., undoubtedly has the largest and most varied collection of newspaper reporters in the world. The Fourth Estate is represented in the Nation's Capital by internationally known reporters and columnists, who are preoccupied with news and events of national and international importance. Many of them are known for their individual and distinctive styles and techniques.

Their news stories and features are read by millions in cities and towns, large and small; but I doubt that any are read with such avid interest as are the local news columns in the small weekly newspapers.

The news writers for the small weekly papers also have their own individual styles, and these reporters are depended upon by the community residents as the source of news about their friends and neighbors.

One of the most unique news reporters anywhere is the man who writes the Heart Butte news for the Glacier Reporter, in Browning, Mont. John Tatsey, a Blackfoot Indian service policeman, gathers interesting bits of news about his Indian friends in the community, and prepares, without a doubt, the most unusual weekly news column of its kind.

He makes light of incidents in the lives of these people, as do the syndicated columnists who touch on the incidents in the lives of Government officials and noted personages. So far as John Tatsey is concerned, his friends are of no less importance than any national celebrity.

The weekly news column from Heart Butte, on the Blackfoot Reservation, may discuss items ranging from the most recent inmates in the local jail to a man who motored to a Canadian Blackfoot settlement and returned with a bride.

For example, the following are a few excerpts from John Tatsey's column published on August 9, 1957.

Sam Horn and his wife went to Browning last week. There Sam got orders from his wife not to cross the street from Yegen Hotel. Somehow he managed to stop at the Legion Club to get a bottle opener for some pop, so there he downed 3 bottles of beer in 3 minutes. Might be a record.

Here is another one:

Joe Running Crane is having rather a hard time by not having a car. He left his car in Dupuyer to have it overhauled. He cannot walk.

Here is another:

Stoles Head Carrier has quit his job at Valier and has been home. His wife left. She was afraid of drunks, so she landed in Dupuyer where she would be safe.

The following are excerpts from John Tatsey's column published on August 16:

Styles is out this week. Just wait.

Here is another one:

John Mittens has been hanging around town since his wife got in jail. He is trying hard to get in there too.

Here is another:

Pete Day Rider has been home from the county jail in Conrad and had a party, and his wife broke even on him by putting a gash on his head.

Here is another:

Mrs. Richard Wild Gun has been missing for 2 weeks. She went to town to get some groceries. She was heard of at Starr School. One boy has not been to work from Starr School since she has been there.

Mr. President, the Washington Post may have its George Dixon; the New York Herald Tribune, its Art Buchwald; and the Washington Evening Star may have its Fletcher Knebel; but the Glacier Reporter and the Hungry Horse News have John Tatsey. He is another Will Rogers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two of John Tatsey's news columns, reprinted in the Hungry Horse News, of Columbia Falls, Mont., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia Falls (Mont.) Hungry Horse News of August 9, 1957]

HORNE DOWNS BOTTLE A MINUTE

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman, writes the Heart Butte news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper. Here is his column.)

Sam Horne and his wife went to Browning last week. There Sam got orders from his wife not to cross the street from Yegen Hotel. Somehow he managed to stop at the Legion Club to get a bottle opener for some pop, so there he downed 3 bottles of beer in 3 minutes. Might be a record.

Father Mallman has returned from New York after spending his vacation there with his aged mother.

Mr. and Mrs. John Tatsey motored to Deer Lodge last Sunday where they spent the afternoon with Abe Racine.

Thomas Many Guns was over to the Canadian Blackfeet early part of July and returned home with a bride.

Joe Running Crane is rather having a hard time by not having a car. He left his car in Dupuyer to have it overhauled. He cannot walk.

Stoles Head Carrier has quit his job at Valier and has been home. His wife left. She was afraid of drunks so she landed in Dupuyer where she would be safe.

Gerald Bauttier came home from Greenland where he was stationed. He will be home until September 1 and then go west to Spokane.

[From the Columbia Falls (Mont.) Hungry Horse News of August 16, 1957]

IN, OUT OF JAIL AT HEART BUTTE

(John Tatsey, Indiana service policeman, writes the Heart Butte news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper. Here is last week's column.)

John Mittens has been hanging around town since his wife got in jail. He is trying hard to get in there, too.

Pete Day Rider has been home from the county jail in Conrad and had a party and his wife broke even on him by putting a gash on his head.

Louie Red Head is serving a time in the county jail in Conrad. When they are in jail off the reservation they wish they were in James Walters place.

Alvin Mountain Chief was picked up for not paying an old fine and a notice was sent to Indian Police Tatsey for being a. w. o. l. and was taken by Air Force police from Great Falls last Monday. He got in a little trouble by running over a child with a car.

James H. Walters was around Heart Butte Sunday with his family.

The news the reporter gets from Heart Butte is true with a little joking mixed up with it.

Tom Williamson and Ted Spotted Eagle were in Havre last week where they attended a drivers' school. They are going to transport schoolchildren from Swims Under and Mad Plum Schools.

Stoles is out this week. Just wait.

Sunday was a very nice day at Heart Butte. Church was well attended and afternoon the boys had their regular stick game.

Mervin Brave Rock from Canada was here where his wife was confined to the hospital.

George Comes At Night pulled a stunt when he hid from his wife in town. When she left he showed up at Jack Miles Pool Hall. Tatsey was sitting in car outside. Every 10 or 15 minutes he would go across the street.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Doore were at the Tatsey place and had a picnic at Big Badger Canyon, where John cooked some steak on campfire. Maybe Joe Running Crane will try a trip like this.

Some of the boys are getting back from haying jobs. One guy lost his wife. Some white guy took off with her.

Mrs. Richard Wild Gun has been missing for 2 weeks. She went to town to get some groceries. She was heard of at Starr School. One boy has not been to work from Starr School since she has been there.

EXPOSURE OF IMPROPER PRACTICES IN THE LABOR AND MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time for approximately 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Arizona may proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the current investigation into improper practices in the relationship of labor and management has brought to light astounding acts of some corrupt leaders of labor and management that are shocking the Nation. These revelations have come as a surprise to the American people; yet this should not be the case, because diligent members of the American press have for many years been pointing out the practices of some of these unscrupulous leaders. An examination of the past articles by Westbrook Pegler, of the Hearst publications; the articles by Carl R. Baldwin, James A. Kearns, and Charles Marselak, of the St. Louis Post Dispatch; the complete, detailed stories by Clark Mollenhoff, appearing in newspapers of the Middle West; the disclosures in the Port Huron Times-Herald editorials of Louis Weil, Sr.; the daily columns by Victor Riesel; the disclosures of Edward J. Donohue in the Scranton Times, along with similar stories by J. Harold Brislin appearing in the Scrantonian and the Scranton Tribune; the complete exposé by Wallace Turner and William Lambert that led to the downfall of Beck, as published in the Oregonian; and the equally excellent articles by Ed Guthman, of the Seattle Times, show that the American public was long ago forewarned of the perversions taking place in the labor field. Today, the finger of guilt is being pointed by the McClellan committee at these discredits to labor, many of whom were described in the earlier articles written by these newspapermen.

The list I have read and shall discuss is not by any means a complete one; but I feel that it is typical of the work that has been done in this area, which to many is a never-never land, a field which some believe should never be covered by the alert and courageous newspaper reporter.

The dean of newspapermen covering irregularities in labor activity is Westbrook Pegler. For more years than I care to remember, I have been following the activities of this amazing man as he has courageously exposed racketeers in the labor movement, from Willie Bioff to James Hoffa. Back in the 1940's, Pegler exposed Joe Fay, long before the labor leader was convicted of extortion. The late-September revelations that Fay had been holding a court in Sing Sing, with State and city officials and labor leaders beating a path to his cell, was not news to Pegler's readers. On September 4, 1940, Pegler had written:

Sing Sing is a very convenient prison for Fay * * * and he has had the privilege of many visits from persons who are not eligible by the rules applying to other prisoners. John V. Kenny, the mayor of Jersey City, was one of these visitors, on a mission to negotiate a deal about crime on the waterfront.

After World War I, Pegler became markets editor of the United News, in New York. He also held the positions of sports editor, cable editor, fashion editor, society editor, and editor, until he was hired by the Chicago Tribune Syndicate, in 1925, to cover sports. This phase ended in 1933, when he went to work for Roy Howard. Thereafter, Pegler spent a good deal of his time in Washington. From 1944 until the present, Pegler has written a daily column for King Features.

In 1942 Pegler received the Pulitzer prize for distinguished reporting. He has received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Knox College, and twice he has won the National Headliners Club annual award. He has also received the American Legion award for Americanism.

In 1954, he received the Silver Lady award for being "the outstanding reporter and columnist of the year," from the Banshees, a New York luncheon club composed of editors, writers, artists, and others in the creative trades. At the same luncheon, a remarkable and unique tribute was paid him by 25 winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor, who presented him with a special citation for Americanism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, samples of Pegler's articles which illustrate the scope of his pioneering in the labor racketeering field.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREAT TO BOYCOTT TWO STATES PORTRAYS UNION "PATRIOTISM"

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I am so bright I sometimes wonder how I stand it, but I just go on giving myself day after day and today I thought I would tell you something about the obligations and restrictions imposed on so many millions of our people by Mr. Roosevelt's high-minded friends of the union racket, including, of course, the thieves and gorillas who formerly had to use their wits to get by but now rely on the Wagner Act, the War Labor Board and good old Professor Weenie of the Supreme Court.

I led myself into this subject a few days ago when I tossed off a learned essay on Joe Padway's threat to call a sort of general strike of the AFL against the States of Florida and Arkansas because their citizens, by popular vote in the recent election, adopted constitutional amendments affirming a man's right to work though he should refuse to join a union.

This imported American doesn't like the constitutions of these two States of our glorious Union and would punish the people thereof for daring to flout his will. Naturally we want to know what sort of constitutions he does like, for which information we turn to my little library of constitutions, some of which incidentally are very hard to get even if a fellow happens to be a member.

For example, I was talking the other day to a poor working stiff, a common man, as Henry Wallace, a very uncommon man himself, would call the guy, who had just had his ears kicked off by the president of his local for protesting against a speed-up arranged by the mob in command. When I

read his union book and saw some mention of sick benefits and a burial fund I asked:

"What are these sick and burial funds?"

"Huh?" the guy said. "I dunno. I never heard of them. They don't leave us see the constitution."

Oh, before I go any further, I want to show you how Padway and Mr. Big team up in this thing. Roosevelt sent Padway over to Europe last year in company with old Dan Tobin as a representative of American labor. That shows you how he stands with the boss.

Well, here is the oath that an American sailor has to take when Mr. Big's political henchmen drive him into the national maritime union:

"I solemnly swear to be true and loyal to the union and the labor cause and to obey all rules the union may adopt."

That means the sailor obligates himself in advance, to follow the Communist Party line when the union follows the line, as it has done pretty consistently from the beginning, even though he may sincerely believe the union has adopted rules inimical to the United States.

This one is in the constitution of the boilermakers' union:

"If a member be so indiscreet as to buy or cause to be bought goods without the union label or patronize an unfair shop or restaurant, he shall be tried and, if found guilty, fined not less than $5 nor more than $10."

This clause invites the ruling clique to blacklist any shop, restaurant or product and divert the patronage of the members to rivals in trade who might be willing to lay a little something on the line in return for the favor.

In the same constitution it is written that the hundreds of thousands of members must buy life insurance under a group policy negotiated by the son of the union's president, now emeritus, who gets a commission on every dollar of the premiums.

If they don't keep up their insurance payments so that the old man's son can collect his share, they can't work, even in the Kaiser shipyards, and no matter how desperate the labor shortage.

Here is a hot one from the constitution of the old Browne-Bioff racket in the movie and theatrical trades for which Padway was general counsel:

"I solemnly pledge my word of honor as a man to abide by the constitution and bylaws of local 225 and abide by its rules without resort to a court of law."

These two filthy gangsters were two of the most vicious criminals in the whole union racket at the very time when Padway was drawing pay for representing the outfit and yet the constitution forbade the stiffs to appeal to the public courts for their rights. And, in accordance with the hammy Ku Klux tradition which still prevails in many of these subgovernments, the new brother being initiated was required to "take your fellow brother by the right hand, place your left hand over your heart, and repeat your obligation."

The president's welcoming address to the new joiners leads off by saying that nothing in the vow conflicts with any civil or religious beliefs, and two paragraphs later denies him access to the courts and the system of justice esablished by centuries of struggle.

To Padway this seems to have been all right. It seems O. K. to him, too, that the constitution of the Musicians' Union, for which he now is counsel, delivers the members into utter slavery by means of a clause granting Jimmy Petrillo the power to suspend the whole constitution at will and rule as absolute dictator.

And the constitution of the teamsters, as you may remember, grants to old Dan Tobin, Roosevelt's pal, the most luxurious and elaborate scale of free living at the members' expense, in addition to his salary of $30,000 a year, with a provision that this goes for Dan only and not for any successor.

It is like the British arrangements for the maintenance of the royal family. And there is, moreover, a special article which makes it a much more serious offense to take a poke at old Dan or any other member of the royal class than to make a pass at some commoner or lesser official. It is less majestic and no kidding to throw a hook at Old Dan, and this special protection for his august person certainly sounds kind of funny against the old fourflusher's stories of the terrible fights he used to have and what a hero he has been in labor's struggle over the years.

Padway, of course, is Tobin's general counsel, too.

There is a lot more, but I don't want to overload my pupils with homework.

Just absorb this and remember that Padway is the guy who says these outfits will boycott two of our States because their people decided that a man didn't necessarily have to submit to such violations of his human and civil rights.

Professor Weenie, Senator Wagner, the old Tammany gang politician and labor faker, and Padway. We certainly did draw some honey from Europe, didn't we?

Fascistic Phase of Hillman's PAC Shown in Election

(By Westbrook Pegler)

We have just seen an alarming demonstration of the fascistic phase of unionism in the operations of Sidney Hillman's political action committee and in the campaign activities of other politicians of the union movement.

Some of labor, apparently a majority of the union members, either did not realize that they were voting for fascism or realized it and went along, anyway, sacrificing freedom for immediate pay, as Italian labor did under Mussolini.

On the surface it may seem inconsistent of me to say that the political action committee is dominated by Communists and then to say that the immediate effect of this program is Fascist. The explanation is that fascism and communism are alike in all important elements and that the Communists, as they demonstrated in Germany when they voted for Hitler, are willing to go through fascism to arrive at communism.

After all, Mussolini improvised fascism out of communism and, like President Roosevelt, he won the so-called common man by giving him vacations with pay, baby bonuses and other illusory benefits.

To enable the employers to meet these costs, Mussolini subsidized them, too, so that the expense was met out of the public treasury, which meant that the people paid for their own raises through taxes. Moreover, Mussolini thus, by subsidizing industry, got control of industry, as now is happening here.

Under Mussolini, the unions were not actually abolished, as the anti-Fascist, but pro-Communist, propagandists in this country would have Americans believe. Instead, he absorbed them into the Fascist movement, as unionism here is now almost wholly absorbed into the Roosevelt party, and made their treasuries available to himself for his political purposes.

It must be apparent to American labor that in this campaign most of the union treasuries were made available to Roosevelt's party. Not only did unions contribute enormously to the campaign, in some cases by minority decisions, in others by executive decision of the officials, but many of them levied special political assessments.

We discovered cases in which workers were fired for refusing to pay the political assessments or goaded and terrorized into quitting their jobs.

We had one specific case in which a man was convicted of un-union-like activity and dismissed by the union from an important semi-military war job because he declared that if he had to pay a dollar to Roosevelt's campaign fund he would give $5 to Dewey's fund. Other cases could have been authenticated, but, as in the courts, samples suffice to prove the charge.

Often, in criminal prosecutions, a defendant is convicted and sentenced on only one particular count of, say, grand larceny, when dozens could be proved, the idea being that even if he were convicted on each separate count, the sentences would run concurrently.

We have seen in operation many of the methods by which the Roosevelt regime has driven millions of workers into the unions, including the device called maintenance of membership, whereby men and women of the highest skill in war plants must be fired and their effort subtracted from the war effort, if they drop out of membership or violate union discipline, which includes a deferential respect for a Communist union official or an underworld racketeer.

The union's interests come before those of the fighting men, and maintenance of membership, on its face, is an admission by the union that it cannot keep its members on the rolls without Government coercion.

Nevertheless, Roosevelt, in one of his most important and persuasive speeches, called this free collective bargaining.

Another trick by which men and women are driven into the unions which, in turn, support their great political idol, called Il Duce in Italy, is the work of Jimmy Byrnes, formerly of the Supreme Court, who resigned to become Roosevelt's political odd-job man.

This is how it works:

George Spelvin, American, works in an unorganized or nonunion occupation. He is, let us say, a clerk. He has earned a raise and his employer wants to reward him and to help him meet the increased cost of living. But he can't give Spelvin a raise.

Then a union comes along and, incidentally, the most aggressive and successful of the office workers' unions is one which consistently follows the Communist Party line and whose president goes under an assumed name and has received cordial greetings from President Roosevelt.

The union can get Spelvin that raise through the War Labor Board if he and a sufficient number of his fellow-workers will consent to join. But in that case the employer must raise not only Spelvin, who has earned his increase, but dozens or hundreds of others, regardless of their merit or ability and including the undeserving.

So, instead of holding the line against inflation, up go the wages of all hands and up goes the prestige of the union, which, naturally, contributes generously to Roosevelt. And, of course, in most cases, since American industry went almost wholly to war, those raises are paid out of the workers' own taxes because the Treasury has subsidized the company and is meeting the payrolls.

Whether the workers who voted for this system understood what they were doing and realized that this was Mussolini's way and pure fascism, we can't know. It is bad enough that they did vote for it. The prospect is dark for that free America which so many million men and women entrusted to the conscience and intelligence of the voters at home when they went overseas to fight fascism.

Union Bosses Vote Selves Big Rakeoff, Freeze Out Widows

(By Westbrook Pegler)

Although the funny business occurred last April in Chicago, it still may be news to you that the mob who run the International Union of Operating Engineers of the A. F. of L. did very well for themselves and neatly

waltzed around if they did not crash right through the Government's verboten on wage and salary increases which limits the earnings of that pathetic object in more or less human form whom the bleeding hearts fondly refer to as the common man.

This is the outfit of which Joe Fay is a vice president, he being also a hoodlum and racketeer of the Frank Hague satrapy of the New Deal and at present under indictment in New York charged with a shakedown of $703,000 on the Delaware Aqueduct job. He has been indicted before, to be sure, but this time he may wind up in Sing Sing after all these years.

The mob got together at the big Stevens Hotel in Chicago which, by interesting coincidence, was knocked down by the Government to a big Chicago construction contractor and politician who had a piece of the Aqueduct job and happens to be very friendly with the union's president, William E. Maloney.

Maloney is a very frugal fellow, indeed, for, on a salary of $8,000 a year from the union, or racket, he has managed to save enough to buy a great farm in Illinois and a winter home in Miami Beach, Fla., for which he paid $22,500 and maintain a stable of racing steeds and ship them around the country for the horse meets.

Fay, too, for that matter, has done very well on even less salary for he has two homes in the North and one in Sarasota, Fla., and is quite a clubman in both New York and Newark. However, he is also a contractor, leasing heavy equipment to construction contractors on jobs on which his union subjects are employed and, moreover, he is a Hague politician of the hoodlum branch of the New Deal party, which is no amateur activity.

Well, they had a big time in Chicago. Ed Kelly, the mayor, addressed the gang one day and William Green, the president of the A. F. of L., also showed up and sounded off with that set piece of his to the effect that "American workers will stand together, come what may, through thick and thin, unflinchingly, until victory is won over the foul forces of oppression."

There were two propositions before the convention which made an interesting contrast.

One provided that the general executive board, meaning Maloney, Fay and the rest of the tight little corporation of bosses, could vote themselves perpetual pensions in case they should slip politically and be heaved out. The pensions are to be irrevocable and there is no limit on the amount.

One fellow named Stoner, who seems to have been a working stiff, had the nerve to say that the high-rollers of the ruling mob ought to struggle along like the rank and file on the regular Federal social security after the age of 65.

"We are giving the general executive board a great deal of leeway when we say that they may establish pensions for those that they deem worthy," he said, but Brother Thomas F. McGraw, of Albany, N. Y., and a leading member of the O'Connell branch of the party of humanity, got up and said he believed in pensions for the big shots in addition to their social security.

Brother McGraw was fined $10,000 in the Federal court a couple of years back for shaking down working stiffs for job fees on a big war-construction project at Voorheesville, so he knows something about the occupational hazards and embarrassments which beset the defenders of labor's gains as in the present charges against Brother Fay.

Brother Fay also spoke a piece but he might have been plastered at the time because his remarks, as stated in the record, don't make much sense. He said he hoped the thing would go through because "I feel that the integrity and honesty and sincerity has been well performed and should be to the satisfaction of every delegate here."

Maybe you can figure that out. Anyway, the pension thing went sailing through and now the boys can get together any time and vote themselves, say $20,000 a year or whatever the the treasury will stand, in sincere appreciation of their own services to the workingman.

Well, then they came to a proposition which would have raised the maximum death insurance to the widow of a stiff in good standing for 10 years from $250, as at present, to $500 and hiked the benefits for members of inferior classes to $75 and $200, respectively.

At that, however, the opposition went to work. The resolution frankly said the money in the death benefit fund had increased enormously, but nevertheless, the general secretary and others spoke in great alarm about quick depletion of the kitty if this increase went through and the tragedy of widows who then would get no insurance at all. So this one was licked and the maximum remains at $250, even for a 10-year man.

But you ain't heard it all, yet.

Finally, the boys put through a resolution which blew not only the ceiling but the roof off the pay of worthy President William Maloney, with his farm and winter estate and racing stable and all, and of worthy Secretary-Treasurer F. A. Fitzgerald, of Washington. This one authorized the mob to raise these two salaries without any limit whatever up to the total of the entire treasury and provided only that Maloney's pay should not be less than $15,000 and Fitzgerald's not less than $10,000.

But don't let it run up your blood pressure. These boys are good, solid, down-the-line Roosevelt unioneers, like old Dan Tobin, and you certainly aren't naive enough to think they are subject to the same laws that rule the lives of the common man, are you?

Freeing Willie Bioff and Browne Is Payoff in Odorous Bargain

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The release from prison of George Browne and Willie Bioff is the fulfillment of a routine bargain between public prosecutors and criminals who squeal on their partners in crime. They, in their turn, had been betrayed by their old friend, Joseph Schenck, the Hollywood moving picture magnate, who also received lenity for this service to the community.

The 6 Chicago underworld gangsters and 1 member of the Hague New Jersey mob who were sent to prison by the testimony of Browne and Bioff would appear to be the ultimate losers as there seems to be nobody whom they can turn in. They lost their appeals only last week.

With these two recent developments it might seem to the casual reader that a very bad situation in labor organization had been reformed.

That is not so, however, for men who tolerated these two particular crooks still are powerful in the American Federation of Labor and in the Roosevelt party and are allowed to pose as leaders and defenders of the American worker. And every attempt to enact Federal law correcting defects in labor administration which made possible their perfidies has been obstructed by the Roosevelt following in the Senate.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, used the power of his office to uphold Browne against a group of legitimate workmen in an evil St. Louis case. He sat with Browne in the executive council, or cabinet, of the A. F. of L. long after Browne had been made notorious by independent newspaper investigation.

Dan Tobin, President Roosevelt's particular friend, who was host to Roosevelt at the scandalous episode in Washington in October when the President made his flippant campaign oration and two young naval officers were beaten up, also sat with Browne in the executive council.

I am able to say flatly that Tobin knew Browne's union was a dirty racket and that, like any Tammany or Hague or Kelly politician, he refrained from exposing or opposing Browne in a spirit of live and let live. He let Browne alone because he anticipated that if he molested him, Browne would call attention to some similar characters and evils in Tobin's union of the teamsters.

Browne's general counsel for the union was Joseph Padway who similarly serves Tobin's union and the bartenders' and waiters' union, among others. Padway also is a friend of Roosevelt and has been honored by him.

That he could have been unaware of the character of Browne and Bioff, who was, from his youth, a common underworld bum, thief, and white slaver, is an assumption which belittles his intelligence. Some lawyers discovered long ago, however, that union law is a rich field of practice and Browne, through his union, was a juicy client.

Padway praised Browne lavishly at a national convention of this racket at a time when Bioff, acknowledged as Browne's personal representative, had been sent to jail to finish a term of 6 months for operating a brothel. Incidentally, his status in the jail was aristocratic and he held business conferences with other criminals and with Hollywood businessmen in a special room with a tub of bottled beer cooling in the corner.

About the same time, many faithless bosses of California unions were sending Bioff telegrams of sympathy and expressions of faith in his conduct and character. And Padway's praise of Browne went into the record of the proceedings along with Browne's own praise and defense of Bioff.

Another union lawyer who was receiving large fees at the time and who attended the same convention without raising his voice against the frightful betrayal of labor and exploitation of the workers for loot by an underworld gang, was Matthew Levy, of New York. Nevertheless, 2 years ago, another group of professional New Deal union operators and politicians handpicked Levy as a candidate for the supreme court and had the effrontery to present him as a labor candidate.

Here again, as in the case of Padway, to excuse Levy's association and his failure to utter some slight reproof of criminality and underworld power in unionism, would be no compliment to the acumen of the man.

The presentation in court of the detailed evidence on which Browne and Bioff were convicted and sentenced to 8 and 10 years, respectively, for extortion, had not yet occurred, it is true. But Padway, Levy, and Green all certainly had been put on warning that there was corruption in the union and the situation was one in which any man pretending to the title of leader or friend of American labor had a moral duty to disassociate himself if not to take the initiative and campaign for reform.

The discouraging fact is that not a single leader or boss of the American union movement took the initiative or any action against these men. Green, on the contrary, selected Browne to investigate racketeering.

And when, finally, there could no longer be any pretense that Browne was a victim of punishment without trial, the A. F. of L. did not have the decency to throw him out of the executive council by positive action but eased him out by abolishing the vice-presidency which he held.

Many remedial laws have been proposed, none of which, by any stretch of the imagination, could be said by any honest man to threaten any right or interest of the rank-and-file worker. Some of them would, however, impair the powers and stop the graft of union bosses and might curtail the fees of union lawyers who pose as labor leaders and spokesmen for the workers.

Everyone has been defeated by the Roosevelt element in Congress although two reform bills did pass the House of Representatives.

Browne and Bioff are low things who will now be on probation under Judge John C. Knox, a shrewd and strict man who knows them thoroughly and doubtless would throw them back into prison should they resume their racketeering. With the other gangsters safely put away, then, it might seem probable that conditions would improve.

Unfortunately, however, there are other crooks just as evil still operating notoriously in the A. F. of L. All to the detriment of the rank and file and the whole labor movement. And there has been no sign that decency has dawned in the higher councils.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Clark Mollenhoff of the Des Moines Register, whose columns are carried by other midwestern newspapers, represents admirably the present-day writer interested in the wrongdoings of certain labor leaders. The fact that his ability and crusading heart are recognized is evidenced by his having been awarded a Niemann Fellowship at Harvard, the Sigma Delta Chi award in 1953 and 1955, the Heywood Broun award in 1956, and the Ray Clapper award in 1956. It was my pleasure to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back in 1956 several columns written by this man, covering the misdoings of James Hoffa, and so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to refresh their memories on Hoffa's activities, I ask that this material be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOTOR CARRIER INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently there were concluded hearings, directed at competition, regulation, and the public interest in the motor carrier industry, before the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate. At the end of the report of that select committee, under "Recommendations," the paragraph No. 5 reads as follows:

"Although your committee was primarily studying the role of the ICC in motor trucking, several witnesses testified and submitted statements alleging that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters was playing a trade-restraining role in the industry. It is recommended that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce review those complaints to determine if more extensive inquiries should be conducted."

It is with that in mind that I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a series of nine articles by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, of the Cowles publications in Minneapolis and Des Moines, outlining in complete detail the dangers that were pointed out in testimony during the hearings.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BECK'S AID CASTS LONG SHADOW—IS HOFFA TOP MAN IN TEAMSTERS?

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—As chairman of the central States conference of teamsters, James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa casts a long shadow over the highway transportation of the Nation.

"The influence of the young, dynamic vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America extends from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rocky Mountains.

"Although he is only 42, Hoffa has been a labor organizer for more than 25 years. Today his title is ninth vice president of the International Teamsters, but the 5-foot-5 inch teamster official is regarded as the No. 2 man in the Nation's biggest union.

"There are some indications that Hoffa would rank above President Dave Beck if he wanted to press his claim with the 1,500,000 rank-and-file members.

"The free-wheeling Detroit labor leader is a political independent, who wields his personal influence and the union treasury for favorite candidates in local elections.

"He has paid fines of $1,000 and $500 for violating the labor laws but he has bounded back to become even more important in the teamsters' union.

"The highly critical reports written by Congressional committees haven't disturbed him except to bring his shouted threats to take care of those who gave information unfavorable to him.

"Hoffa was in a number of joint business enterprises with the group that was awarded the multimillion dollar annual contract for insurance for the Central States conference of teamsters.

"Hoffa's wife, Josephine, and the wife of Owen Bert Brennan, Hoffa's top aid, drew $65,000 in dividends from a truck-leasing firm set up for them by a large trucking firm that hired members of the teamsters union in Detroit, Mich.

"Two years ago, Hoffa told Congressional investigators he owed $38,000 in unpaid loans to persons who hired teamsters union members and to business agents of the teamsters union.

"Hoffa told the Congressional subcommittee he had put up no collateral on those loans and that no notes or other documents were involved in the transaction. It was just his word that he would repay.

"Teamster President Beck told a television audience he didn't know about the labor law violations by Hoffa, but declared that he would not criticize any transaction Hoffa has been involved in that he knows about.

"A study at Princeton University has ranked Hoffa as having one of the highest I. Q.'s among the Nation's labor leaders, despite the fact that his education was cut off in the eighth grade.

"Hoffa's Central States area include Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and the Louisville area in Kentucky.

"But those 13 States do not end the extent of his influence. As a key figure in the handling of health and welfare plans for the teamsters' union, he has extended his jurisdiction to 12 other States from Texas and Oklahoma and Arkansas east to the Atlantic coast.

"Hoffa says he has been directed by Beck to cooperate in managing teamsters' affairs in those areas.

"Hoffa had what he considered to be a legitimate reason for moving south. 'Trucks from those areas were running into the Central States conference and they were breaking down our wage scale,' Hoffa says.

"This was justification for moving in to help jack up the wage scale in the southern areas, he says.

"Hoffa was also troubleshooter for the teamsters when there were contract troubles in New Jersey, New York, and the New England area.

"Hoffa is likely to show up almost any place in the country from Florida to North Dakota to show local teamsters' union officials how to deal effectively with employers. Hoffa says he acts only on general directions from Beck.

" 'Beck knows how to delegate authority,' Hoffa explains. 'That is what I like about Dave. He is a good administrator. He gives you a job to do and lets you do it.'

"Hoffa's personal fortunes have swelled as he has climbed to a position of dominance in the teamsters' union, but he won't say how much.

" 'I won't tell the Internal Revenue Service, so I'd be a damned fool to tell you,' Hoffa commented.

"The records brought out in various Congressional committees show his outside business investments include oil leases, a farm, a brewery, a small interest in a race track, and a share of a girls' camp at Eagle River, Wis.

"In addition, his wife owns a truck-leasing firm that hires no members of the teamsters' union but merely leases the equipment to a firm that hires teamsters' union members.

"The last time he went on record before a Congressional committee, Hoffa was drawing a salary of $21,000 from local 299 of the teamsters' union in Detroit and from the international union. In addition, he had an unlimited expense account on the million-dollar treasury of the Detroit local.

"Hoffa was born on St. Valentine's Day in 1913 in Brazil, Ind. He is of Dutch and Irish extraction. When he was 4, his father died, and his mother was left to support 4 small children. He was next to the youngest.

"They moved to Clinton, Ind., and when he was 9 the family moved to Detroit and his mother went to work in a factory.

"Family financial problems forced Hoffa to drop out of school at 14 and go to work. He had just finished the eighth grade, but work wasn't new to him. He had worked in a grocery store, sold newspapers and peddled bills.

"He was working in a warehouse for the Kroger Co. in Detroit at 16 when he started working as a labor organizer. His success in the rough and tough struggle to organize an independent union gave Hoffa his first boost. In 1932, when he was only 19, he took his independent union into the International Teamsters. He's been there ever since.

"Hoffa works 12 to 16 hours a day on a 6- or 7-day week on affairs of the Teamsters International. He's home only about 2 days a week as he keeps up close contact with local teamsters from Baltimore, Md., to Bismarck, N. Dak.

"He neither smokes nor drinks, and he exercises to keep in shape by swinging an ax in the woods of northern Michigan. Six weeks a year he vacations—2 weeks in Canada, 2 weeks at Iron River, Mich., and 2 weeks in Florida."

"EXPENSE ACCOUNT UNLIMITED—HOFFA GAINS POWER IN MICHIGAN POLITICS

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—Backed by the million-dollar treasury of local 299 of the teamsters union in Detroit, Mich., James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa has become a power in Michigan politics.

"The 42-year-old chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters calls himself a political independent. The labels of Republican and Democrat mean nothing to him. He backs the people he thinks will be best for Hoffa and Hoffa's boys.

"In 1952, Hoffa threw his support to the late Senator Blair Moody, one of the most liberal Democrats in the Senate.

"In 1954, Hoffa was lined up with Senator Homer Ferguson, a Republican with a conservative voting record.

"In supporting Ferguson, Hoffa passed over the Democratic candidate who had been selected out of labor's ranks. Senator PATRICK MCNAMARA, a former A. F. of L. labor leader, defeated Ferguson despite the fact that Hoffa accompanied Ferguson to numerous meetings, and introduced the Republican as the man he wanted to win.

"Hoffa's record of losing with Moody in 1952 and losing with Ferguson in 1954 would not appear to indicate any strength at the polls. However, every time an election comes around, Hoffa gets the local union to pass a motion to allow him to spend whatever moneys he thinks necessary in the forthcoming local's elections.

"He pours this money into the campaign funds of persons seeking election as judges in Michigan. He knows the value of a friendly judiciary, from experience with judges who were not necessarily sympathetic to his pleas.

"Hoffa avoids putting any of the money from the union treasury in the campaign funds of candidates for the United States Senate or for the House of Representatives.

"However, Hoffa knows how to raise a political action fund in a hurry. In 1952, Moody needed money and Hoffa ordered his business agents to turn up $100 personal contributions. A fund totaling several thousand dollars was raised in a few days.

"Hoffa and his organization also distributed campaign literature for Moody. One of Moody's associates explained that placards and other printed material were given to the teamsters union; and that within a day truckdrivers had blanketed the State with signs.

"Ferguson accepted Hoffa's support and personal endorsement in 1954 despite the fact that two committees of the House had written scorching reports on Hoffa and his top aid, Owen Bert Brennan.

" 'Hoffa is a dominant figure in the teamsters union and virtually a dictator in certain areas, despite the fact that he has been found guilty and convicted of violation of the Michigan State labor law and the Federal antitrust laws,' commented the joint subcommittee of the home labor and government operations committees.

"The report labeled Hoffa as 'the brains between this shakedown (in the jukebox industry) and power grab by (William) Bufalino.'

" 'Bufalino could not have succeeded in gaining monopolistic control of the coin-vending business in Detroit without the cognizance and approval of Hoffa,' the report said.

"Another House subcommittee report criticized Hoffa's handling of the health and welfare funds of the central States teamsters' conference, and his wife's business connections with persons employing members of the teamsters union.

"Hoffa has a reputation for never asking a candidate for anything.

" 'All Jimmy wants is to be left alone,' commented one man who was closely associated with the Moody campaign in 1952.

"Hoffa enters into politics to get the most friendly atmosphere possible for his activities.

" 'We are getting along O. K.,' Hoffa explains. 'We don't need any help.'

"Congressional investigators found that on the union income-tax returns for 1948, Hoffa had listed 'State political contributions in the amount of $15,487.50.' In 1950, the 'State political contributions' had totaled $13,410.30.

"Hoffa also told the subcommittee that the union had sponsored television shows 'for the best interests of trucking concerns and our members, and we used a couple of those shows to introduce some judges that were running for office.'

"But, when the Congressional investigators sought to learn how Hoffa used money allocated to 'State political contributions,' Hoffa said he couldn't remember any details. He also told the subcommittee that it would be impossible to produce records since he had approved a policy under which the union destroyed its records each year.

"All that was left for Congressional investigators to examine were the worksheets from which the Federal income-tax returns were prepared.

"Chief Counsel William McKenna read Hoffa the Treasury Department Decision 5381 which states:

" 'The books of record required by this section shall be kept at all times available for inspection by internal-revenue officers and shall be retained so long as the contents thereof may become material in the ministration of the internal-revenue law."

" 'Have you had any advice from the Bureau of Internal Revenue that the contents of those books are not material in the administration of the internal revenue law?' McKenna asked.

" 'I have not consulted with internal revenue,' Hoffa answered. 'Neither have they talked to me. I don't know if they have talked to our lawyers or not.'

"Hoffa told the subcommittee that local 299 of the teamsters has a million-dollar treasury, and that it has been the practice of the members to vote unanimously to let him use whatever funds he feels are necessary for organizational work, for expenses, or for politics.

"So far, Hoffa's political influence has been confined to his home State of Michigan even though his influence in the teamsters union extends from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean."

"WIFE PUT ON UNION PAYROLL—HOFFA $1,000 NETS 200 PERCENT AND CLAIM ON GOLDEN ERA

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—The wife of James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa was on the payroll of the racket-ridden jukebox local of the Detroit teamsters union at $100 a week, but she never went near the office.

"The payment of $3,000 to the wife of the Detroit teamster boss was represented as being repayment of a loan from Hoffa with 200 percent interest.

"Eugene C. (Jimmy) James, former head of jukebox union 985, testified the payments were made to Mrs. Hoffa because union rules would have prevented Hoffa from drawing money from the local while he was drawing a salary as the top official of Teamsters Union 299 in Detroit.

"James told a one-man grand jury in Detroit that Hoffa, an international vice president of the teamsters, and Owen Bert Brennan, Hoffa's top aid, had each loaned him $1,000 to start the jukebox union.

"To repay the $2,000, the wives of Hoffa and Brennan were put on the payroll of the jukebox union at $100 a week each. By the time a one-man grand jury started its operations in 1946, a total of $6,000 had been paid to Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan.

"Judge George B. Murphy, who was sitting as the one-man grand jury, pointed out that repayment of $6,000 on a $2,000 loan was a repayment by 300 percent.

" 'That was quite a difference; about $4,000. Did you consider that interest on the loan?' Judge Murphy asked James.

" 'Yes,' James answered, and the judge continued:

" 'Or was it a payoff to them?'

" 'It was no payoff, judge,' James answered. 'I gave it to them out of the graciousness of my heart.'

" 'But the money belonged to the union,' Judge Murphy commented.

" 'The union gave me the right to spend it.'

" 'The county gives me $100,000 to spend on this grand jury,' Judge Murphy replied. 'But, out of the graciousness of my heart I can't be throwing the money around.'

" 'I didn't figure I wasted the money,' James said. 'I figured it was well spent.'

" 'Why do you figure the money is well spent?' Murphy asked.

" 'Because they (Hoffa and Brennan) are big men, they could help me a lot.'

" 'Did they ever help you?' the judge asked.

" 'No, I never had to call on them. Just luck enough I never needed them,' James said.

"Not long after the grand jury investigation, James left Detroit for Chicago. He continued to receive a salary from the Detroit jukebox union for several years, but his major interest switched to the health and welfare funds of the laundry workers.

"Within the last 6 months, a Senate labor subcommittee has charged that James and a New Jersey insurance broker embezzled approximately $1 million from the Laundry Workers International health and welfare funds.

"Back in 1951, the Kefauver crime committee reported 'evidence of strong-arm methods in the jukebox distributing business in Chicago, Kansas City, Mo., and Detroit.'

"That subcommittee said it was 'the more refined method of shakedown and extortion' that was found in Detroit.

" 'Here a union was used as a front by underworld characters to extort money from jukebox distributors,' it said. 'These distributors were forced to join the union as "honorary members" and pay initiation fees and dues or risk having lines thrown around their locations.'

"In 1953 Phillip Berman, a jukebox serviceman, told the labor subcommittee that he was forced out of business as a jukebox operator.

"Acid was poured in his jukeboxes after he testified before the Kefauver crime committee, Berman told the House committee.

"When James went to Chicago, William E. Bufalino became president and principal operating official of union 985.

"Picket lines, bombing threats and acid plagued those who tried to operate machines that did not carry the union label of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America.

"Bufalino and six associates were indicted in Wayne County, Mich., on a 7-count indictment charging conspiracy to extort money from jukebox operators and to use terrorism and teamster pickets as a weapon.

"A House labor racket investigating subcommittee charged that Bufalino was the 'principal offender and perpetrator of racketeering extortion and gangsterism' which involved the jukebox union.

" 'Bufalino and the executive board of union 985 conspired and confederated to obtain this monopoly and used the union, not to advance the interest of labor, nor to protect labor in genuine labor disputes, but the interest of a favored few jukebox owners and operators at the expense of other owners and union members,' the House report stated.

"It stated that Bufalino's brother-in-law, Vincent A. Meli, headed Melton Music Co.—a jukebox distributor whom witnesses testified received favored treatment.

"Union members were forced out of the union by Bufalino, business places were bombed, and union dues of $20 a month per member were characterized as a tribute because the union did nothing for the members, the report said.

"The House report stated that 'Hoffa is a dominant figure in the teamsters union and virtually a dictator' in the Detroit area through his position as president of Teamsters Union 299, president of the teamsters joint council 43, and president of the Michigan conference of teamsters.

"Hoffa 'has been described as the brains between this shakedown and power grab by Bufalino and his Teamsters Union 985,' the report said.

"In any event, Bufalino could not have succeeded in gaining monopolistic control of

the coin-vending business in Detroit without the cognizance and approval of Hoffa.

"Hoffa's faith in Bufalino and the State courts were rewarded when Bufalino was acquitted. Several of Bufalino's associates had entered pleas of guilty and were fined.

"General President Dave Beck, of the International Teamsters Union, contends that the teamsters have jurisdiction over jukeboxes because these machines are hauled on trucks. He states it is ridiculous for electrical workers to claim jurisdiction just because a little plug is put in the wall to operate the machine.

"When Hoffa appeared before a House subcommittee the jukebox union had between 400 and 450 members with dues running $20 a month per man.

"It was admitted that more than $6,000 a month flowed into the union treasury from dues, but the subcommittee was never able to determine how this money was spent.

"Under authority from Hoffa as president of Teamsters Joint Council 43, Bufalino's jukebox union was destroying its records every year 'to conserve space.'

"In the era of automation that is dawning, the jukebox local has great potential for expansion. In the Detroit area, the wash racks and service station organization has been claimed for this union in addition to any automats or other coin-operated machines.

"When Jimmy Hoffa made a $1,000 investment in the jukebox local he proved he is a labor leader with a good deal of foresight in claiming teamster jurisdiction in the field of coin-operated devices."

"OWNERSHIP CAMOUFLAGES—UNION DRIVERS LOSE PAY, JOBS TO MRS. HOFFA'S FIRM

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—Members of the teamsters union lost part of their income when a Detroit trucking firm set up a truck-leasing corporation for the wife of Detroit teamster union boss James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa.

"Teamster union members who previously had leased their equipment to Commercial Carrier, Inc., saw their business handled by the new firm of Test Fleet, Inc. They also saw their personal income cut as much as $1,500 to $2,000 a year.

"Meanwhile, Mrs. Hoffa and the wife of another Detroit teamster official drew $65,000 from Test Fleet, Inc., in a 4-year period.

"Teamster union members in Detroit didn't know that the wives of two teamster officials were receiving the earnings of Test Fleet until a House labor subcommittee went into Detroit late in 1953.

"Ownership of the Test Fleet was well camouflaged. The firm was set up for Mrs. Hoffa and the wife of Owen Bert Brennan, Hoffa's top aid in Detroit. However, the maiden names of Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan—Josephine Poszywak and Alice Johnson—were used on the record.

"Even these names did not appear when the firm was incorporated in Tennessee by attorney James W. Wrape of Memphis. Wrape and some of his office employees were listed as officers.

"Neither Mrs. Hoffa nor Mrs. Brennan took any part in setting up the corporation, or in running it, according to a House subcommittee report.

"Test Fleet came into being in 1949 when B. B. Beveridge, one of the owners of Commercial Carriers, called Elliot R. Beidler, vice president of Commercial Carriers, and said:

" 'I am going to put some friends of mine in business and I want you to handle the account.'

"The friends turned out to be Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan, wives of the teamsters officials who negotiated union contracts with Beidler.

"Beidler and Wrape handled the details. The $4,000 invested by Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan wasn't enough to finance payment on the 10 tractors that Commercial Carriers had purchased for Test Fleet.

"Commercial Carriers carried the additional $5,000 on an open account for a month until Test Fleet had made enough from Commercial Carriers to pay it off.

"Test Fleet had no employees, and Beidler ran it for Mrs. Hoffa and Mrs. Brennan along with his duties as a vice president of Commercial Carriers.

"Periodically, Mrs. Hoffa or Mrs. Brennan would call and ask to have a dividend declared. On at least one occasion no dividend amount was stated and it was suggested that the dividend be as much as the corporation could stand out of its earnings.

"In that 4-year period the net earnings were $145,800 which went to pay for the equipment and the $65,000 in dividends.

"Two of the teamster union members who lost part of their income appeared before a House subcommittee to testify how the organization of Test Fleet had hurt them.

"Paul L. Smith, a veteran Flint, Mich., truckdriver with a long accident-free record, said his income was cut from $6,000 a year to about $4,500. Smith had his own equipment and was able to supplement his regular drivers pay before Test Fleet came into existence.

"Harold Herbert Cross, Flint, Mich, was another truckdriver who lost part of his income when Test Fleet was organized.

"Smith and Cross were among drivers who became involved in contract difficulties with Commercial Carriers, and struck contrary to the wishes of teamster chief Hoffa, the House report said.

"When the strike was over, Cross and Smith were blackballed by the teamsters union.

" 'He (Cross) lost his equipment because he could not meet the payments, was forced to sell his house, and now finds the work he once did for Commercial Carriers is being done by the Hoffa-Brennan Test Fleet Corp.,' the House subcommittee officially reported.

"After he lost his equipment, Cross was once more permitted to go to work—this time as a driver at a sharply cut income.

"The report of the House Labor Subcommittee stated that Frank Fitzsimmons, another Detroit teamster official, under Hoffa's jurisdiction, became a dominant partner and later gained full control of a film-delivery business originally owned by a man with whom the union had recurring labor troubles.

"Howard C. Craven, Ann Arbor, Mich., was operating a film-delivery and paper-delivery business that brought in about $30,000 to $40,000 a year gross. It was a prosperous business until teamsters union members started striking. Teamster boss Fitzsimmons said he didn't know why.

"As a result of these strikes, a teamsters union steward in Fitzsimmons' union started taking over Craven's paper-hauling operations, Craven testified.

"As Craven's income diminished, he was approached by Fitzsimmons who suggested he could get Craven a contract for exclusive rights of hauling the paper in Detroit and suburbs, and all revenue.

" 'He [Fitzsimmons] was to collect 90 percent of the revenue,' Craven testified.

"Craven testified he thought this was a good contract for increasing his business, but that he was forced to pay $9,000 to Fitzsimmons in the first year in checks made out to cash.

"Not satisfied with the $9,000, Fitzsimmons called him down to the teamsters union offices with the books to make sure he was getting his share, and had insisted that Craven produce another $600 to pay the income tax on the $9,000.

"The elderly truckline operator said the payments to Fitzsimmons made him go broke, and he took a job as a school janitor at $50 a week.

"House subcommittee investigators said a similar story was related by Gustave E. Leveque who sold his film trucking service firms. His firms were swallowed by a combined firm in which Mrs. Hoffa showed up as one of the directors under the name of Josephine Poszywak.

"Hoffa says he would never own a trucking firm that hired members of the teamsters union, because this would be against his principles as a union official.

"However, he has allowed his wife to keep her interest in the lucrative Test Fleet Corp. He justifies this arrangement on grounds that it is his wife's business enterprise, that he has no connection with it, and because Test Fleet hires no employees.

" 'If Test Fleet hired union members I might make her drop it, but it is just an equipment leasing firm that happens to lease to a trucking firm,' Hoffa explains.

" 'It is just an investment,' Hoffa declares. 'There is nothing wrong with legitimate investments. She has nothing to do with the operations.'

"The House Labor Subcommittee commented that 'we seriously question the ethics of the various business arrangements which we recount here.'

" 'It should be pointed out that your subcommittee does not deny the free right of any American to engage in the business or profession of his choice,' the House report states.

" 'However, we deny the right of anyone to take improper or unfair or unlawful advantage of anyone else. It is in this context that we raise the issue we do now.

" 'Congress has decreed that employees may be represented by unions in dealing with their employers. The facts of business and economic life are such that through unions, employees enjoy considerable power and can bargain with an authority they could never have as individuals. Congress intended that this be so.'

"The report stated that if an employer, for good and proper reason, seeks to resist the demands of a union, the law does not prohibit him from doing so.

" 'But suppose the same union, or its officers, operates a competitor business,' the report said. 'The employer may well have no choice but to yield to the union's demands. This is obviously not the type of collective bargaining which Federal statutes should compel. It is not the type of collective bargaining that Congress should condone. Yet implicit in this hearing record is the suggestion that such bargaining may soon be commonplace.' "

"CONSPIRACY LEADS TO $1,000 FINE—HOFFA BACKS LAWBREAKING AID

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—Two convictions of labor law violations have made James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa tolerant of minor officials of the teamsters union who run afoul of the law.

"Hoffa blames his own arrests on 'anti-union police' and regards his convictions on Federal and State labor law violations as purely 'technical.'

"The case of Gerald P. Connelly, Minneapolis, is an indication that Hoffa will have a big voice in determining whether persons indicted and convicted of labor racketeering will continue to be influential in the teamsters.

"Connelly entered a plea of guilty to violation of the Taft-Hartley law by accepting money from an employer and was ousted from Teamsters Union 548 in Minneapolis.

"However, a three-man committee including Hoffa, Einar Mohn, Washington, 10th vice president, and John T. O'Brien, Chicago, 4th vice president, recommended that Connelly be reinstated in local 548.

"Hoffa said he considered Connelly's law violation to be 'technical,' and that he wouldn't let Connelly down because it reminded him of his own 'technical' convictions.

"It was back in November 1940 that the first so-called 'technical' indictment was returned against Hoffa in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

"Hoffa, his chief aid, Owen Bert Brennan, Teamsters Union 337, and four wastepaper concerns were indicted on charges of having 'knowingly engaged in a combination and conspiracy unreasonably to prevent' other firms from selling wastepaper for shipment from Detroit to other States and to Canada.

"The indictment set out that the union followed the trucks of other firms, picketed railroads that hauled the wastepaper handled by other firms, and that a bomb was thrown into the home of Charles Ginns, a wholesaler of wastepaper.

"Hoffa admitted that he entered a plea of nolo contendere to the charge, paid a $1,000 fine, and had a permanent injunction against continuation of this activity in the wastepaper industry.

"Hoffa told a House subcommittee that his plea of nolo contendere amounted to admission of the facts, but that it was not the same as a guilty plea, because he contended he felt the things that were done were legal.

"Samuel L. Travis, a former special assistant to the attorney general of Michigan, explained the incident to a House labor-racket investigating subcommittee in 1947.

"He said that the teamsters union was only in its swaddling clothes in Detroit at that time, but that it was extremely powerful even then.

"At that time, they (Brennan and Hoffa) joined together with a group of wastepaper wholesalers to create a monopoly in Detroit of the wastepaper industry.

"No one but employees of the four concerns involved were permitted into union membership. The employees of the companies on the outside were not permitted to join the union, and then because of the fact that these companies were so-called nonunion companies and their employees were not members, they were not permitted to do business.

"Hoffa's second technical conviction arose out of efforts of the teamsters union to organize more than 6,000 independent grocers and meat dealers in Detroit in 1945.

"Hoffa and 17 associates were indicted for violation of the State labor laws. Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere and paid a $500 fine.

"The Detroit teamster boss explained that the charge was reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor. He said he entered a plea on the advice of his attorneys, and on the theory 'You don't go to court for a $25 fine.'

" 'When they reduced it to a misdemeanor, I entered a plea. A lot of big corporations do it. There is no sense in spending a lot of union money fighting under the circumstances even if you might win if you took it all the way to the Supreme Court.

" 'I would have fought that one, but there were so many involved that we decided it would cause less stink and cost a lot less money if we just entered a plea.'

"Hoffa said a plea of nolo contendere 'is nothing against a man,' 'Even General Motors has pleaded nolo,' he said.

"Circuit Judge George B. Murphy, of Michigan, wasn't so charitable about Hoffa's activity when he appeared before a House labor racket investigating subcommittee in 1947 to relate the story of the organizing of the so-called mamma-and-papa shops.

"Judge Murphy sat as a one-man grand jury to investigate the pattern used by Hoffa's union in organizing these independent grocers and meat dealers.

"He explained that Hoffa, as president of the Teamsters Joint Council 43, and Owen Bert Brennan, president of Teamsters Local 299, were the key figures in the organization drive.

" 'Prior to that the teamsters union successfully unionized the packers and wholesale meat dealers and distributors,' Judge Murphy testified. 'An attempt was made to sew up the food industry in Detroit.

" 'It was contended that more jobs ought to be created for returning soldiers, and more trucks should be put on the road, and that no one should be permitted to pick up his meat (from the wholesaler) unless and until he joined the teamsters union or bought a permit which would cost $5 and be good for 30 days.'

"Murphy said that many of the small groceries operated by a husband and wife had made it a practice of picking up their meat in a truck or car.

"However, pamphlets were passed out by the teamsters union that no meat was to be delivered by wholesalers of the packinghouse unless the teamsters union permit was presented.

"A great many paid the $5 a month for a permit under protest prior to the time that the grand jury started operating.

"Murphy said the union contended that it was creating more jobs, and that it wanted the meat hauled in sanitary trucks as a health measure.

" 'However, when some fellow had a broken-down Ford, or even a passenger car, he was permitted to take the meat in that truck regardless of whether it was sanitary or otherwise, provided he had paid the $5 for a permit,' Murphy said.

"In all, from 300 to 400 witnesses were called before the grand jury before indictments were handed down charging Hoffa, Brennan, and their associates with extortion of the $5 on permits, and for attempting to force employers to join a union against their will, Judge Murphy said.

"Hoffa said that those indictments were dismissed, and he entered his plea of guilty to a charge of violating the State labor law by improper organizing activity.

"Hoffa said his local union paid his $500 fine 'with full and complete acceptance of the membership.' Under court order the union also refunded $7,617 collected illegally from the mamma-and-papa stores in permit payments."

"You Shoulda Seen Other Guys—Black Eye in Street Fight Causes Hoffa to Boast

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"Washington.—Two carloads of police broke up a brawl on the streets of Charlotte, N. C., September 3, and James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa was charged with being engaged in an affray.

"The 42-year-old chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters was 1 of 7 persons arrested.

"The fist fighting broke out in a longstanding dispute between members of local 71 of the teamsters union and officials of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America.

" 'Our men didn't like the way the contract was rammed down our throats,' said Sam Ewing, a steward in the local union.

"However, Hoffa, Thomas E. Flynn, Bethesda, Md., and Richard Kavner, St. Louis, Mo., regarded the contract as in line with the pattern the international union seeks.

"Although Hoffa got the contract approved on a 590 to 40 vote on a head-count procedure, this did not end the criticism. Fighting broke out as Hoffa and local union members bickered outside the Fox theater.

"A crowd of several hundred gathered to watch before two carloads of police arrested Hoffa, Flynn, Kavner, and four local truckdrivers.

"Hoffa, Flynn, and Kavner posted $50 bond each and were released. City Prosecutor James E. Walker stated that they did not appear for the September 20 trial, and forfeited the cash bond. The four truckdrivers were found guilty and paid $13 court costs each.

"The operation in North Carolina was merely one of a number of cases where Hoffa has been active on the east coast. He's been in New York, New England, and Maryland, bringing his talents to contract negotiations.

"Hoffa, as chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters, rules a 13-State region.

"In addition, Hoffa says that teamsters General President Dave Beck has given him supervisory authority over the 9-State Southern Conference of Teamsters which include Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.

"When an investigator for a Congressional committee kidded Hoffa about the black eye he received in the fight at Charlotte, Hoffa quipped:

" 'I took care of myself okay. You should have seen the other guys—two of them went to the hospital.'

"Police said one of the truckers injured his arm quite badly, and one suffered a bloody nose, but that they had taken none to the hospital.

"Hoffa was proud that he had taken care of himself with his fists, but he says he is opposed to using such physical force in settling disputes with other labor officials or with employers.

"He blames 'antiunion police' for the numerous arrests in connection with assault, and points out that he has only one conviction for assault and battery.

"Detroit police department file No. 59,527 shows that Hoffa was arrested for investigation of assault charges three times before his first conviction on February 4, 1938. Hoffa paid a $10 fine on the assault and battery charge.

"On March 30, 1938, he was arrested on a charge of disturbing the peace but it was dismissed in April 1938.

"In June 1938, a special investigation squad arrested Hoffa but he was discharged the same day.

"On February 16, 1939, Hoffa was arrested on a charge of molesting and disturbing workmen at work, but 11 days later this charge was dismissed.

"Hoffa was arrested November 2, 1939, on a charge of molesting a truck driver, but was discharged immediately.

"On February 10, 1940, Hoffa was arrested in the investigation of a shooting, but he was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus February 13, 1940.

"In 1942, Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of violating the Federal antitrust laws, paid a $1,000 fine, and was put under a permanent injunction.

"The indictment and injunction involved the teamsters union agreements with four wastepaper firms which it was contended created a monopoly.

"In 1947, Hoffa and 17 associates were indicted on charges of violating the labor laws of Michigan by extorting $5 fees for permits for grocery and meat dealers to use to pick up meat at various packing houses and wholesale establishments.

"Again Hoffa entered a plea of nolo contendere, when the charge was reduced to a misdemeanor, and paid a $500 fine.

"Hoffa's police record was barren from 1947 until the Charlotte affair.

"The troubles between local 71 and the International Teamsters Union had started about a year ago when an election in the local upset the previous leadership. Bud Jenkins defeated A. L. Gunter for president.

"The international union removed Jenkins, put the local union in trusteeship, and named Gunter a district trustee with headquarters in Charlotte. Many local union

members considered this to be a high-handed action by the international union.

"Hoffa went to Charlotte in September to work out details of contracts with employers. The negotiations had taken about 5 weeks, and local union members contended that they were not apprised of contents of the contract until time for a vote.

"Union Steward Ewing complained that Hoffa and others 'approved the contract without knowing anything about working conditions here.'

"He also declared that, although the membership heard rumors about the contract provisions, it wasn't until the day of the altercation that they learned the details. It was read to them.

"Instead of the locals' usual secret ballot, Hoffa, Flynn, and Kavner took a public head count.

"In general, the local drivers complained that a one-half cent per mile increase annually for the next 3 years was nullified by contract provisions increasing the layover time from 12 to 13 hours for over-the-road drivers.

"Under the previous contract, the employer had to start paying the driver after a 12-hour layover even if he wasn't driving.

"The contract negotiated by Hoffa provided increases of 35 cents an hour for dock workers and warehousemen and pickup and delivery drivers with a minimum of 45 hours a week.

"This brought the pickup and delivery drivers pay to $1.68 an hour, and the weekly minimum to $75.60. The pay of dock workers and warehousemen was boosted to $1.53 an hour with $68.85 weekly minimum.

"International headquarters of the teamsters' union said the altercation was a result of a misunderstanding. Some members of local 71 hadn't understood the contract Hoffa had negotiated for them, it was explained."

"HOFFA'S FRIENDS DRAW MILLIONS FROM UNION INSURANCE FUND DEALS

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—Teamsters' union insurance premiums of more than $9 million were paid a year ago to an insurance firm operated by friends of James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa, chairman of the Central States Conference of Teamsters.

"The teamsters' union official admits that he used his influence to throw the health and welfare insurance for a 22-State area to an insurance firm operated by the wife and son of a Chicago labor leader, Paul (Red) Dorfman.

"'I think it was the best insurance we could get,' Hoffa said. 'I still think so. Our insurance fund is clean—one of the best in the country. None of these investigations has been able to show that one dime is missing.'

"Two Congressional inquiries have been made into the teamsters' health and welfare insurance fund paid to Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co., of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

"Some of the employer trustees objected to having the insurance placed with Union Casualty & Life, headed by Dr. Leo Perlman, executive vice president.

"However, Hoffa convinced employer representatives the insurance program should be placed with Union Casualty in 1949, and he's kept it there in the face of Congressional investigations and criticisms.

"In 1953, a House labor subcommittee brought out the fact that Allen Dorfman, then 30, and his mother, Rose Dorfman, had cleaned up more than a million dollars in commissions in the period from 1949 through June 1953.

"Investigators testified that $101,000 was missing from the Dorfman insurance agency. Allen Dorfman declined to testify on this missing $101,000 on grounds that he might incriminate himself. Hoffa testified he received none of the missing money.

"At present, a Senate labor investigating subcommittee headed by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, is taking another look at the operations.

"There has been no criticism of theft or loss of money from the funds while held by the trustees.

"However, there has been considerable criticism of the huge commissions that have flowed to Hoffa's friends. The hearings also pointed out that Hoffa has been engaged in lucrative joint business enterprises with friends who received these huge commissions.

"Hoffa contends members of the teamsters' union in the 22 States are getting the best possible coverage at the best price.

"Hoffa's friends—Mrs. Dorfman, Allen Dorfman, and Perlman—have drawn millions in profits from the Union insurance agency in Illinois operated by the Dorfmans, and from Union Casualty & Life.

"At the same time, Hoffa has entered into joint business operations with the Dorfmans and Perlman, including oil leases in North Dakota and Jack-o'-Lantern Lodge, a camp near Eagle River, Wis.

"Hoffa testified his partners in the Jack-o-Lantern Lodge were Allen Dorfman, Rose Dorfman, Owen Bert Brennan, and Phil Goodman, a Chicago lawyer. Brennan is another Detroit teamsters' union official and is regarded as Hoffa's top aid in the union.

"Hoffa says he is in a partnership with Brennan, Allen Dorfman, Mrs. Dorfman, and Perlman in Northwestern Oil Co., Bismarck, N. Dak. According to Hoffa, each of the partners put up $10,000 for that venture in oil leasing.

"The 42-year-old vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America says he finds no conflict of interest in using his influence to place insurance with his business associates and friends.

"'I've got a right to make legitimate investments,' Hoffa declares. 'I've got a right to have these people for my friends. Paul Dorfman was my friend years before this insurance deal came up.'

"To this date Hoffa has received no criticism from the teamsters general president, Dave Beck, a fellow whose own private investments have made him a millionaire.

"Hoffa points to this lack of criticism from Beck as a sort of endorsement for the way the teamster health and welfare funds are being handled.

"Hoffa has been a key figure in bringing together the central State conference of teamsters welfare fund with the States of the southern conference of teamsters and steering them to Union Casualty.

"The Michigan conference of teamsters operates from a separate fund, but the insurance is placed with the same company.

"Under the contract signed for the over-the-road drivers for the period from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1961, employers must contribute $2.25 a week for each employee. A pension plan has been added in the contract calling for an additional $2 a week contribution for each employee.

"Under the Taft-Hartley labor law, these multi-million-dollar funds are jointly administered by an equal number of representatives of labor and of management.

"Congressional committees have stated that in practice, the management trustees often disregard their responsibility and try to curry favor with the labor union officials who are trustees.

"Hoffa has been a long-time friend of Red Dorfman, head of local 20467 of the AFL Waste Material Handlers Union in Chicago.

"Perlman, as operating head of Union Casualty & Life, cultivated labor leaders such as Hoffa, Brennan, Dorfman, and Frank Darling, head of local 1031 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in Chicago.

"A House committee investigative report states that the direct premium payments to Perlman's firm jumped from $1,460,000 in 1948, to $8,900,000 in 1952. Nearly 77 percent of the 1952 premiums came from the teamsters' union and Darling's electrical workers.

"In the last year, the total premium payments to Perlman's firm have soared to more than $11 million. More than $9 million of this comes from the huge 22-State teamsters bloc dominated by Hoffa. Another $1,500,000 comes from health and welfare insurance premiums for the 35,000 to 37,000 members in Darling's Electrical Workers Union.

"Hoffa contends that the contract with Perlman has been mutually beneficial, since it has enabled the Michigan conference of teamsters to buy a $250,000 bloc of preferred stock in Union Casualty & Life.

"This made the Michigan teamsters the largest holder of preferred stock. With the payment of $40 a share—another $250,000—this stock can be converted to common stock with voting privileges on an option that must be exercised before January 1, 1956.

"Congressional investigators have pointed to the problem involved if union ownership in an insurance company is such that union officials have an interest in curbing the claim rate of members of other unions insured by the company."

"FEAR OF REPRISALS CITED—HOFFA NEARLY WRECKS CAREER OF TRUCK OFFICIAL

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—A number of disputes with James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa have nearly wrecked the career of a Des Moines man as a representative of the trucking industry.

"Willis J. McCarthy, an attorney who represented the Midwest Operators Association, told Congressional investigators that when he disagreed with Central States teamsters chief Hoffa, his clients were harassed with labor grievances.

"One employer had as many as 60 grievances filed against him in 1 month, with only a few of the grievances justified, McCarthy said.

"McCarthy said Hoffa had forced a Des Moines transportation firm to rehire 8 truck-drivers, 5 of whom admitted that they had made illegal charges for second-story deliveries and were pocketing the money.

"Hoffa boasted he would break McCarthy's clients, laughed at him for his futility in fighting the teamsters, and after having defeated McCarthy called him to chide him, McCarthy testified.

"McCarthy was one of the employer representatives in 1949 when Hoffa prevailed upon the trustees to place the multimillion-dollar health and welfare insurance policy with Union Casualty and Life, Mount Vernon, N. Y., bringing big commissions to Hoffa's friends.

"McCarthy said the employee representatives gave in to avoid 'reprisals (by the teamsters) against their companies.'

"As an example, McCarthy testified that when contract negotiations broke down in a local cartage driver's contract in Kansas City, Mo., the teamsters shut down operations of the trucking concern at such distant points as Denver, Colo., Des Moines, Iowa, Omaha, Nebr., St. Paul, Minn., South Bend, Ind., and Detroit, Mich.

"'In these distant cities they had local cartage contracts that were fully in effect and an over-the-road contract that was fully in effect, and that should not be affected by anything that occurred in Kansas City,' McCarthy told Congressional investigators.

"'Did Hoffa ever tell you what would happen to your clients because you were representing them?' asked Chief Counsel William M. McKenna, of the House Labor Investigating Subcommittee.

"'Hoffa told me that I should make an effort to get along with him; and if I didn't, that grievances would be filed against the

carriers, and they would be struck as a result,' McCarthy testified.

"McCarthy said that in the case of drivers making extra charges for second-story deliveries the union contended that the charges were tips and that no dishonesty was involved. Forty city drivers and 50 road drivers went on strike, and teamsters' union members in Kansas City, St. Louis, and St. Paul picketed the company.

"McCarthy said the firm was faced with 'giving up or going broke, so we gave up.'

"McCarthy related that when a committee met to settle the case there were dissenting votes.

" 'I asked the committee be polled to get the result of the vote,' McCarthy said. 'Hoffa said, "If you want the committee polled, we will shut you down, and you will stay shut down forever. Now, if you want the committee polled, that is your answer." '

"McCarthy said he asked for a recess to consult with the president of the company, and that the company president said:

" 'I can't afford another strike. If I have another strike, it will mean we are broke.'

"The eight drivers were put back and were paid somewhere between $3,000 and $4,000 back pay without requesting a poll of the committee, McCarthy said.

"McCarthy said Hoffa called him on the telephone to ask, 'Do you want to keep on fighting, or do you want to give up?'

"Months later, McCarthy was in Washington seeking further Congressional inquiry into the actions of Hoffa in the Midwest.

"However, he was a cautious man. It was obvious that trucking interests were backing McCarthy, but as he called on Congressmen and investigators he carefully avoided naming his employer. He told Congressmen that he did not want his employer revealed because of the danger of reprisals.

"Teamsters President Dave Beck has ignored the request of the New York City anticrime committee that Hoffa be kept out of New York.

"Hoffa was the subject of a scathing report by the New York anticrime committee which was presented by Chairman Spruille Braden this year.

"Hoffa was characterized as a friend and associate of several major figures in the ranks of gangsterdom, and the public was warned that the regional organization of the teamsters union will facilitate the efforts of racketeers to dominate the trucking industry in this area.

"According to Braden's report, even big, tough New York City had reason to tremble at the invasion of the dynamic little labor leader from Detroit.

" 'His (Hoffa's) activities, though well publicized, have not as yet developed in Beck any visible will to take action,' the report said.

"Hoffa's invasions of other areas have been accomplished without the handicap of such organized resistance.

"Hoffa is president of local 299 of the teamsters in Detroit, president of Joint Teamsters Council 43 in Detroit, president of the Michigan conference of teamsters, chairman of the 12-State central conference of teamsters, and is ninth vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

"He has been trustee of a dozen local unions throughout the Midwest, and through arrangements with Beck has had some supervisory authority over the nine-State southern conference of teamsters.

"The New York anticrime committee viewed with alarm the fact that the teamsters union is stamping out the autonomy of local unions.

"The report stated that until recently the racketeers have not been too successful in getting control of the trucking industry in New York.

" 'A major barrier has been the virtual autonomy of the locals in the International Brotherhood of Teamsters,' the report said. 'The result has been that here in New York a few bona fide honest labor leaders have, through the control of their locals, been able to withstand the onslaught of the racketeers and to preserve the hard core of honest trade unionism.'

"The report stated that at the present time 'an intensive effort is being made to break down that autonomy and to gain control over the teamster locals.'

" 'Regional organizations are being used to accomplish this end,' the report said. 'The resultant centralization of control, in the opinion of experts, will facilitate the efforts of racketeers to dominate the trucking industry in any area, provided they are able to get control of the regional office of that union.'

"The report pointed out that in recent city-wide strikes in New York 'the accepted spokesman for the trucking unions was replaced by order of Hoffa.'

" 'Hoffa put in as spokesman a man who has been a lifelong associate of the worst gangster in this city. The strike was settled on terms dictated by Hoffa.'

"The report then pointed out that Hoffa was 'the same man whose activities in the field of union welfare funds was the subject of disclosures by this committee and later by Congressional committees.

" 'He, himself, is a friend of several major figures in the ranks of gangsterdom,' the report said.

"The anticrime committee said the rise of Hoffa to a position of prominence in the teamsters union was due in large measure to the backing of a few nationwide trucking firms who have purposely played into his hands.

" 'Hoffa's plans for New York City, though not publicized by him, have been uncovered by your committee's investigation,' the report stated.

" 'Any trucking firm desirous of favored treatment can easily get it by retaining one of a few select labor-relations firms and by going along with suggestions as to what insurance agencies will handle the union welfare and insurance funds.'

"The report warned that 'certain leaders in the New York City trucking industry have already been approached with this proposition.'

"The report stated that there is much indecision in the trucking industry as to whether to go along with Hoffa's plan.

" 'They are bothered by the realization that one major weapon of Hoffa's is a plan which will ultimately relegate the local trucker to a very minor status in the industry,' the report said.

"The report stated that other leaders in the trucking industry 'have decided to combine their efforts in order to fight Hoffa and his racketeering allies.'

" 'These men, unlike their colleagues, realize the truth of the statement that "you employ the racketeer on Monday—he is your partner by Wednesday—and your employer by Friday." '

"The grand juries' indictments and Congressional committees that had criticized Hoffa over the years had never hit him any harder that the New York Anticrime Committee. The crime committee continued to gather information on Hoffa's contacts with Johnny Dio, a convicted extortionist who operates a labor relations firm.

"But, as if in defiance to the anticrime group, Hoffa continued to visit New York for the teamsters union. He said it was on authority from General President Beck."

"TEAMSTER BOSS EYES BECK POST—HOFFA SYMBOL OF DEFIANCE OF CONGRESSIONAL PROBERS

"(By Clark Mollenhoff)

"WASHINGTON.—James R. (Jimmy) Hoffa stands as a symbol of the teamsters union's successful defiance of Congressional investigators in the past few years.

"This little Napoleon of the drivers union is a shrewd, fearless, and aggressive warrior in the battles to expand the jurisdiction of the teamsters, to solidify it, and to defend his allies against those who attack them.

"He appears to be in no hurry to seize the crown from General President Dave Beck. He is merely moving to make alliances that will put him in line for the top post when Beck bows out.

"Throughout the central States conference of teamsters, local teamsters officials have been under the fire of Congressional investigators and grand juries.

"Hoffa has stood his ground when he has been under fire personally in Michigan. He has consistently backed those in his area who have been scorched by Congressional committees, indicted, or convicted.

"As chairman of the central States conference of teamsters, the 42-year-old Detroit man has been the bulwark of the teamster defense against Congressional committees that have conducted investigations in Minneapolis, Minn., Kansas City and St. Louis, Mo., Chicago, Cleveland and Akron, Ohio, and Detroit, Mich.

"Lack of records and lack of access to union records hampered investigators throughout 3 years of investigation. When Hoffa was called to explain the lack of records in his Michigan area, he testified he had approved the destruction of financial records to conserve space.

"Congressional committees and grand juries have plagued his career as a labor leader almost from the outset, but Jimmy said he has learned that all these things blow over. There are no indications that Hoffa's policy has hurt him at this stage.

In July 1953, the New York Anticrime Commission was critical of Hoffa as a lifelong associate of the worst gangsters in this city, and Chairman Spruille Braden asked that President Beck keep Hoffa out of New York.

"Beck declined to move against Hoffa, and in a nationwide television show asserted that he found nothing in Hoffa's operations to criticize.

"The various teamsters union members and officials who gathered in Washington for dedication of the $5 million teamsters building certainly didn't indicate any disenchantment with Hoffa.

"Minor officials made him the center of attention with an effusive greeting.

"Although he strutted with the carriage of one who expected this as his due, he had the names of all on the tip of his tongue and a quick comment that made it apparent he remembered them.

"His table gets a constant stream of minor teamsters officials. Some want to thank him for help in cutting redtape to settle administrative problems, or problems with employers. Others want to ask him to contact the heads of large organizations to iron out difficulties that local officials have found impossible to handle with regular labor-relations representatives of the firm.

"Beck can visit the White House and walk with kings, but Jimmy Hoffa is working 14 to 16 hours a day on the contacts that make him the No. 2 power in the 1,500,000-member International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

"Hoffa has two telephones in his home in Detroit. The number of the upstairs phone is known to business agents and other officials of the teamsters union.

"Hoffa says he is available 24 hours a day to hear the problems of any of the teamsters in his 22-State area.

"Hoffa also will take up the problems of local labor leaders in New York, New Jersey, Maryland, or North Carolina. Jimmy says this activity is not an encroachment on Thomas E. Flynn, head of the eastern conference of teamsters.

"Flynn is not an international vice president of the teamsters union, and Hoffa says that Beck had authorized him to go in and settle problems in those areas.

"Hoffa has continued to branch out in the East, and make plans for further organization drives in the Middle West despite the upsetting influence of indictments in the last 2 years of top teamster officials in St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, Chicago, and Minneapolis.

"Hoffa and his lawyers have listened to the problems of indicted teamster officials with a sympathetic ear. They had then set about giving what they consider to be sound advice for beating the rap, or copping a plea.

"When Gerald P. Connelly, former official of local 548 in Minneapolis, copped a plea of guilty to violation of the Taft-Hartley labor law he was acting on the advice of Hoffa.

"Hoffa said he listened to the story behind the charge that Connelly had illegally accepted $300 from an employer in violation of the Taft-Hartley law.

"In Hoffa's opinion it was a technical violation but there were so many problems involved in trying to beat the case that Hoffa advised Connelly to enter a plea of guilty and was fined $500.

"Later, when an effort was made to oust Connelly as a convicted labor racketeer, Hoffa was on the three-man committee that studied the case and recommended to Beck that Connelly be reinstated.

"Hoffa is equally critical of the indictments returned against Harold Gibbons, St. Louis teamster official; Orville Ring, teamster boss in Kansas City, and William Presser, Cleveland, chairman of the Ohio conference of teamsters.

"Presser paid a $1,500 fine after pleading nolo contendere (no contest) to a charge of conspiracy to create a monopoly in the distribution of candy and tobacco products in Ohio. Neither Gibbons nor Ring was convicted.

"Connelly and Hoffa had been friends for 20 years, and Hoffa stuck with a friend while he was in trouble.

"In the teamsters union, Hoffa is regarded as a man of his word whether he says he will back you, or whether he says he will get you.

"In November 1943, Hoffa paced back and forth outside of the door of an eight-floor courtroom of the Federal Building in Detroit. A Congressional hearing was in progress that was aimed at Hoffa. A committee ruling forced Hoffa to stay on the outside.

"He was the center of attention as he moved back and forth shouting his dislikes for Chairman Wint Smith, Republican, of Kansas, and his archenemy, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, who were conducting the hearings.

"On one occasion he cursed a personal representative of Teamster President Beck, and accused Beck of instigating the Congressional inquiry to get him. The representative of Beck said there was nothing to such reports, but he carefully avoided denouncing Hoffa for making such an accusation.

"Hoffa says he likes to run a union so that any member 'can come up and tell me I'm wrong.'

"I like to be able to sit down across the table and argue things out, and when it is all over with I like to forget it," Hoffa said.

"'I've had some tough battles with employers, but I've never seen an employer yet that I couldn't get along with afterward,' Hoffa said. 'I can go out right afterward and have a cup of coffee with them and get along just as if nothing had happened.'

"Part of the reason that Jimmy can be so cheerful after a battle is that he hasn't lost many.

"What is Hoffa's secret of success?

"'You gotta use your pressure, and make sure you got everything stopped off,' Hoffa explains. 'I've turned down a lot of strikes because I knew they (the local union) weren't ready. I won't sanction a strike when I'm not sure they have everything stopped off so they'll win.'

"Hoffa says that when local officials come in with just a feeling they can win a strike, he sends them back for the facts.

"'They have to show me,' he said. 'It must be done on a scientific basis. When you put the screws on you're sure they'll have to come your way.'

"Hoffa doesn't try to give the impression that he has never had any abortive attempts to organize, but he has considered those only temporary difficulties.

"At present, Hoffa is making big plans to organize the service stations, grease racks, and parking lots all over the area from the Appalachian Mountains to the Rocky Mountains.

"Hoffa says he's made some exploratory moves in his home territory around Detroit, and has concluded that it is not yet time for the big move.

"The teamster's action in Detroit was in part successful, but some of the big service stations just closed up and went home. The big oil companies then cut gasoline prices on the outskirts of the affected area, and this drew customers enough to keep the total gallonage up, Hoffa said.

"'It proved we've got to go at this in a wider area to really make it hurt,' Hoffa said. 'They think they have us stopped, but we've been doing some planning recently that will set these big oil companies up for a big surprise.'

"Hoffa asserts that the teamsters should have a right to organize small firms in which a man runs his own business and has no employees outside of his family.

"He cites the organization of the independent juke-box owner as essential, and each of these independent juke-box operators 'is a threat to the teamsters, and to organized labor as a whole.'

"Hoffa cites the case of the unorganized musicians who might work as independent entertainers if it were not for the tight musicians union.

"'Look at the way Petrillo has things sewed up,' Hoffa says. 'There is no reason why the teamsters shouldn't have it the same way.'

"If Jimmy Hoffa has it his way, he's going to have highway transportation, and everything else in teamsters jurisdiction, sewed up as tight as the musicians union."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, carrying on in spite of almost insurmountable handicap of being blind, a blindness caused by the enemies he sought to drive from labor, Mr. Victor Riesel, practically born into the labor movement and raised among many of its leaders, writes a syndicated column that probes deeply into the evils now being exposed by the McClellan committee. Typical of his daily efforts is the column which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks, touching in a broad way on the New York end of the investigation now underway.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

The rackets will bust inaudibly in the Senate hearing room when Counselor Bob Kennedy puts the New York show on the boards knowing that virtually all of his witnesses will be silent men slipping on and off the stand.

If anybody but the interrogators talk as Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN conducts what he considers his most vital hearing, it will be the summer audience. For this time, the committee will face the real pros. Deadly men tell no tales about each other.

What has gone before, in the words of one committee member, is "penny ante stuff." In the other cities, looting was a sideline. In New York it is "an art"—not for art's sake—but a multimillion-dollar-a-year business which Bob Kennedy discovered took in parts of 12 national unions.

In the Big Town he found that over the past 6 or 7 years the mob moved in to increase its other income by buying and selling unions or setting them up as they would bawdy houses or speakeasies in the old days. These unions also became the outlets for deserving young hoods who had to be placed in some lucrative steady jobs to help keep the combine intact.

For almost 18 months Bob Kennedy's men had dug into the labor-crime pattern in New York. If they found one witness willing to talk from the inside, it is a secret that hasn't leaked. East is East, and this probe was tougher and grimmer than digging into the western teamsters.

There were many men who dealt with Dave Beck and Frank Brewster, head of the Western Conference of Teamsters, who were willing to talk of their business relations with those saviors of the proletariat. But in New York it soon was obvious that silence was golden and lack of it could be leaden.

Not one teamster here talked. Not one employer really opened up. Obviously they preferred to be shaken down. The mobsters did not battle each other here as they did in Portland.

Compared to the big city's big-timers, the westerners were amateurs. Kennedy's man found it easy to trace their travels, their expenditures, and their phone calls. The New Yorkers, long accustomed to underworld fashions, always used public phones, not only so they couldn't be easily tapped, but because there would be no traceable record of the numbers reached or the persons talked to that way.

Almost always the eastern crowd traveled incognito and used false registrations on airlines and in hotels. Unlike the western looters, the boys from down east seldom used checks. They dealt in cash, kept no books, and lived quiet, circumspect lives.

They trusted no one. They had a counter-intelligence system which could match the Army's G–2. They tapped wires. They infiltrated other groups. They communicated daily, sometimes hourly, with each other across the network of major cities.

They knew each other's business and how much each made from the sale of labor peace or the sale of a new union charter, and what the "take" was from dues and special assessment of unions covering new territories.

They managed themselves well and were organized in a sort of shadow association, for this was a type of business. There was no central high command, and there doesn't seem to be any now. But while all seemed equal, some were more equal than others—depending on their ties to other forces and how many favors they could deliver to the others.

The man who could deliver new union charters, or order picket lines lifted, or throw one up most frequently was, therefore, the most sought after.

Bob Kennedy's men found that this combine was as much a group of labor leaders as Khrushchev's "people's republics" are free nations. Some 50 Senate investigators found that many of these unions never signed a real contract and never legitimately negotiated wages, hours, or working conditions.

Slowly the probers pieced the story together and subpenas have been going out. The final ones were delivered on July 1.

They were handed to colleagues of one Johnny Dio, accused of so many legal and ethical breaches it would serve naught but the acid bitterness of frustration to list them

here. The subpenas call on the witnesses to be ready to testify in Washington on July 15.

These hearings will run until Congress adjourns. Then the committee will recess for a month. Perhaps they will be resumed in the fall. It all depends on how much of a story the racket busting committee can tell the world through its questions. There will be no answers.

There will only be a pocketful of "fifths."

Mr. GOLDWATER. While these brief remarks are recognized as not covering by any means all the men actively engaged in the reporting of union misdoings, we must recognize that none of these reporters could be successful without the cooperation of either their syndicates or the newspapers for whom they write. Among the larger newspapers of the country none has done a more outstanding job in exposing labor racketeering than the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In 1954, the Pulitzer Publishing Co. of St. Louis produced a brochure outlining the story of this newspaper, and I am sure they will excuse me if I quote directly from the pages of this interesting booklet, which describes how this prominent midwestern newspaper led in the fight against racketeering and misconduct in the labor unions of the St. Louis area.

I ask unanimous consent that the quotation be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the quotation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning also in 1951, the Post-Dispatch carried out an investigation of phases of the construction industry, in which extortion, infiltration of labor by organized crime, and improper monopolistic alliances were found. It started with a seemingly limited inquiry into exorbitant costs of emergency defense construction at Scott Air Force Base, near Belleview. In time, the results were felt across the country in the construction industry. Material for a succession of news articles that brought this about was gathered and written by Carl R. Baldwin of the paper's staff. The stories gave names, dates and amounts in cases of oppressive extortion; showed how some contractors were forced out of business, and disclosed that millions of dollars had been lost on Government construction jobs because of labor strife that appeared to serve no legitimate purpose.

The evidence was made available by the paper to any law enforcement agency that cared to use it, but there was no immediate action. The Senate Labor Committee in Washington, which may have feared political repercussions, took a look at the evidence but did nothing. Then Reporter Baldwin and Reporter Link were sent to the capital, where they explained the situation to the House Labor Committee. They turned over to that group a mass of evidence, and made the same information available to the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Meanwhile, the paper continued to publish showings of unsavory deals and evidence of unrest in the industry. As an incident of developments, a faction of the Democratic Party in St. Louis, led by labor men whose names had been linked with the rackets situation, was defeated in the 1952 primary election. In April 1953, a St. Louis Federal grand jury, making full use of the information obtained by the Post-Dispatch and further developed by the FBI, began an extensive inquiry into labor racketeering. Three months later, the grand jury returned indictments charging 15 well-known labor leaders with extortion in violation of Federal law.

When in the autumn of 1953 it appeared that the Federal investigation had bogged down, the Post-Dispatch waged a heated news, editorial, and cartoon campaign to get action. Public opinion was so aroused that the Department of Justice launched a new grand jury investigation that went far beyond the scope of the earlier one. A top specialist in this field was assigned to the work of the Department. Meanwhile, another Federal grand jury in East St. Louis—also using leads supplied by the Post-Dispatch—undertook investigation of similar rackets in southern Illinois. One of the first results there was an indictment charging two widely known labor bosses with an attempt to extort $1,030,000 from a contractor on a strike-plagued multimillion-dollar atomic energy power facility at Joppa, Ill. Another Federal grand jury inquiry into the rackets was carried out at Springfield, Ill.

By spring of 1954, 38 men were indicted in the various inquiries. Thirty-three of them were charged under a Federal antiracketeering act which carries severe penalties on conviction; the others with miscellaneous crimes. The first 3 cases tried in St. Louis resulted in conviction of 6 union business agents, who were sentenced to prison terms.

A decade earlier, the Post-Dispatch had shown that Orville Golden, an official of the hod carriers' and common laborers' union, had admitted that he and 3 associates embezzled large sums from the union. News of this was turned up by James A. Kearns, Jr., of the paper's staff and he and Reporter Link afterward found material for a series of exclusive articles on affairs of this union. Golden was sent to prison on a charge of taking more than $151,000 of the union's funds.

Racketeering practices of John P. Nick, a big boss of the St. Louis theatrical unions, were exposed by the Post-Dispatch, leading ultimately to the conviction of Nick and an associate, Clyde Weston, and their commitment to Federal prisons under 5-year sentences for violation of the Federal antiracketeering statute. The late Charles W. Marsalek handled the exposé by the paper, aided by Theodore P. Wagner and Theodore C. Link. An earlier and unsuccessful trial of Nick in the State courts, for extortion, resulted in a contempt case against the Post-Dispatch and responsible staff members, which attracted nationwide attention, and was terminated in 1941 by a unanimous decision by the Supreme Court of Missouri upholding the newspaper's right of comment on court action.

Nick obtained $10,000 from theater owners in 1936 and $6,500 in 1937, while the movie operators' demand for increased wages went virtually unsatisfied. State Representative Edward M. (Putty Nose) Brady collected the $10,000 for Nick, and was indicted with him in the State case. Nick went to trial in 1940, and his lawyers pleaded that Brady got the money, as shown by testimony, and that Nick's connection was not proved. Circuit Judge Thomas J. Rowe threw the case out of court on a demurrer. At Brady's trial, the same defense lawyers appeared, but were spared the necessity of making a defense when Judge Rowe advised Circuit Attorney Franklin Miller to dismiss the case for lack of evidence. Miller did so. In the civil division of the circuit court, next day, Judge Ernest F. Oakley adjudged Nick liable to the union for the money collected through Brady. The Post-Dispatch printed an editorial on the Nick-Brady case March 5, titled, "A Burlesque on Justice"; its editorial of March 6 was headed: "Judge Rowe: Turn 'Em Loose; Judge Oakey: These Men Are Guilty." A cartoon, "Burlesque House in Rat Alley," accompanied the latter editorial.

Judge Rowe ordered the issuance of contempt citations; and on April 3 he sentenced Ralph Coghlan, then editorial page editor, to 20 days in jail to pay a $200 fine; Daniel R. Ritzpatrick, editorial cartoonist, to 10 days and a $100 fine, and the Pulitzer Publishing Co., a $2,000 fine. The contempt charge as to a news executive, Ben H. Reese, then managing editor, was dismissed, on a showing he was not responsible for contents of the editorial page. The judgment was reversed and all the defendants discharged by vote of all seven members of the Supreme Court of Missouri en banc, June 10, 1941. To uphold Judge Rowe's charge, the Supreme Court held, "would be to narrow the limits of permissible criticism so greatly that the right to criticise would cease to have practical value."

By implication, the Supreme Court discarded a part of the Shepherd case, long one of the controlling legal precedents in Missouri contempt proceedings. That case, decided in 1903, was strongly relied on by the prosecution in the Post-Dispatch case. The majority opinion in the latter case said: "The elaborate argument in the Shepherd case to prove that a publication scandalizing the court was punishable as in contempt was based upon a misunderstanding of legal history." The decision in the Post-Dispatch case broadened the right of newspapers and others to criticize the official conduct of a judge in connection with a concluded case. The Supreme Court said: "The great weight of judicial authority now supports the proposition that a publication, however scandalous, concerning a case which has been closed is not punishable as a contempt."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Seattle Times, of Seattle, Wash., located in the heartland of Dave Beck's operations, has, through the work of its labor reporters, Paul Staples and Ed Guthman, long been engaged in exposing the peculiar operations of Dave, the "fifth's," teamsters union. Typical of the columns that helped to break this case is one of December 21, 1954, which I ask be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Times of December 21, 1954]

TEAMSTER INSURANCE COMMISSIONS NET SEATTLE MAN $259,470 IN 1953

(The health-and-welfare plan of the teamsters union has provoked considerable discussion, both pro and con. This is the sixth in a series of articles on union health-and-welfare plans in the Northwest, and the first of two on the teamsters' program.)

(By Ed Guthman)

Teamster officials in Seattle submit to investigation of the union's health-and-welfare plan these days with hardly a murmur of protest.

The teamsters' health-and-welfare programs here and elsewhere are being investigated from all sides. Two committees of Congress, the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the press have become curious here.

The big question centers on commissions paid George Newell, Seattle insurance executive, who, with his wife, netted $259,470 from teamster group-insurance policies last year.

In the East and Midwest, State insurance commissions and grand juries have started probing.

TEAMSTERS ANNOYED

The teamsters here are annoyed that their program has come under suspicion. They insist that welfare plans covering more than 100,000 teamsters and their families in Washington and 10 other Western States are strictly on the up-and-up.

Dave Beck, teamster president, says the union has developed a model system in the West—open to investigation from any quarter.

Other persons connected with the teamster plans told the Times they welcomed the investigations and hoped the air would be cleared.

As for teamster plans outside the West, the teamsters here officially take the position they will not pass judgment until all the evidence is in.

Since it has become open season on teamster health-and-welfare plans, some of the finger pointing doubtlessly is being carried on by persons with longstanding grievances against the union.

DIFFERENT ELSEWHERE

Unquestionably, the teamsters here are also being tarred by disclosures of dubious dealings in teamster funds in New York, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Detroit, and St. Louis.

Two examples: A New York local's fund went broke after imprudently spending most its income to develop a vacation resort for union members; a Minneapolis business agent, who doubles as administrator of a pension plan, received a $10,000 advance from the fund to help him open a bar and a cafe.

By comparison, the teamster funds operating in Washington appear to be brimming with virtue.

Financial reports made available to the Times showed that the bulk of the money—an average of 85.5 cents of every dollar contributed—goes for benefits.

The teamster's benefits stand up well in comparison with those offered by other plans. Administration costs do not appear to be excessive.

Reserve totaled $283,206 August 31. The reserve is frozen at that figure, which is relatively low. It looks even lower when stacked against the $1 million in welfare funds which James Hoffa, the teamsters' strong man in the Midwest, could spare to invest last week in Montgomery Ward stock.

NEWELL UNDISTURBED

In the rumpus over Newell's commission, Newell remains undisturbed. He expressed the opinion that he is being criticized unfairly just because he has made a good deal of money.

Newell is the broker of record for all of the teamsters' 164 health and welfare trusts in the 11 Western States. His commission is a flat 2 percent of the premiums.

For the year ending February 28, Newell's gross income from teamster health and welfare and insurance business amounted to $459,268.61, of which $332,091.56 was profit.

Under a partnership setup, Newell and his wife received $129,735 each. The City of Hope Hospital in Los Angeles received $69,020.

Newell said he volunteered to help Beck raise $1,000,000 for the City of Hope by giving the hospital a 25 percent interest in his teamster business. Beck agreed and appointed Samuel B. Bassett, attorney for the teamsters for many years, and George Cavano, president of Teamsters' Local 174, as trustees.

In 6 months ending August 31, Newell's gross income from the teamster premiums amounted to $268,047.

MIXED EMOTIONS

Rival insurance brokers regard Newell's commission with mixed emotions. It's nice if you can get it, they say with a trace of wistfulness.

The competitive rate for brokers' commissions on health and welfare plans in this area is 1 percent or less.

Some employer trustees and some teamster officials grumble about Newell's commission.

One employer trustee said Newell's commission was the damndest gravy train in the West.

Another employer trustee told the Times: "I'm not so sure Newell's commission isn't too high, but what can I do about it?"

A few second-line teamster officials questioned whether Newell's commission wasn't out of line. They asserted that the broker's main work is over, once a plan is established and functioning smoothly.

Newell's commission does not violate any standard insurance practices. He points out that, in addition to health and welfare policies, he will write about $1,000,000 in other types of insurance, not connected with teamsters, on which the commissions are much higher.

BRANCH OFFICES OPENED

Newell also justifies his commission on the grounds that he devotes considerable time to the program and has established branch offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles to service it.

Because Newell is the teamsters' broker and the union will brook no argument about it, he has no competition from other brokers—many of whom say they would write the teamsters' health-and-welfare business for less than 2 percent.

To put Newell's relationship with the teamsters into perspective, some background is essential.

Newell is the first to admit that he is reaping profits beyond his highest hopes and that he is cashing in on the brainchild of his former partner, the late Arthur Morgenstern.

Insurance executives, employers, and union officials pay tribute to Morgenstern as a genius in the group-insurance field. He devised a life-insurance plan which the teamsters bought in 1948. It provided each teamster with a $1,000 policy at the then unheard of rate of 84 cents a month—regardless of age.

A year later, when the teamsters got ready to move for health and welfare, they again turned to Morgenstern and Newell.

NEW TYPE OF PLAN

At that time the multiple employer negotiated type plan was new and again Morgenstern and Newell demonstrated to the teamsters a great amount of ability.

In 1950, the brewery workers negotiated 5 cents an hour for health and welfare and the first teamster plan was established in this area.

At the same time brewery workers in California negotiated a health-and-welfare plan in which the employers purchased the benefits.

The plan which Morgenstern and Newell obtained for the teamsters here proved to be much better than those in California. Accordingly, the teamsters made Morgenstern and Newell brokers of record for the 11 Western States.

Employers didn't like it, but the teamsters made it stick.

In the West, the teamsters always have operated under highly centralized authority, and this principle was extended to the health-and-welfare programs. It is another reason why all the union's business is placed through one broker.

Walter H. Briem, of Seattle, chairman of the statistical and welfare division of the Western Conference of Teamsters, has general supervision of the plans throughout the West. His salary does not come out of welfare funds.

The union has administrative offices in Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Denver. Briem doubles as administrator for teamster plans in Washington, part of Idaho, and Alaska.

HANDLING BACKED

Centralized handling of the plans results in more efficient administration, the teamsters say. An obvious byproduct is that it also keeps some local secretary from handling a fund in a way that might embarrass the union.

This thinking was reflected in Beck's unsuccessful effort earlier this year to have his international office screen teamster plans throughout the Nation.

Except for Newell's commissions, the House Labor Committee has given the teamster plans in the West a clean bill of health, the Times learned.

Newell's dealings with Frank Brewster, president of the Western Conference of Teamsters, still are being probed.

The House Labor Committee disclosed at a hearing in Los Angeles in September that Newell had given Brewster 1,000 blocks of stock in an investment trust in 1951, 1952, and 1953.

"COMMISSIONS" LISTED

Committee investigators testified that Newell had told them the payments were in connection with a race-horse stable which Brewster and Newell operate, but pointed out that Newell's income-tax returns listed the payments as "commissions" paid out of Teamster welfare-account profits.

The inference was that Newell and Brewster were financing their stable with welfare money. Both denied it indignantly. They asserted that the money came from Newell's pocket.

Neither Newell nor Brewster was called to testify, though Brewster was attending a convention in Los Angeles at the time. He has stated he wants to testify before the committee and a committee source told the Times he undoubtedly will have the opportunity.

Mr. GOLDWATER. At the very outset of the current hearings on labor racketeering, the names of two Portland men were prominently identified with the original attempts to expose racketeering and political influence in certain labor unions. These two men are Wallace Turner and William Lambert, of the Oregonian, published in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Lambert went directly from high school into the Army, and after service in the South Pacific he returned and went to work for the Oregon City Banner-Courier, and by 1950 was news editor of the Enterprise Courier, a small daily in Oregon City. He left that organization in 1951 to become associated with the Oregonian. For his efforts in the teamster case, he has been awarded the Pulitzer prize, the Heywood Broun award, and the Sigma Delta Chi award.

His associate in this work, Mr. Turner, is a native of Florida, but he graduated from the University of Missouri School of Journalism in 1943. After the war, he worked for the Springfield, Mo., Daily News, until he joined the Oregonian in late 1943. For his assistance in cleaning up a gambling ring in Oregon, he received honorable mention in the American Newspaper Guild's Heywood Broun competition and received the Press Club of Oregon's award in 1951. He received another Heywood Broun award for disclosing land-fraud operations in 1952, and has recently been awarded, along with Mr. Lambert, the Pulitzer prize, the Heywood Broun award, and the Sigma Delta Chi award.

Instead of attempting to have printed in the RECORD columns which would indicate the scope and intensity of the

efforts of these two men, I am offering instead a manuscript which these two gentlemen have prepared for the Quill, a magazine published for Sigma Delta Chi, a national journalism fraternity. This article will appear in the September issue, but I am certain the fraternity will not object to its being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just prior to that date. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Wallace Turner and William Lambert)

A district attorney has been found guilt of failure to do his duty and has been removed from office, a labor leader has been acquitted on the first of 8 indictments against him, some 39 other defendants are in a mad scramble to organize defense on some 100 counts and capitalize on any available breaks.

On the national scene, Dave Beck has become embattled on many fronts in and out of the teamsters union, Jimmy Hoffa has beaten the rap of a bribery charge and leaders of other unions are scurrying for cover as exposure has followed exposure in the Senate labor rackets hearings.

The first series of events is the direct fruit of an exposé published by the Oregonian 15 months ago and only now is finding its belated way through the courts.

The second series makes up a national drama, which threatens to plunge Beck from his throne as head of organized labor's strongest union and perhaps to rend the ranks of the AFL–CIO. It was to this extravaganza that the Portland story served as a prologue.

In the months since April 1956, the Oregonian—one of the Nation's most famous newspapers—has been engaged in the hardest fight of its 106 years. When circuit court resumes in September after a summer recess, other indictments will come on for trial involving those accused by the Oregonian in its exposé series.

Two months of investigation preceded publication of a 12-part series of articles which linked together teamsters union officials, mobsters and Portland's district attorney in a conspiracy to expand vice activities in Portland and metropolitan Multnomah County.

A series of grand jury investigations followed publication of this series. The Oregonian's disclosures also were a key factor in the decision of United States Senate leaders to investigate labor-management rackets. The story told by the Oregonian in the spring of 1956 was unfolded a year later to a national audience in the opening hearing of the newly created Senate Select Committee on Improper Practices in the Labor or Management Field.

As a result of the series, the Oregonian won the public service award of Sigma Delta Chi. The writers, who had been the first witnesses before the Senate labor-management racketeering hearing, won the Pulitzer prize and the Heywood Broun award.

The grand jury investigations had produced more than 100 indictments, some of them against persons accused in the Oregonian's series, others the result of related but independent investigation by the grand jury, the Oregon State Police and the office of the Oregon attorney general. The attorney general was named almost immediately to supersede the Multnomah County district attorney, one of those officials under fire.

Among those indicted who had been accused by the Oregonian were these: William M. Langley, district attorney, convicted on one count and out of office, but with other indictments still to be tried; Clyde C. Crosby, international organizer for Oregon for the teamsters' union, found not guilty on 1 charge, and with 3 left to be tried; Joseph P. McLaughlin, Seattle bookie, and Thomas E. Maloney, Spokane-Seattle hoodlum, intimates of the district attorney and Crosby, as yet untried.

A great many other indictments also were voted. Among those were a dozen or more against James B. Elkins, Portland racketeer who was one of the chief sources from which the Oregonian gained information about details of the conspiracy it alleged. None of the indictments against Elkins, nor those against his employee, Raymond F. Clark, a former policeman, has been tried in the State court. But both Elkins and Clark stand convicted in Federal court of violation of the Federal wiretapping statute.

Meantime, Portland's new mayor, former Sheriff Terry D. Schrunk, last spring was indicted on the charge of taking a bribe and of lying about it to a grand jury. The perjury indictment was tried first and Schrunk was found not guilty. The attorney general has said he will dismiss the bribery charge.

A reporter for the rival Oregon Journal is named on another indictment against Mayor Schrunk. This one charges violation of the State wiretapping statute. Teamster Boss Crosby also is a defendant. The indictment stems from an illegal raid staged by District Attorney Langley, Schrunk, and the Journal's vice investigator, Arthur Bradley Williams, on the home of Clark, the former policeman who worked for Racketeer Elkins

Five tape recordings allegedly containing telephone taps were seized in the raid. The tape recordings, not among the room conversations which Elkins furnished to the Oregonian, were the basis of indictments in both State and Federal courts against Elkins and Clark. Williams, Schrunk, and Teamster Boss Crosby were indicted for copying them, and this indictment named executives of the Journal as coconspirators in alleged setting up of the illegal raid and misusing the evidence so obtained.

It should be noted that recording room conversations is regarded legally as eavesdropping but interception of telephone conversations is wiretapping.

Even 16 months after publication of the Oregonian's series, there has been no letup in the counterattack launched by those accused. Teamster Boss Crosby has filed about $2 million worth of libel suits. Former District Attorney Langley dismissed a $2 million damage action against the Oregonian rather than answer questions in a deposition.

The Oregonian initiated this crusade as a byproduct of another investigation. There had been rumors of teamsters' union connections with racketeers, but nothing to validate the stories until one of the writers, Turner, chanced on it. Turner was assigned to do a research job on an obscure businessman who suddenly blossomed as a leader in the battle of a group of Portland citizens to locate a proposed $8 million coliseum on a site in the eastern section of the city. The businessman also had been involved in a fight against the city's antipinball ordinance.

It was the businessman's pinball activities that caused Turner to go to Elkins, who in addition to his backing of gambling and bootlegging places had operated a pinball "string."

Turner hadn't seen Elkins for many months and was surprised that the 56-year-old racketeer looked so haggard. Questioned by Turner, Elkins offered this explanation: He had been in a fight with the teamsters. Pressed for details, Elkins said he had made some recordings of room conversations which he could produce as evidence to support his story. He produced them and the magnitude of the job became obvious.

Robert C. Notson, managing editor of the Oregonian, assigned another reporter, Lambert, to work with Turner. Lambert had had extensive investigative reporting experience and the two had collaborated on other investigations, reporting their findings under joint bylines.

For 2 months we worked quietly at the job of documenting Elkins' story which we had pried from him a piece at a time. Operating in such secrecy that even other members of the news staff were unaware of the nature of our assignment, we checked documents and interviewed witnesses in Seattle, San Francisco, and Reno.

In Portland, we worked in hotel rooms, switching hotels frequently to avoid detection and the possibility that someone might try to bug our room with a hidden microphone. We rode in rented automobiles which we switched frequently.

Eventually, we reached the point where the bulk of Elkins' account had been corroborated. We had stacks of documentary evidence and affidavits of witnesses. In a safe deposit box were tape recordings, some 70 hours of them of conversations indicating that key teamsters' union officials, District Attorney Langley and various racketeers were involved in a plot to open the town to vice operations.

During the progress of the investigation, Managing Editor Notson and Publisher M. J. Frey had been kept apprised of developments. Few others knew what was afoot, but information began to leak that the Oregonian was investigating the teamsters. We wrote and polished on our series which was then carefully edited. Came the day when it was necessary to decide whether to print. The 2 months of work had been costly. Every prospect was for more expense. So for Frey and Notson, the decision was not an easy one.

The Oregonian was about to stick out its corporate neck and engage in battle with a powerful enemy. Here was an enemy with a powerful economic weapon. The conspirators also could count on the assistance of the district attorney, one of their number, and the district attorney is the most powerful of the local law-enforcement officers.

There was no question that the independent Republican Oregonian would be falsely accused of going into the exposé for political reasons, since many of the accused were Democrats. We also were to be accused of antilabor bias, we knew. Further, it would be known that much of our information came from Racketeer Elkins, long a leading figure in some underworld activities in our town. His background would be used in an attempt to weaken his evidence, we knew.

Then there was the matter of more cost. No one could forecast how long the crusade would continue, or how costly would be legal fees to defend against libel suits we were certain would be filed.

On the other side of the ledger was the opportunity to fulfill the public service obligation of a great newspaper. Financially the Oregonian stood to lose. No crusade could in any way bring in revenue to compensate for the costs of the job that faced us.

The fact that Frey and Notson decided to go into print was a tribute to their courage and determination. They pulled no punches. They told the whole story, not attempting to avoid libel suits by leaving out important elements, or by picking on only the most vulnerable conspirators.

In its first edition of April 19, 1956, the Oregonian began its disclosures. The stories shocked the city and set in motion a counterattack that was just as vicious as the newspaper's executives had envisioned.

District Attorney Langley struck back immediately. He called a grand jury into session and subpenaed three Oregonian staffers, Herbert Lundy, editor of the editorial page, and Turner and Lambert. But the Oregonian's attorneys stifled this by successfully arguing to the court that Langley had

no right to investigate—and whitewash—charges against himself. Then Gov. Elmo Smith ordered the attorney general to supersede Langley.

But the district attorney had no intention of being stopped so easily. Within less than a month Langley obtained a search warrant, later held to have been obtained through fraud, and used it to break into the home of Clark, the ex-policeman employed by Elkins. There raiders seized the five tape recordings with wiretaps on them. These were used by Langley to get indictments against Elkins and Clark. They later were used in the successful prosecution of the two in Federal court.

The Oregon Journal published Langley's defensive statements, including a three-part life story in which the soon-to-be discredited district attorney claimed he was the victim of an unwarranted attack by the Oregonian and underworld elements. The Oregon Teamster, weekly publication of the Oregon Joint Council of Teamsters, began a campaign of vilification of the Oregonian, its reporters, editors, and owners.

Both the teamster paper and the Oregon Journal attacked the Oregonian and Elkins. As we had forecast, Elkins' background was cited as a reason not to believe the charges. The attorney general, Robert Y. Thornton, also was repeatedly attacked. Eventually, Kennedy and the Senate Rackets Committee also were assailed.

Thornton's grand jury sat for about 2 months and returned at the end of July with a stack of 38 indictments, more than a dozen of them against Elkins for a variety of things. He was indicted for his bootlegging and gambling activities; he was indicted for having conspired with Crosby, the teamster boss, to control the pinball racket, and for having plotted to profit from the location of the Coliseum. Crosby was a member of the unpaid city commission which was to select the Coliseum's site. Langley was indicted on several counts.

Then began a series of maneuvers by Langley and his deputies. Witnesses named on the chief conspiracy indictment against Langley were subjected to raids by the district attorney's office and sheriff's deputies. Legal attacks were made on the indictments by all the defendants, and a disquieting story began to emerge: Many of the indictments were technically faulty. They were ordered resubmitted to the grand jury.

In the fall, the situation quieted. But in November, Robert F. Kennedy, then chief counsel of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, came to town. He examined the Oregonian's evidence and began interviewing witnesses. At first Elkins, the most-indicted man in town, was reluctant. But he cooperated and was the star witness when Kennedy opened his presentation for the new labor-management racketeering committee in late February 1957.

We were the first witnesses and acquainted the committee with the general nature of what the Oregonian had done. Then came Elkins and a horde of witnesses produced by Kennedy's investigators. Eventually came Langley's turn. He took the fifth amendment about 100 times.

Then Langley came home and was tried on a neglect-of-office charge, convicted, and removed from office.

Meantime, Kennedy continued to pursue the top teamsters. He had Crosby on and Crosby denied any connection with Elkins, controverting the evidence to show he had known Elkins well and had been associated with him. He had on Frank W. Brewster, top teamster in the West, and Brewster eventually had to admit he had misused union money but planned to pay it back. He had Dave Beck, the most bellicose, bellowing teamster of them all. And Beck took the fifth amendment.

The Oregonian, aided by the national attention of the Senate hearings, continued vigorously the battle to clear the city of an undesirable alliance between certain leaders of a powerful union and the underworld.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The city of Scranton, Pa., has produced two outstanding examples of newspapers and newsmen working for the best interests of their community against the machinations of a union organization bent on terrorizing the city. The chief associate editor of the Scranton Times, Thomas F. Murphy, doggedly pursued the hoodlums who were in control of the local teamsters union to the end that police action finally came and the entire matter was exposed to public view. In recognition of this work, the University of Scranton, at its June commencement this year, conferred upon Mr. Murphy an honorary degree of doctor of laws for his contributions to the American way of life, notably his writings on matters of labor and the welfare of labor. Mr. Edward J. Donohoe, the city editor of this newspaper, has written an exceedingly interesting article on Mr. Murphy and his fight against hoodlumism which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM MURPHY VERSUS DYNAMITERS: LONG CAMPAIGN WAS NOT AGAINST UNIONISM, BUT FOR FAIR PLAY

(By Edward J. Donohoe)

Let me tell you about a fellow named Tom Murphy.

He happens to be a newspaperman.

But more than that, he is a citizen who believes in the American way of life, in orderly process, human dignity, in fair play, and in moderation.

Tom Murphy is a quiet man, but he is a fighter, too.

His rugged Irish face, disarming smile, and gentle voice do not betray the intensity of the burning, hereditary love of freedom that has been his trademark over some 60 eventful years as reporter and editor of the Scranton Times.

He is no Johnny-come-lately in the defense of human rights. And nowhere in the vibrant editorials which fill the pages of Tom Murphy's long journalistic lifetime has it been written that he ever chose expediency over the dictates of his conscience.

In what kind of community does Tom Murphy live and work? What did he do to safeguard those principles of fair play and moderation upon which the American tradition is based?

Not, necessarily, the ancient traditions that bulwark powerful, articulate rights such as free press, free speech and freedom of worship, but the newer brand that guarantees to the lowliest or most ordinary citizen, under the law, the fullest privileges of thought, decision, and action.

And even more, in this complex age, a guaranty of the modern application of fair play, assuring complete, uninhibited protection, also under the law, from vandals who, by unlawful acts, would wantonly seek to deprive any American of his rights.

I give you this example:

Scranton, Pa., where Tom Murphy has labored long as associate editor of the Times, is known as a union town.

Here, John Mitchell organized the coal miners, and as president of the United Mine Workers of America, led them through one of the most violent eras of this Nation's industrial life.

Tom Murphy and John Mitchell were friends.

Here, in Scranton's Cathedral Cemetery, John Mitchell lies at rest. Here, on Scranton's Courthouse Square stands an imposing granite likeness of frock-coated John Mitchell. It is America's first such memorial to a labor leader, built by public subscription.

Tom Murphy has written many editorials on the significance of Mitchell Day (October 29) when hard-coal miners suspend their labors and place floral wreaths at Mitchell's feet.

MINERS ONCE MARCHED

In Tom Murphy's time as a Times reporter, tens of thousands of miners marched around Courthouse Square in celebration of economic gains won for them by John Mitchell.

Yes, and in Scranton, even before John Mitchell, lived Terrence V. Powderly, Grand Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, the secret labor union which was the forerunner of the American Federation of Labor.

Tom Murphy came to know Terrence V. Powderly, too. A colorful and controversial union figure, TV was thrice-elected mayor of the city of Scranton, the first labor mayor on the American scene.

And what about Tom Murphy's own personal participation and contributions to the cause of organized labor?

Before the turn of the century, Scranton had become known as a newspaper graveyard. It was said a good reporter worked only long enough on some publications to earn the price of a train ticket out of town. Tom Murphy helped organize Scranton Newswriters Union No. 3 which brought that unpleasant era to an end.

CHARTER MEMBER TWICE

Labor union charters were obtained by Scranton newspapermen in 1904 and again in 1907. Tom Murphy was one of the incorporators both times. He planned and worked in behalf of the union with other visionaries of that day: John F. Sullivan of the Boston Globe, noted labor writer of his time; John P. O'Connor, brother of the famous Tay Pay O'Connor of England, and many more.

That union and its successor, the American Newspaper Guild, have had more than a half century of uninterrupted contractual relationships with Tom Murphy's publishers. Within the same newspaper framework are a variety of other unions, each with its own history of amicable, gainful and mutually beneficial dealings with the Times management.

Greatness, circulation, and affluence came to Tom Murphy's newspaper as over the years it championed the rights of labor. It defended the miners through the dark days when feudal coal barons were invoking their "divine right" to do what they pleased with a God-given natural resource. Tom Murphy's editorials contributed much to this success and prestige.

Editorially, under his aegis and in the news columns, all labor disputes were treated on their merit, equity, and relation to the public interest. Always there was constant awareness of the fact that there are two sides to every controversy and that any given situation can generate contradictory interpretations. As Tom Murphy often observed, "It all depends on which side of the street you're walking."

In this favorable climate, unionism in Scranton has flourished for more than a half century.

Indeed, it is a union town.

And Tom Murphy, union charter member, likes unions. He couldn't feel otherwise.

But, let's not forget, Tom Murphy believes, above all, in the American way of life, in fair play, and in moderation.

Andrew Ruby, a middle-class dental technician, decided to build a home for his family. He chose a plot of ground only about 2 miles from the central city business district.

Wage rates of building tradesmen are high in Scranton. It is a union town. The only

construction work that isn't union falls into the do-it-yourself category.

Andrew Ruby decided to utilize nonunion labor, or, in any event, he elected to deal with a contractor who wasn't union. He had a right to do so, if he felt like it. There's no law against it.

His builder, Edward Pozusek, began the job. Shortly he had visitors. There was some tough talk about somebody "getting ulcers" if union labor wasn't employed.

Edward Pozusek, who lives some 16 miles from Scranton, was not persuaded to go along. He kept his men working.

Some time after midnight on May 1, 1954, a charge of dynamite was set off in the basement of Andrew Ruby's partly completed home.

Police were called. Damage was not extensive; in fact, it was quite minor. But the technique of the goon squad was unmistakable. Tom Murphy's newspaper gave the story a pretty good play in the news columns; others paid little or no attention.

Forty-eight hours passed. The investigation lagged. No one seemed overly interested. Perhaps it was cynicism, probably it was simple public apathy. That might be par for the course in a union town. When good wage scales are threatened, not many unions stand idly by. But there are effective legal pressures, too.

Here, however, was a clear, open challenge to the principles in which Tom Murphy believes above all, in the American way of life, in fair play, and in moderation—20th century style.

On the second day after the dynamiting—there was an intervening weekend—Tom Murphy sat down and wrote an editorial: Get the Dynamiters. It was calm, mild, and reasonable. But those who knew Tom Murphy recognized his hallmark. He had enlisted for the duration.

This was the first of many editorials.

Police statements to reporters that the dynamiting baffled them, left Tom Murphy unimpressed. His first editorial had pointed out that the identity of the visitors to Andrew Ruby's home was no mystery. From the beginning he urged that Scranton police, if they find themselves stymied, should avail themselves of the crime detection facilities of the Pennsylvania State Police.

WRITES PROVOCATIVE EDITORIAL

Weeks passed and nothing developed. Tom Murphy's seventh editorial was a provocative one: Are the Dynamiters Laughing? There had been no apparent change in the earlier disinterest of townspeople. Perhaps their attitude had by this time resolved to cynicism.

Union circles, generally, swung to the view that Tom Murphy, friend of long standing, had launched a persecution of organized labor per se. To them it seemed out of focus. Were not the police professing complete bafflement? Other newspapers had yet to publish a single line of editorial opinion on the dynamiting. No one but Tom Murphy, really, seemed to care whether arrests were made. Why not forget about the whole thing? Nobody was hurt, much.

During the first 10 weeks following the dynamiting, Tom Murphy wrote 11 editorials, repeatedly demanding that the city investigation be broadened. It was after the 11th editorial that the district attorney's office entered the probe, along with crack men from the Pennsylvania State Police.

On October 8, 1954, 5 months after the dynamiting, the augmented police detail arrested one Paul Bradshaw, a minor union figure, an ex-prizefighter, reputed to be a "strong-arm guy." Subsequent events were to show, after the roof fell in, that he wasn't so tough, at all.

Bradshaw pleaded innocent but a criminal court jury did not believe him. He was convicted on Saturday, February 5, 1955. On Monday, February 7, his first publishing day following the conviction, Tom Murphy told colleagues: "Watch things happen from here in."

Then Tom Murphy wrote another editorial: Now Get the Others.

Thereupon ensued feverish activity back of the scenes.

Bradshaw, sweating out the prospect of a long penitentiary imprisonment, called a conference in the apartment of his sharp-witted girl friend.

The room was bugged for a hidden tape recorder. Everybody had lots to say about the Ruby job, including the invited guests who didn't know, of course, that a concealed microphone was recording the discussions.

MUSIC STARTS GOING 'ROUND

Not long after, Bradshaw decided that he was not going to take the rap alone. He sang. The first perjured lyrics—there were variations as time went on—implicated four accomplices, smalltime hoods like himself.

They pleaded guilty in criminal court.

Now there were reports that the case was ended with the hoods behind bars and Bradshaw, referred to flatteringly by his accomplices as the mastermind, awaiting sentence. These reports were given widest currency in union circles.

Tom Murphy just kept writing editorials: "What About the Others?"

Then, suddenly, came a grand jury probe, ordered by the president judge of Lackawanna County.

Six topflight officials of four big unions in the building and transportation fields were indicted on September 23, 1955.

These men were prominent in community politics, civic activities, etc. They occupied positions of power and influence in areas beyond their union jurisdictions.

The sweeping indictments—felonious use of dyanmite, conspiracy, malicious mischief—in varying combinations of defendants, embraced additional figures.

GOODBYE, GOON SQUAD

The grand jury too, had dug into instances of goon squad hoodlumism that had gone into the records as unsolved. Perhaps this was due to someone's misinterpretation of a union town.

But at the top of the list were those Tom Murphy had repeatedly referred to over the period of his unrelenting editorial campaign as the others.

For the first time in 16 months, Tom Murphy rested at his editorial labors. Younger colleagues were asked to finish the job.

The top defendants went on trial. When a criminal court jury deadlocked, 11 for conviction and 1 for acquittal, and was discharged, Tom Murphy came forward with the benefit of his long newspaper experience.

The district attorney immediatly launched investigation into rumored jury fixing. One juror was arrested on a morals charge.

The second trial was as lengthy and hard-fought as the first. But this time the verdict was conclusive: Guilty as charged.

Tom Murphy wrote all but a few of the 26 editorials appearing in his newspaper between the time Andrew Ruby's home was dynamited on May 1, 1954, and the conviction of the top union leaders on October 23, 1956. He directed the writing of the several he didn't do personally.

The 27th editorial was written October 24, 1956. It was captioned: Justice Is Served.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired. Does the Senator have another item?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have two more items. I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for not more than 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The other newspaper in Scranton, the Scrantonian, has on its staff a writer by the name of J. Harold Brislin, who has been recognized by Time magazine and Westbrook Pegler as one of the outstanding men in the field of labor today. He comes from a newspaper family and has been cited many times for his work in investigative reporting. He, like many other men in the newspaper profession, is also a union member, having been president of Local No. 177 of the American Newspaper Guild. This, however, has not prevented him from recognizing that goons and hoodlums, racketeers and crooks, infest a part of the movement he so loyally embraces, and he has directed his brilliance and ability to exposing these people. I ask unanimous consent that several columns from this newspaper written by and about Mr. Brislin be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Scrantonian of October 24, 1956]

TRIBUNE-SCRANTONIAN UPHELD IN PUSHING PROBE OF BLAST

Enterprise and determination of the Tribune and the Scrantonian in pressing the investigation of a North Scranton dynamiting case to a logical conclusion were largely responsible for the series of dramatic developments which followed the conviction of Paul Bradshaw in February 1955.

When Bradshaw was convicted the probe subsided and to all practical purposes appeared to have stopped—despite the fact that the general public was not satisfied that Bradshaw was alone in the commission of the crime.

Yesterday's conviction of four top labor leaders—as well as the earlier confessions by four members of Local 229, General Drivers Union—demonstrated that the public had ample justification for its opinion.

In his closing address to the jury, District Attorney Carlon M. O'Malley delivered ringing words of praise for the accomplishments of the Tribune and the Scrantonian, adding that Bradshaw, through the two newspapers, "handed on a silver platter" the statement which brought about the indictment of the four men.

In may 1955, after more than 3 months had passed since the conviction of Bradshaw without disclosure of further progress in the case, Bradshaw approached J. Harold Brislin, reporter for the Tribune and Scrantonian, on the street and indicated a willingness to talk—and to back up his talk with evidence in the form of tape recordings.

Bradshaw asserted that he and Miss Helen Canfield had secretly secured tape recordings of conversations with two of the four local 229 members who subsequently pleaded guilty to participating in the dynamiting of a nonunion home project in North Scranton on May 1, 1954.

Those recordings, of discussions with George Murphy and William Munley, gave the impression Bradshaw was innocent of the bombing, despite the fact he actually was involved, because he argued against the use of explosives.

The tapes also tended to free labor leaders of responsibility because repeatedly it was stressed that they didn't want a dynamiting. Bradshaw from the outset has maintained the position that the labor leaders opposed dynamite, while insisting they did desire the nonunion job sabotaged.

Bradshaw and Miss Canfield produced the tape recordings. Duplicate copies were made and retained by the Scrantonian and the Tribune. The originals were turned over to District Attorney O'Malley, together with sworn affidavits by Bradshaw and Miss Canfield.

Things happened fast after that delivery took place.

District Attorney O'Malley called in his county detectives, city detectives John J. "Sparky" Owens and officers from the Blakely barracks of the State police. Those named by Bradshaw—Robert X. Hubshmann, Murphy, Munley, and Joseph Malloy—were rounded up in a matter of hours.

After initial interrogation at the district attorney's office they were transported to the Blakely barracks where the grilling continued for several days—ending finally with the confessions of all four.

However, they refuted part of Bradshaw's first story to the Scrantonian and the Tribune—that the ex-steward for Local 229, General Drivers Union, was not involved. Rather they asserted, correctly as subsequent developments showed, that Bradshaw was an active participant in the plot to damage the property being built at 1045 North Main Avenue by a nonunion contractor.

District Attorney O'Malley, in addition to arresting Hubshmann, Murphy, Munley, and Malloy for felonious use of dynamite, placed fresh charges of perjury and conspiracy to obstruct justice against Bradshaw and also booked Miss Canfield for conspiracy to obstruct justice.

Then District Attorney O'Malley was quoted in the evening paper as labeling as a hoax the sensational developments which broke the case the police had not been able to crack.

And to the further amazement of the public, the district attorney also was quoted in the evening paper as classifying the dynamiting case as completely solved with no top labor leaders being involved.

While the case was being labeled a hoax and completely solved, the Scrantonian and the Tribune were busy obtaining additional and even more sensational information from Bradshaw—who had been tagged the mastermind of the dynamiting.

That additional information, much of it incorporated in a second statement by Bradshaw and the balance verbally passed along to authorities by Bradshaw and this reporter, involved the labor leaders who were found guilty of criminal conspiracy yesterday.

When the second statement and additional information was turned over to authorities it touched off renewed activity, climaxed by a special grand jury investigation and the indictment of six labor leaders, including the four convicted yesterday in connection with the dynamiting.

Also indicted, in connection with another alleged sabotage job on a nonunion contractor, were Robert Malloy and Joseph McHugh, business agents of local 229. Two of the quartet found guilty yesterday, Philip Brady and Joseph Bartell, also were indicted as participants in the second sabotage job—at the Denny property on the East Mountain.

John Durkin and Anthony Bonacuse, the other two labor leaders convicted in the dynamiting conspiracy case, are not among the defendants in the Denny case which is still to come to trial. The first conspiracy trial, last February, ended with the jury deadlocked 11 to 1 for conviction.

Public officials and police officers working on the investigation and prosecution of the accused men included:

District Attorney O'Malley and First Assistant District Attorney William J. Kearney who handled both conspiracy trials of the four labor leaders; City Detective Owens, First Sgt. John J. Tama and Trooper Leo McDonnell of the State Police, and County Detectives Thomas "Tim" Vellela and Adam Wojchiechowski.

[From the Scrantonian of May 1, 1957]

MAJOR NEWS BREAKS CREDITED TO BRISLIN

The biggest news breaks in the Scanton labor racketeering scandal are credited to Scranton Tribune reporter J. Harold Brislin in this week's Time magazine, which hits the newsstands tomorrow. Time calls him tough, aggressive.

Leading off its The Press section, the news magazine said:

"When Teamster Steward Paul Bradshaw went on trial for the dynamiting in 1955, a tough, aggressive Tribune reported named J. Harold Brislin interviewed him and wrote a story after his conviction asking: 'Will Bradshaw talk?'

"Four months later, out on bail and embittered by the way his union pals had let him take the rap, Paul Bradshaw decided at last to talk—to Harold Brislin."

The magazine article continued:

"In a series of surreptitious midnight conferences at Brislin's house, Bradshaw and girl friend sang out the story of the dynamiting and allowed the newsman to copy tape-recorded conversations by the four other goons who had done the job. With affidavits from Bradshaw and girl friend in hand, Brislin turned his story into the Tribune city desk and handed over his evidence to the district attorney.

"Within 3 days all four dynamiters had confessed.

"Brislin's continuing exclusive series in the Tribune * * * led to grand jury indictments against six local union leaders and four of their goons. Later Brislin turned over his files to McClellan committee investigators and even accompanied Witness Bradshaw to Washington.

"Convinced that the committee and the press have 'still only scratched the surface' in Scranton, Newsman Brislin (whose city editor says he has vinegar in his blood) last week was digging deeper into the story that he has followed for 25 months."

Leading off its article, Time magazine said:

"In a society as complex as the United States, it takes more than one man, or one newspaper, or one committee to focus the national attention on a serious problem. While the United States Senate's McClellan committee has produced the national headlines on labor racketeering, it was vigilant newsmen from Des Moines to Portland, Oreg., and back to Scranton, Pa., who sparked the Senate investigation and provided the scattered local fragments that fell into a nationwide kaleidoscope of corruption and violence. The pattern of partnership showed sharply this week as Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S men wound up their hearings on union terrorism in Scranton."

The magazine article observed that "In a few cities have union bullyboys faced a more obdurate press than in Scranton."

The article commented on sensitive white-haired Thomas F. Murphy, editorial page editor of the Democratic Evening Times. It said:

"A Times man for 60 of his 77 years, fighting Tom Murphy is a stanch unionist; in 1904 he helped found the Newswriters Union, a forerunner of the American Newspaper Guild. But in recent years, as labor goons and commissars pushed their thumbs deeper into Scranton's economic windpipe, old Tom hammered tirelessly at union despotism."

[From the Scrantonian of May 3, 1957]

PEGLER LAUDS BRISLIN FOR BEST REPORTING

Columnist Westbrook Pegler who often aims his typewriter at labor racketeering today hails Tribune Reporter J. Harold Brislin's work on the Scranton labor situation as the best job of reporting among all newsmen credited with ventilating labor scandals stretching to Oregon.

In his column this morning on the Tribune's editorial page, Mr. Pegler described Brislin's job as a great job of old-style reporting.

For the second time in 48 hours Tribune Reporter Brislin received national acclaim first through Time magazine which capsuled Brislin's job of exposing behind-the-scenery conspiracy, and today through the Pegler column which is nationally syndicated.

Time hailed Brislin's reportorial work as tough, aggressive, and said he is still digging deeper after 25 months of investigation.

On previous occasions Pegler praised Brislin's work. Today however, he places the Tribune reporter's efforts as the No. 1 job among all newsmen involved in digging up facts leading to Senate probing of labor scandals.

Pegler charges the Kennedy brothers, John and Robert, the former the Senator, the latter the Senate committee's chief, with taking bows for work done by Brislin and other reporters.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Next I present a brief résumé of how a daily newspaper put a halt to teamster labor recruiting in a community of 35,000 persons by exposing the strong-arm tactics of tough union organizers, arousing the community with front-page editorials and news stories into virtually running the labor racketeers out of town.

The year was 1943, a time when the United States was at war.

The community was Port Huron, Mich., which is 65 miles north of Detroit.

The newspaper was the Port Huron Times Herald.

The publisher of the newspaper was Louis A. Weil, Sr.

A teamster goon squad from Detroit, led by Maurice Coleman, a chief lieutenant of James R. Hoffa, and who had a long police record of violence, moved into Port Huron in early March of 1943, to organize the truck drivers of Port Huron's dairies. There had been no request on the part of the drivers for unionization; nor were there any complaints of bad working conditions or low pay.

Coleman was aided by 10 organizers from Detroit—who also were reported to have long police records—and the late Lester "Cuts" Burde, an ex-prizefighter and bartender, who was the local teamster business agent.

Coleman and his goons were armed with baseball bats, tire chains, and an assortment of other makeshift weapons. They drove new automobiles and had C gasoline-ration stamps, which gave them unlimited motor fuel for their cars.

There was no meeting between Coleman and the milk truck drivers of Port Huron. Nor was there any contact made by him or his organizers with the dairy employees to form a local union chapter.

Coleman, instead, went to the dairy owners and told them to organize their workers and pay their dues, or else. Despite the fact that there was not one employee who belonged to the union in all the dairies, the teamster goons struck the plants by setting up picket lines, warning the workers that there would be violence if they crossed the picket lines.

The strike action strangled Port Huron's milk supply.

A team of two Times Herald reporters dug up the facts and the newspaper published them on page 1.

The publisher, Louis Weil, wheeled into action with hardhitting, two-column, front-page editorials while the reporters continued to get the facts, the background record of the goons, and kept a constant vigilance in tracing the movements of the teamster organizers.

Owners of the dairies came forward with their stories. One of them was Mrs. Ada Wurzel, a civic leader who devoted her spare time to Red Cross activities in the war effort. The day she was approached by Coleman was the same day that she and other Red Cross workers accompanied 175 draftees to Fort Custer.

The exposure of the tactics of the teamsters by the newspapers aroused the community. Money was raised to help the milk truck drivers who were thrown out of work.

The junior chamber of commerce and other groups held public meetings, and the wrath of the community came to the boiling point. There was open talk of tar and feather parties for the organizers. The police had to stand by, because there was no open violence, and the courts were powerless to act.

The editorials and news stories continued, despite anonymous telephone calls to the publisher. The unknown callers threatened to bomb the newspaper plant. The news reporters also got threatening telephone calls. As tension mounted, the community became more and more aroused. Groups of citizens formed where the organizers were housed, despite the fact that they moved quarters several times.

The teamster organizers quit under pressure. They moved back to Detroit. The milk strike was over. The truckdrivers went back to work. No one wanted to belong to the union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Times Herald be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Port Huron Times Herald of March 16, 1943]

DRIVE OUT THESE OUTLAWS

The people of Port Huron today are being made the victims of as fine a bunch of pirates as ever scuttled a ship.

Babies are being deprived of milk and sick persons are suffering because a lot of racketeers have this city's milk supply shut off.

It is an intolerable situation and one which demands prompt and decisive action from State and Federal authorities.

Milk drivers of Port Huron, refusing to be forced into a union against their will, have asserted their Americanism and rebelled against as rotten an attempt to invade their sacred rights as has ever been witnessed in this or any other American community.

This is not a question of whether a union is a good thing, or whether it isn't.

It is not a question of employers standing in the way of their employees to organize a union.

It is not a question of wages, hours, or anything else of that kind.

This is simply and solely a question of whether a crowd of highbinders, led by a few outlaws, are going to be able to cram down the throats of good decent Americans a union contract upon which the racketeers can take a rakeoff for themselves.

It is an unthinkable thing, the sort of thing that Adolf Hitler has tried to force upon free men and women all over the world.

It is something which should never for a minute have been allowed to go as far as it has already gone without someone being placed behind prison bars.

Employers, protesting that they have no control over whether their men may consent to join a union, have been laughed at and told to get busy, or they would be put out of business.

Their customers have been taken away from them, or picketed by as frowsy and lousy individuals as could possibly be obtained.

They have been plainly and brazenly told to go ahead and organize their men and that the so-called labor leaders were only out for the dough.

"Come across or else," they have said in just those words.

Decent labor leaders in this community have been shocked by the tactics employed and have so informed this newspaper.

If this sort of thing can go on in this country without any interference from State or Federal authorities there is little use trying to fight a war for freedom.

Why should our sons be spilling their blood all over the world, while a lot of bandits are being permitted to ply their dirty trade at home?

The Times Herald believes the milk drivers are doing exactly the right thing and that they have only done what every decent American would do under the circumstances.

They are not antiunion, or anything of the kind.

They are simply demanding the right, which they are entitled to under the law, to vote themselves on whether they should unionize and, if so, what union they should join.

Their employers would be in direct violation of the Federal law if they attempted to force an organization on them.

The time has come for a showdown.

Drive out these outlaws.

[From the Port Huron Times Herald of March 17, 1943]

WHY NOT A GRAND JURY?

Here are a few facts concerning the manner in which the racketeers, who are responsible for failure of babies, sick persons, and others to get milk, have plied their rotten trade in Port Huron.

Morris Coleman, their so-called international agent, approaches an employer and says, "We want to organize your men into a union."

The employer replies that it is all right with him and for them to talk with the men and see if they want to join.

That's the last the employer hears of them for some time.

Then he gets a letter telling him that, unless he proceeds to organize his men into a union (regardless of whether they want to join and regardless of the fact that it is illegal for him to form a union) they will picket his place and his customers.

They proceed to boycott him.

They also tell the employer that they "Don't give a damn about the men—all they want is the dues."

They state that "these teamsters are an ignorant lot—any man can drive a truck" and that all they are concerned with is getting them "organized" in any way they can.

They want the money.

These are facts.

There are statements that have been made to the Times Herald by responsible men and which we stand ready to prove.

These are the methods of racketeers and not decent and responsible labor leaders.

A grand jury investigation in Port Huron might put some of these racketeers right where they belong.

This is not a question of unionism.

The Times Herald is a union shop and it wouldn't have anything else.

For more than a third of a century we have had union contracts wherever men wanted them and we have as fine men as ever worked anywhere—men of the very highest type and standing in this community.

They are not racketeers.

They are real Americans.

Why not a grand jury to reveal to the public the methods of the persons responsible for the facts that babies and invalids and sick persons, as well as the general public are being deprived of their daily supply of milk?

Why not?

[From the Port Huron Times Herald of March 18, 1943]

HOW DO YOU LIKE THIS?

The Times Herald wants to thank the hundreds and hundreds of persons who have called or written us during the past few days in commendation of the attitude of this paper with regard to the milk situation here.

We greatly appreciate the confidence expressed in this newspaper, but the fact of the matter is the Times Herald is simply doing its plain duty as an American newspaper published in an American community.

When a lot of gorillas and racketeers get a community by its throat and attempt to take over, there is nothing a self-respecting American citizen can do but to fight to the limit of his ability.

We sent our sons to Africa, to the Pacific, to Iceland, and all over the world to die, if necessary, on the battlefields and ships that we might be free over here and the very least we can do is to try to protect their wives and babies at home while they are fighting for us.

God knows if we don't do that we are lost.

This newspaper is a firm believer in the right of organization and collective bargaining, if employees so desire. But to force them against their will into a union through illegal pressure on their employers is a racket not indulged in by honest union leaders.

The degree of patriotism possessed by these scavengers in the guise of labor representatives is best illustrated by what took place in a meeting of the milk wagon drivers with Lester (Cuts) Burde, former bootlegger and prizefighter, now business agent of the bartenders union.

Frank Houk, one of the drivers, prompted by a remark by Burde said: "In other words you and your organization are taking away the right of independence that is given to every American citizen."

At this point Houk was interrupted by Burde who exclaimed,

"Aw, don't give us that American s———."

(Too filthy to print.)

Attesting to the absolute accuracy of this statement are Houk, Clarence R. Smith, William Duncanson, Alger Ashley, Clarence Ogden, Thomas Odom, and Walter Harris, all good American citizens and drivers of milk trucks.

Do you wonder that decent men of this type object to being ruled and lorded over by such filth?

What do you American Legion boys, who fought for their country in the last world war, think of this?

Do you believe decent union men and responsible union leaders will stand for this sort of talk, with their own sons fighting for America today?

Burde is the man responsible for the boycott declared against restaurants and others who sell milk delivered by nonunion teamsters.

Burde is the man responsible for picketing.

There was a time in the United States of America when they didn't fool with people of this type, but things seem somewhat different today.

Surely there is some way under the law to deal with the Burdes and Colemans and other racketeers and surely our law enforcement officials cannot, in all decency, permit this sort of thing to go on.

If we do, we have lost the war before our boys come back and they will return ashamed of their fathers and brothers and everyone else.

Why not a grand jury?

[From the Port Huron Times Herald of March 20, 1943]

AND THIS IS THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

This is the fifth of a series of page one editorials revealing to the public the tactics of the labor racketeers in plying their filthy trade.

Lester "Cuts" Burde, exbootlegger and prize fighter and, of all things, ex-strikebreaker himself, the so-called business agent of the bartenders' union and the restaurant employees, walked into the cafeteria of Mueller's a few days ago.

Here is the conversation as related to us by one of the girls (we have her name and address) who was employed there, but who quit rather than be forced to pay tribute to Burde.

"Why don't you get your employees organized here?" demanded Burde of the proprietor. "Didn't I tell you to get busy?"

The proprietor said he just didn't happen to have the time.

"Well," exclaimed Burde, "we'll have no more fooling. You get this place organized or else ——."

As a parting shot Burde declared:

"I don't want you to wait longer than Monday or Tuesday, do you understand?"

The proprietor meekly said he did.

Incidentally Burde informed this young lady that, having once before been a member of the union, she would have to pay $8.25 to rejoin if she wanted to hold her job, and in addition she would have to pay $1.75 a month dues.

The girls who do not belong to the union must pay $5 to join and $1.75 a month thereafter. Occasionally they are fined by Burde to the extent of $5.

They have nothing to say about whether they wanted to join this union or any other union. They were to be organized by their proprietor and all Burde wanted was "the dough."

This is what has been going on in Port Huron, where this former bootlegger has been strutting about the streets, threatening and boycotting businessmen and taking blood-money from a lot of helpless working girls.

This is the sort of thing which brought on the refusal of the milk drivers to give up their sacred American rights and be forced to join a union which frankly tells them they will do nothing for them and that they don't give a damn about them.

This is the sort of thing which started our forefathers in the flight for American freedom and finally resulted in the Boston Tea Party.

And yet there are a few individuals so lacking in patriotism and so selfish and concerned with their own comfort, that they wonder why the drivers quit their jobs rather than give up their sacred freedom.

Thank God from the great majority there has come a response to the action of the milk drivers which shows that the heart of America is still sound.

There is a way, under the law, to organize a union.

That way is to go to the employees and get them to join of their own free will and accord.

No employer may, under penalty of the law, interfere with this.

The purpose of a union is to improve the working conditions and to seek fair wages and other rights and privileges for the workers.

The purpose of the racketeers is to get a soft living by shaking down a hard-working man or woman.

There are people who ask, "Why don't they go to the courts for protection?"

We are ashamed to say there is no protection from the courts.

This same outfit which has plied its filthy trade here recently said "to hell with that injunction" which had been issued by the court in behalf of a local concern.

And that's their attitude and the courts find themselves helpless.

These are things the public should know.

These are facts which the rotten racketeers cannot refute.

Our soldier boys who are fighting for their country in far-off lands while Burde and Coleman are holding up their fathers and mothers and interfering with the delivery of milk to their babies at home will be interested in this.

If they haven't already heard about it we shall tell them when they get back, and we doubt if Port Huron will be a very healthy place for these slimy individuals.

When the cowardly Coleman came here he called Ada Wurzel on the phone.

"Why haven't you organized your men?" he asked Mrs. Wurzel.

Mrs. Wurzel told him her husband was handling the matter and that the men told Mr. Wurzel they wouldn't join a union.

"I'll tell you something," this bully said to Mrs. Wurzel, "you will organize these men or else——."

And this is the United States of America.

[From the Port Huron Times Herald of March 21, 1943]

WE WANT PUBLIC TO KNOW

This morning the Times Herald had a telephone call—among hundreds of other good citizens who are fighting mad—from Mrs. William DeMars, of Lakeport, president of the parent-teacher association of that community.

Yesterday Mrs. DeMars' son, Wilbert, left for Fort Custer with 170 other Port Huron and St. Clair County boys to fight for his country.

Now Mrs. DeMars wants to know why her son should be taken to some foreign land to fight Japs and Germans in order to preserve our freedom, when we are losing it at home.

Frankly, Mrs. DeMars we find it difficult to answer your question.

We don't know what good it is going to do to send our sons to far-off foreign lands to fight for us, if we are going to permit the leeches and racketeers of the kind who are now operating in this community to take away our rights as American citizens.

Coleman and Burde and their dirty gang are not interested in this American s———, and Burde has plainly said so to the milk wagon drivers.

All they want is a rakeoff on the pay of a lot of working men and girls—$2 or more a month.

Coleman came to Port Huron in a big new Buick car with a "C" license and so have his associates.

An honest workingman couldn't get a "C" license to save his neck, but a labor racketeer can get one simply by asking for it.

Nice situation, isn't it, Mrs. DeMars?

Bet your husband who probably works hard for his living every day, can't get one.

Coleman didn't go to the milk-wagon drivers and ask them to join a union—not that racketeer.

That isn't his way of working.

He went to the employers, driving up in his big new car, and told them to get busy organizing their men or else.

Those were his words, not in one particular place, but in many places he visited.

He said he "didn't give a damn" about the drivers, but was simply a businessman interested in getting "the dough."

The drivers, he said, are an "ignorant lot and anybody can drive a truck."

He didn't promise any better wages, working hours, or conditions, or anything else to the men. He didn't even talk to them and said "to hell with that."

The Times Herald has Mr. Coleman on record and we haven't yet completed the publication of the record.

The whole purpose of these editorials is to make clear to the people of this community and the readers of the Times Herald everywhere what is really going on in this good old United States of America which we all love so well.

We want the public to know something of the methods of labor racketeers, to whom we have referred on many occasions, as distinguished from decent, responsible labor leaders, who are really trying to improve working conditions among working people.

As we have said before, the Times Herald has had a union and a closed shop for a third of a century, and we would have nothing else today under any circumstances.

But we deal and work with honest, responsible, fine Americans who are not out to take pennies from a dead man's eyes.

We don't have any "Cuts" Burdes or Morris Coleman's around our shop, ready to grab off part of the wages of hard-working girls who only get a living.

We want a showdown and we want the authorities in high and low places to help us get it.

We want to put some of these gorillas where they belong and we're not going to be "shushed" by anybody.

We're still free, thank God, and we're going to keep right on fighting to maintain that freedom as long as we live.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, my colleagues will wonder why I have used the time of the Senate today and have asked for this large amount of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I believe an explanation is due them. It is often said that the American people do not read the editorial pages of their newspapers, and, from the expressions of surprise at the exposés being made by the McClellan committee, I am inclined to agree. The situations that are being unfolded are not new; they have existed for years, and many eminent newspapermen and newspapers have been discussing them daily in their editorials and on their editorial pages through the medium of columns.

That we have had our Fays, our Becks, our Johnny Dios, our James Hoffas, our Willie Bioffs, our Frank Brewsters, should not come as a surprise to anyone, but the fact that it does causes me today to make available to my colleagues and to those who read the RECORD some interesting background and material which I hope will show the extent to which these misdoings have been covered for many years.

I also wish to point out at this time the great results which real investigative reporting can accomplish for the protection of our institutions and our way

of life. Reporters who are willing to go after the facts, to dig them out, to analyze them and to present them in an honest fashion to their readers, will forever be a credit to their profession and a guaranty that the freedom of the press will continue, and with it the freedom of all Americans.

Mr. President, we are indebted to the men and to the newspapers I have mentioned today, but we are also indebted to many others, who for lack of time and lack of space, I have not mentioned.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 54 to the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6508) to modify the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 959. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes;

S. 1866. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers," approved May 10, 1956, in order to provide adequate time for the formulation and consideration of rules and regulations to be prescribed under such act;

S. 2431. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Klamath River Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 787. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the United States of America and the State of California;

H. R. 1944. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to make inapplicable, in the case of the survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces, the provisions which presently prevent the payment of benefits to aliens who are outside the United States;

H. R. 2741. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands of the United States to the Hermann Hospital Estate, Houston, Tex.;

H. R. 2842. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of certain tanning extracts, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of coconut oil;

H. R. 2979. An act for the relief of Mary Hummel;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico, between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America;

H. R. 3583. An act for the relief of Chandler R. Scott;

H. R. 4602. An act to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct-loan program for veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6166. An act for the relief of Michael S. Tilimon;

H. R. 6456. An act to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned;

H. R. 7467. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the citizenship and residence qualifications of the directors or trustees of certain companies in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance of interests of the United States in and to fissionable materials in certain tracts of land situated in Cook County, Ill., and in Buffalo County, Nebr.;

H. R. 8079. An act to amend the act of June 20, 1910, by deleting therefrom certain provisions relating to the establishment, deposit, and investment of funds derived from land grants to the States of New Mexico and Arizona;

H. R. 8240. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8753. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include California, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Rhode Island among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; and

H. R. 8929. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1935, as amended, to permit the disposal of lands and interests in lands by the Secretary of State to aliens.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 21, 1957, pp. 15508–15509, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by way of explanation, I will say the conference committee reached an agreement on all of the Senate amendments except No. 6, which deals with an additional Washington airport. However, because of a parliamentary entanglement on the floor of the other body during the consideration of the conference report, amendment No. 54, which involves funds for construction by the Corps of Engineers, will have to go back to conference.

After the conference report and the amendments in disagreement on which the conferees have now reached an agreement have been disposed of, I intend to make a motion that the Senate insist on its amendments Nos. 6 and 54, and request a further conference with the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question first is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report, with the exception of amendments Nos. 6 and 54, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9131, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
August 21, 1957.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 15, 33, 34, 43, 45, 47, 49, 50, 57, 58, 64, 69, 70, 72, and 75 to the bill (H. R. 9131) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$1,300,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$20,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$2,400,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$750,000."

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

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

"To complete its final report to the President and the Congress as provided by law, $100,000: *Provided*, That the committee shall complete its report and terminate its activities by December 31, 1957."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, $2,235,000; and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed $6,877,000 from the revolving fund,

Small Business Administration, and not to exceed $490,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation Disaster Loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided*, That the amount authorized for transfer from the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans: *Provided further*, That the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate shall be notified in advance of such increases in transfers from the revolving fund."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 312. The Secretary of Defense in his discretion, is hereby authorized to transfer to the "Air Force industrial fund" not to exceed $75 million from appropriations to the Department of the Air Force available for obligation during the fiscal year 1958."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF POWER SYSTEMS, RYUKYU ISLANDS

"For necessary expenses of construction, installation, and equipment of electric power systems in the Ryukyu Islands, which shall be operated by the Ryukyu Electric Power Corporation, an instrumentality of the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 a day for individuals; $1,513,000, to remain available until expended, without regard to sections 355 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and title 10, United States Code, section 4774."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, authorizing the establishment of a hospital center in the District of Columbia, including grants to private agencies for hospital facilities in said District, $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 644), as amended, on the total amount to be provided for completion of grant projects, is increased from $13,010,000 to $13,300,000: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the total amount for completion of the hospital center is increased from $23,200,000 to $23,413,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an additional amount for the 'President's special international program', including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 2131), $2,745,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available under this head in the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1958, for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, is increased from '$6,500,000' to '$7,045,000'."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 54.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the Senate amendments numbered 3, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 32, 38, 40, and 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator from Arizona what disposition was made of the amendment affecting the matter of counterpart funds in relation to Israeli towns?

Mr. HAYDEN. That was agreed to as passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 6 and 54, request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE POSTAL RATE INCREASE BILL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the other body recently passed a bill in connection with the postal rate increase, which is now before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on which bill hearings are underway.

I sincerely hope the committee will report the bill to the Senate, and that action can be obtained at this session of Congress. The amount involved is $2 million a day—$2 million a day more which will come into the Federal Treasury, if we pass the postal-rate bill.

We all know how dangerously close to the debt ceiling the Government's expenditures are running. Probably the situation will deteriorate in the next few months, before the large tax receipts come in early next year. For that reason, also, I hope action can be taken on the postal-rate bill at this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

THE TOWN OF MEDICINE LAKE, MONT.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1103, H. R. 7384.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7384) for the relief of the town of Medicine Lake, Mont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the water supply of the town of Medicine Lake, Mont., comes from a well located on the western edge of the town. This well is located in what is known as the Little Muddy Valley. This valley is bordered by foothills on its western side and until 1940 any overflow of water from the Muddy River flowed naturally over a 3-mile terrain and no trouble was experienced with floods.

In 1939 and 1940 the Fish and Wildlife Service built a dike and canal which diverted the Muddy River into a lake known as Medicine Lake. The diversion canal and dike extends across the Muddy Valley to a point about 100 feet from the town well. The dike is about 8 to 10 feet high and has the effect of forcing any floodwater into a narrow channel some 30 to 40 feet in width. Prior to its construction it had the full 3-mile width of the valley in which to flow. The mayor of the city has stated that the result has been that the area around the well has been flooded and the well and its pumping equipment has been inundated so as to deprive the city of its water for as long as 24 hours at a time. In the face of flood threats, the city has on occasion been required to remove its pumping equipment and warn its residents to boil all water.

The Montana State Board of Health has taken cognizance of this situation.

The Department of the Interior indicates it has no objection to the enactment of the bill. It observes that the reports of the Department of Health of the State of Montana indicate that the contamination of the town's water supply has become progressively more serious since the completion of the diversion of the creek. On the basis of the material in the files and the facts outlined, the Committee on the Judiciary recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose and the letter from D. Otis Beasley, administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, be printed in the RECORD in connection with the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement of purpose and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide payment for the town of Medicine Lake, Mont., in the sum of $12,000 in full settlement of all claims of the town for damages to their municipal water supply resulting from developments of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1957.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: Your committee has requested a report on H. R. 7384, a bill for the relief of the town of Medicine Lake, Mont. This bill would authorize the payment of $12,000 to the town of Medicine Lake, Mont., in settlement of its claim for damages to its municipal water-supply system. The Federal

activity to which this bill refers, the establishment of the Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge, which provides the basis for this claim, occurred in 1935.

Because of the circumstances in the case, we would have no objection to the favorable consideration of this measure if your committee finds that such favorable consideration is warranted.

The establishment in 1935 of the Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge below the town of Medicine Lake, Mont., required the diversion of a local water supply, Muddy Creek, from the new channel of the creek to its former channel. The city reservoir is located on the edge of the old channel of the creek, however, and we understand that there been some contamination of the town water supply, possibly as a result of the diversion. Our reports on this matter are inconclusive that the establishment of the refuge and diversion of the creek was alone responsible for the subsequent condition of the town water supply.

In any event, we are informed by reports of the Montana Department of Public Health that contamination of the town water supply, while not entirely absent before such diversion of the creek, became progressively more serious after completion of such diversion. Contamination may have occurred, of course, from some other source or in some other manner.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for favorable consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7384) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLICE JURISDICTION OVER THE BLACKFEET HIGHWAY, MONTANA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1086, Senate bill 1828.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1828) to retrocede to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway and its connections with the Glacier National Park road system, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement from the committee report concerning the purpose of the bill, together with a letter dated August 7, 1957, from Roger Ernst, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

There being no objection, the statement from the report (No. 1063) and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The Blackfeet Highway was constructed originally to serve visitors to the Glacier National Park. The United States initially assumed responsibility for maintaining the highway and concurrently with the State, has exercised police jurisdiction over it. Due to shifts in the volume and nature of the traffic over the highway, an agreement was entered into with the State of Montana by which the State will maintain the highway. Retrocession would bring about a change in the jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway which would be in keeping with its changed use and the State's assumption of responsibility for its maintenance.

The Department of Interior's favorable report on S. 1828 is set forth below.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1957.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your committee has requested a report on S. 1828, a bill to retrocede to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway and its connections with the Glacier National Park road system, and for other purposes.

We recommend the enactment of this bill.

The Blackfeet Highway, to which this bill refers, extends from East Glacier Park, Mont., to the Canadian boundary at Carway, a distance of 52.7 miles. The highway was constructed initially by the State with Federal funds in order to serve visitors to the park as well as to provide for various administrative needs of the park. The United States assumed initial responsibility for maintenance of the highway. Also, concurrently with the State, the United States has exercised police jurisdiction over the highway as a result of State and Federal enactments.

In recent years, however, the highway has been subject to heavy use for commercial and international traffic. Therefore, it has lost much of its identity as a road serving the park. The policy of this Department is to relieve the United States from the maintenance of roads outside park boundaries wherever possible; and we entered into an agreement with the State of Montana on April 1, 1956, by which the State has assumed responsibility for maintaining the highway.

In these circumstances, we consider that a retrocession by the United States of police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway, and its connections with the park road system, would be a logical implementation of the State's newly acquired maintenance responsibility.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby retroceded to the State of Montana such concurrent police jurisdiction as has been ceded to the United States of America over the rights-of-way of the Blackfeet Highway, including the highway itself, and over the rights-of-way of its connections with the Glacier National Park road system on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, including the highways themselves, the same being the jurisdiction ceded by the act of the Legislature of Montana, approved February 27, 1929 (Laws of Montana, 1929, p. 63), and accepted by act of Congress approved May 2, 1932 (47 Stat. 144).

SEC. 2. Following acceptance by the State of Montana of the retrocession provided herein, the laws and regulations of the United States pertaining to Glacier National Park shall cease to apply to the territory of said rights-of-way and highways.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 939) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to postpone, until January 30, 1958, at 2 o'clock p. m., further consideration of the conference report.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and that the time utilized in making the call be not deducted from the time of either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum call is in order without any unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to postpone, until January 30, 1958, at 2 o'clock p. m., further consideration of the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The prime purpose of the House amendment pushed upon the Senate conferees, to which some Members of the Senate on the conference committee did not agree and which others accepted reluctantly, is to enable certain railroad companies to win a decision in a lawsuit which was brought in the District Court for the District of Columbia, and which is now pending on appeal in the circuit court of appeals.

An additional purpose of the amendment which was placed in the confer-

ence report, without a hearing, is to remove the injunction by the district court which was granted certain small airlines against certain railroad companies. A further purpose is to try to prevent the collection of damages in the amount of several million dollars because of alleged violations of the antitrust laws on the part of these railroads which were found to have been committed by the district court.

Mr. President, this is an unholy purpose. It is a purpose for which the Congress should not be used. Litigants in a case ought to try the case in the courts. They have no business coming to Congress to try to get themselves out of a judgment entered against them. They have no business to come to Congress to try to remove the restrictions of an injunction issued by the district court. They have no business to try to use the Senate or Congress to immunize themselves from a possible monetary judgment of many million dollars.

I wish to develop a little further the point that this is the primary purpose of this provision of the conference report.

The bill the Senate passed merely provided that the transportation companies under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the case of section 22 rates would file with the Commission a report, the purpose of which would be to enable a statistical study to be made of section 22 rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission was not given any jurisdiction over those rates. The Commission has never had jurisdiction over section 22 rates, according to the court decision and according to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission itself, Mr. Clarke. So the bill the Senate passed had a good purpose.

Then the bill went to the House of Representatives. The House committee reported the bill to the House of Representatives, and recommended adoption of the Senate provision regarding the filing of reports. At about that time the district court in the District of Columbia decided, in a case against the railroads, that they had been guilty of a violation of the antitrust laws. The court issued an injunction. The suit was also for damages in the amount of $45 million. The case is now on appeal to the court of appeals.

At that point, without any hearings whatsoever, without giving the parties to the suit an opportunity to be heard, there was offered on the floor of the House of Representatives—and the matter was treated as a more or less routine one—an amendment to change the position of the parties to that lawsuit by eliminating the injunction, and including the words which would take away the substantive right of the parties plaintiff for damages. All that was done without the holding of any hearings whatsoever. All that was done without giving the parties plaintiff in the suit—the small airlines—an opportunity to appear before the appropriate Congressional committees.

I realize that toward the end of page 2 of the conference report the following appears:

Provided, That nothing in this paragraph shall affect any liability or cause of action which may have accrued prior to the date on which this paragraph takes effect.

I know that language was offered by Representative DINGELL, in the conference, and was adopted.

The original sponsors of the bill and the railroad lobby that is pushing it tried to have the bill passed without having that provision included. But, as I understand, it was added by Representative DINGELL in the conference.

Mr. President, the bill is cleverly drawn. The protection which is alleged to be given by means of this provision in the case of the lawsuit, in my opinion is practically no protection at all; and I wish to demonstrate why that is true.

In the first place, if the conference report is agreed to, the injunction will be meaningless, because in that case the railroad companies will be permitted, by statute, to do exactly what the injunction has said they cannot do; and, of course, the statute will supersede, and will give the railroads the right to do it, and will take away any protection afforded by the injunction. An injunction against a lawful act cannot stand. So long as there is a violation of the antitrust laws, the injunction is valid. But when the companies are exempted by statute from the antitrust laws, the injunction becomes meaningless, because an injunction cannot stand against a legal law enacted by the Congress.

As to the substantative right, Mr. President, this measure is the most skillfully worded measure I have ever seen. It is really a "slicker." I wish to pay my compliments to the clever lawyers who devised the language appearing on page 2, in order to try to avoid the burden of the millions of dollars which the railroad companies may be owing to these airlines, under the decision of the district court, which has decided in favor of the small airlines.

Let us just for a moment examine the language. How any Member of Congress can fall for this strange proposal, I do not know. I begin to read on page 1 of the amendment; the bill would be amended by inserting the following at the end of the section:

2. All quotations or tenders of rates, fares, or charges under paragraph 1 of this section for transportation, storage, or handling of property or the transportation of persons free or at reduced rates for the United States or any agency or department thereof, including quotations or tenders for retroactive application, whether negotiated or renegotiated. After the service has been performed.

Mr. President, the intent there is, of course, is to permit the railroads to file retroactively their tariffs and their applications with the Interstate Commerce Commission, under section 5 (a) of the Transportation Act—that is to say, the Reed-Bulwinkle Act.

If the tariffs or applications are approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, then, of course, the entire cause of action of the small airlines will vanish immediately. Mr. President, that is not right. It is not fair to take away, by means of such clever, slick language, anyone's rights in connection with a lawsuit.

So, Mr. President, regardless of the clause appearing at the end, if the conference report is agreed to, the suit of the small airlines—which they won in the district court—against the railroads, which were charged with violating the antitrust laws, will become meaningless, and the injunction which has been issued will become meaningless, because the action taken by the railroads in violating the antitrust laws will then have been made legal. Furthermore, the cause of action of the small airlines for damages will have been destroyed, because the effort in connection with this measure is to try to obtain retroactive approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission of what the railroads have done in violation of the antitrust laws.

Furthermore, of course, any protection which the small airlines may have had, or any opportunity they may have had to compete with the railroads, in the future will not exist, if this measure is enacted into law, because in that event the law will have been changed.

I have heard it said that the enactment of this measure will do nothing more than apply the Reed-Bulwinkle law to section 22 cases. In the first place, Mr. President, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill—for which I did not vote, but for which many of the present Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives did vote—was passed only after long hearings before the House committee and the Senate committee. After the bill was passed, it was vetoed by the President. Thereafter, the bill was passed over the Presidential veto. The matter was a most highly controverted one. So, even if we accept the statement of those who say this measure is nothing but an extension of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act to section 22 transportation cases, it is strange that the law should be extended to so large an item of business. After all, the Government is one of the largest shippers of both freight and passengers. So it is very strange that such a change would be made without holding any committee hearings at all, and without having the matter receive any consideration by any Congressional committee.

In the case of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, the committee hearings lasted for months and months. The bill was highly controversial. But the present effort is to extend the application of that act to the largest segment of freight and passenger traffic in the United States, and a very large part of the business of the railroads. And it is proposed that that change be made without having had any committee hearings whatever.

Mr. President, it is important to note that the conference report does more than extend the Reed-Bulwinkle Act to section 22 cases. Under the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, bad as it is, the railroads could draw up a tariff, when taking action in concert. The tariff would have to be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and would have to be publicly advertised, and notice of it would

have to be given, and there would have to be an opportunity for objections to be filed to the proposed tariff or rate, and there would have to be an opportunity to have a hearing held before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Thereafter, the Interstate Commerce Commission, acting in a quasi-judicial capacity, and after having given full notice, could approve the tariff, in which case it would be applicable in the future.

Mr. President, all Senators should read the language of the proposed change. None of those safeguards or standards is included in the monstrosity which is before the Senate at this time. Under this proposal, once the railroad companies negotiate for the business, they are entitled to make application to the Interstate Commerce Commission to have the tariff or rates applied retroactively—after they have the business, after they have acted. Then, if they find the negotiated rate is not satisfactory to them, they can renegotiate it, after the service has been performed. There will be no notice, there will be no opportunity for anyone to object, there will be no hearings, because the act will already have taken place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair.) The time the Senator from Tennessee has yielded to himself has expired. Does he desire to yield himself additional time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So, Mr. President, the pending proposal is not only for an extension of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act to section 22 cases, but it would also take away all the existing safeguards. And that would be done without the holding of any hearings whatsoever.

Mr. President, the opinion of Judge McGarraghy appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, beginning at page 15485. The RECORD also includes the orders which have been issued. The court's opinion represents months of study, litigation, and presentations to the court. The small airlines have a vested interest in the order the court has issued. So I cannot understand how any Member of Congress can in good conscience vote for a measure which would take away those rights of the small airlines and would deprive them of what they have won after a long and difficult presentation in court, and without at least giving them an opportunity to appear at a hearing before a Congressional committee.

Mr. President, no harm will be done by postponing action on this conference report until January 30, 1958. That will give the committees a chance to have hearings and give the parties who are interested an opportunity to have their day in court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is all my motion seeks to do.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

I assume the Senator from Florida desires to yield some time on the other side.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to say that the conferees have made their statement. They feel it stands unrefuted. We are ready to vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will yield me some time so that I may address some questions to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KEFAUVER. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. MORSE. Ten minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield the Senator from Oregon 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. First I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from Florida when he said, if I understood him correctly, about everything on the bill that could be said was said last night. I do not know what else I could say in opposition to taking up the conference report at this time, but I shall summarize what I said after I put a few questions to the Senator from Florida, for the RECORD, in order to make legislative history.

Did the Senate conferees examine General Lasher when he made the flat statement that unless the Harris amendment is agreed to it will cost the Government $100 million?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct. That letter was written to us by General Lasher in his capacity as Executive Director of the Mililtary Traffic Management Agency of the Department of Defense. We made that letter a part of the record.

Mr. MORSE. Did the conferees examine him about the letter?

Mr. SMATHERS. We had him before the conference committee, and did examine him with respect to the letter.

Mr. MORSE. Did he tell the conferees what the $100 million consisted of, by way of a breakdown?

Mr. SMATHERS. He indicated to us it was broken down somewhat as follows. If I may, I should like to put into the RECORD his own language.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. This is his statement:

> The monetary savings on the Department of Defense transportation bill for 1956 resulting from tenders under section 22 was $140 million—$12 million on household goods and $128 million on other freight and on passenger traffic (H. Rept. 677, 85th Cong.). Restrictions against carriers jointly submitting, or through concerted action, quotations, would nullify most of these savings under section 22.

That is a part of his argument. We will strike out the argument—

> As a vast majority of Government movements must, for practical purposes, result from joint consideration and action by carriers. This is particularly so on joint passenger movements, annual passenger agreements, area, territorial, and interterritorial freight adjustments. It is the informed judgment of the traffic people in the Department of Defense that approximately 75 percent of the savings under section 22 result from quotations concertedly arrived at, or better than $100 million.

We gathered from questioning him that approximately 85 percent of the Defense Department's expense with respect to transporting its goods had to do solely with freight, and that the remainder of it had to do with carrying passengers. In addition, I had him prepare a chart for us pertaining to traffic obtained by the supplemental air carriers, which Senators can see at the rear of the Chamber, and which I shall be glad to have the Senator from Oregon consult if he cares to do so.

General Lasher further pointed out that in 1952, when the nonscheduled airlines began to receive a part of the business, the railroads received about 65 percent of the total passenger business. That business has now been changed to the point where the railroads receive about 38 percent of the total passenger business of the Defense Department under the program in 1956. Of the group passenger travel of Defense, railroads, motor carriers, and water carriers receive much less than do the four nonscheduled airlines. That was, generally, the information we gathered.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Florida say the hearing which the conferees held, if it could be called a hearing, with General Lasher was comparable to the type of hearing which would have taken place had the Harris amendment, for example, gone back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and those in favor and those opposed to it had been given an opportunity to appear before the committee and testify upon it?

Mr. SMATHERS. I would say it was not that type of hearing; but I would say the conferees, who have the same desire to save the taxpayers money as other Senators have, and the same desire, certainly in the case of the junior Senator from Florida—and I see present the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]—to preserve the protection of the antitrust laws, as has any other Senator on the floor, felt that under the circumstances in which we found ourselves, this was the most practical thing we could do.

Mr. MORSE. I understand. The Senator from Florida understands that if we differ, we differ only over the matter of procedure. I happen to be of the opinion that when the Senate receives a conference report which involves really a rewriting of the bill which left the floor of the Senate and went to conference—a rewriting in the sense that an amendment was added on the floor of the House, on which there has been no hearing so far as the Senate is concerned—the burden of proof is on the conferees to show that any great harm would result from our waiting until January, when we could get the whole matter sent back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for hearing on the Harris amendment. That is the position which the Senator from Oregon takes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I could not disagree greatly with the Senator from Oregon except in this respect: I believe we as legislators have a duty to represent the Government of the United States and the taxpayers, just as we have a duty of representing four nonscheduled airlines.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. SMATHERS. In this instance we felt that unless we took this action it would cost the Federal Government an extra $100 million in fiscal 1958. That amount of money would not go to anybody that I know of except the railroads. So, in effect, we believed the most practical thing to do was to attempt to keep the situation as it has existed since 1948, at least until such time next year when perhaps the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Oregon, or perhaps I, could introduce a bill amending the Interstate Commerce Act and repealing outright the Bulwinkle provisions.

Mr. MORSE. The only difficulty I have with respect to the amount of $100 million is that I am not inclined to accept it without a record that makes it possible for adverse witnesses to rebut it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Information has been given to various Senators by lobbyists—and I do not use that term unkindly, because all groups must have lobbyists—to the effect that the figure $100 million probably is not correct.

Mr. MORSE. The reception room is full of lobbyists.

Mr. SMATHERS. As a Senator goes from the Chamber to the elevator he is importuned and buttonholed and has information stuck into his pockets and put in his ear that the figure is inaccurate. The best proof of the fact that it would cost the Government a great deal of money—I do not know if it would amount to $100 million—is that the Atomic Energy Commission has stated it would cost $4 million and the General Services Administration has indicated it would cost approximately $13 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be glad to yield the Senator 5 minutes, and more, if he needs it.

Mr. MORSE. I am not going to be long. I made my long speech last night.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would say the best proof of the fact that the Government is realizing some benefit from the section 22 rate quotations made by the railroads is that in the complaint which was filed in the District Court it was alleged that the railroads were quoting rates 50 percent below the published rates. We find that is the first point in the decision of the court—that the railroads were quoting to the Government rates 50 percent below the published rates. It seems to me on the face of that allegation it would at least have to be admitted that the Government was getting some benefit from section 22.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to invite attention to the question whether the members of the committee had any knowledge of what savings the Government would make except those as declared by General Lasher. Pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was Senate bill 939, which is the bill now before the Senate, asking that there be a repeal of section 22. The main subject of inquiry was whether it would be to the interest of the Government to reject Senate bill 939 or repeal section 22, which permitted the railroads to charge lesser rates to the Government. Inquiries were made of the witnesses as to whether it should or should not be repealed. The Defense Department appeared and fought against the repeal of section 22.

I should like to read to the Senator from Oregon, because he possibly did not hear it, what I said yesterday:

On page 101 of the hearings on the bill, S. 939, we find the testimony of Mr. Smith, the Director for Transportation and Petroleum Logistics, of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, at the Pentagon, Washington, D. C. He was questioned by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I read the following from the hearings:

How much would it cost the Government if section 22 were repealed or changed, as has been recommended in Senate bill 939?

That is what is before us.

How much additional expense would it cost the Government?

Mr. SMITH. At the time I testified before the House committee last year, based on the then freight bills of the military departments, I estimated it would cost, if section 22 were eliminated, and all the rates went back to the tariff basis, the cost to the Government would be $215 million per year. Based on the present freight bill, I testified before the House just a few days ago that the cost would be $128 million per year.

I may say that that statement of Mr. Smith was challenged. Questions were put to him about studies which showed that the Government would make no saving. When we were through with our hearing, there was unanimous judgment that section 22 should not be repealed, because the loss to the Government would be $215 million a year.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Florida tell me whether the conferees considered the other alternatives by way of transportation available to the Government. It would seem to me that if the railroads raised the rates, then the Department of Defense would have to make a choice between and among alternatives, such as the use of trucks, buses, air and water facilities. Did the conferees go into that problem?

Mr. SMATHERS. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that of course when we talk about railroads the whole question of transportation is involved, and at the same time we are talking about motor trucks and water carriers and everything but air carriers, because they all come under the same provisions of section 22. Naturally we did consider that feature.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon, so that we may continue the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. My question is addressed either to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], or to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Night before last, when the conference report came before the Senate for debate, I asked a question. Perhaps in the debate that question has been discussed. If so, I have missed the discussion in my reading of the RECORD.

My question was addressed to the opinion of those who have charge of this bill as to what the legal effect would be on the proceedings which were initiated in court. My own judgment was that if the Harris amendment became the law, and there was no ambiguity in the law, then the discussion on the floor or in the committee report could not change the legal effect of the law.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is one question ahead of me.

Mr. COOPER. The case is before the court. I know there are great lawyers considering the question in the Senate. I should like to have their judgment on that issue.

I think the Senator will remember that in 1947 when the portal-to-portal pay bill was enacted there was a problem involved. I know something about that legislation, because I was a member of the subcommittee which had charge of the measure then pending. In that bill, it was specifically provided that all prior claims or subsequent claims dealing with the area covered by the bill, outside the field of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which had previously been considered an area for compensable activities, should be invalid. There was written into the law a specific provision about the effect of that legislation upon such proceedings. There was a proceeding at that time which had been initiated in a Federal district court and was in the process of appeal. What is the judgment of the Senators who are in charge of this bill and those Senators who are opposing the bill as to the legal effect of the amendment, so far as further court proceedings are concerned?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is only fair that I give my judgment first, for whatever it may be worth. Then I should like to have the opinion of the conferees.

I think we owe it to them to tell them what our doubts are about the language of the conference report.

It is my judgment that we cannot write anything into the conference report, including the Harris amendment, which could have any possible effect on the case in the court, unless the court found first that the Harris amendment was ambiguous. If the Harris amendment is clear and unambiguous, it is the law.

In the conference report, I understand there is certain language which would seem to have been written by the conferees on the assumption that it sets forth reservations and qualifications about the Harris amendment. In my judgment, that is not worth the paper it is written on, if the court, picking up the Harris amendment, says that the law with the Harris amendment added to it has no ambiguity. The determination of whether there is an ambiguity cannot be made on the floor of the Senate. That determination has to be made in

the courtroom, with able counsel representing the parties litigant. The court will have to decide whether there is an ambiguity.

If the court decides there is no ambiguity, then the conference report will not get into evidence. That is my legal opinion. I should be glad to ascertain whether the conferees are proceeding on the assumption that the Harris amendment is ambiguous. If that is so, that is all the more reason why we should wait until January, to get the matter cleared up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield the Senator an additional 5 minutes. However, I do not wish to yield all of my time. I believe I have yielded 15 minutes thus far. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has yielded 13 minutes thus far.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding of the law that the court, when interpreting the language, must declare the language to mean what it says, unless there is ambiguity. If there is ambiguity, the court can search for ulterior surrounding circumstances to determine what was intended.

In my judgment, there can be no question about the clarity of the language. It reads:

> That nothing in this paragraph shall affect any liability or cause of action which may have accrued prior to the date on which this paragraph takes effect.

Now, the challenge is made that the preceding language may create an ambiguity. I do not think it does. The preceding language says that there shall continue the right to file, under the law, joint and concert rates. That is the only purpose of that language, I think we agree.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my friend the Senator from Ohio that I think we agree on the rule of law as to legislative interpretation; but I want to say to my friend the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from Ohio has convinced me all the more, when he has talked about the present status of the bill, how wise it would be to let the report go over until January. All the circumstances could be considered de novo before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We could start all over.

In the meantime, the decision of Judge McGarraghy would go to the appellate courts for a determination.

That causes me to reiterate what I said last night, on the basis of the cost to the taxpayers. We should not forget that we are dealing here with a question involving the antitrust laws. I do not know what is more valuable to the American taxpayers than to keep the antitrust laws without any breach in them.

This dispute has arisen over the rider which was put on the bill in the House. I stress the argument I made last night, which was supported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who first described this amendment as a rider. The Harris amendment is a rider. If we did such a thing on the floor of the Senate, I think it would be subject to the long standing judgment of the Senate that in the Senate we do not pass legislation containing riders. What we are discussing is a rider. I do not think it has any place in the legislation which left the floor of the Senate, at least without a Senate hearing and without consideration of a legislative committee.

The legislative committees and not the conferees, under the procedure of the Senate, should make the decision with regard to bills which are to have the approval of the Senate. So in this instance it is rather like having the buggy before the horse. We really have a new bill within a bill that is brought back to us from the conferees, and the new bill was inserted in the Senate bill by way of an amendment in the House. If that were my only protest I would say wait until January, but I have the other objections which I have also raised.

I think the Senator from Ohio has very accurately stated what the law is as to the rule of legislative interpretation, but I believe the discussion also points out that we have a first class lawsuit coming along if we agree to the Harris amendment. Certainly counsel will try to have it set aside on some basis, if possible.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to offer this further suggestion to the Senator from Kentucky. If the language is clear, as I contend it is, then there can be no question that the rights now existing are preserved. But if there is ambiguity, and the court must look further to determine what the Congress intended, I now call attention to page 5 of the conference report:

> However, it is the understanding of the conferees, in accepting the language which the House added to S. 939 as to the applicability of the Reed-Bulwinkle amendment to section 22 rates, that nothing therein adopted and agreed to herein would vitiate or in any way affect the order of the court in the Air Coach case or similar litigation now pending.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not ask for any more time. If my friend from Florida will permit me, I will close with this further brief statement:

I do not think the language which the Senator from Ohio has just read would have any standing whatsoever in a court of law in litigation involving the McGarraghy decision, which will go up on appeal. I think what is proposed, in effect, by way of a rider on this particular piece of proposed legislation, would at least crack the antitrust wall, if not blast some stones out of it and cause a real breach.

I say to my friend from Florida that I do not consider it to be an issue of railroad versus air coach line. I am not approaching it from that standpoint. I am approaching it from the standpoint of what will best protect the shippers and consumers of the country. I do not think the Harris amendment would do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield the Senator from Oregon 3 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I ask my friend from Florida to think with me for a moment as to the effect on the "nonskeds." The nonskeds are pretty important in a great many States which are discriminated against in freight rates, such as my section of the country, and, very important, in the Senator's section of the country. Some of the nonsked air coach lines which have been put out of business have their bases in Florida. They are Florida companies. They have made a great contribution to the transportation system of Florida, just as they are making a great contribution to the transportation system of the Western States. So I say, give them their day in court. They are in court. The case is going "upstairs."

Now it is proposed to adopt the Harris amendment, which undoubtedly applies to the nonskeds. It will be to the disadvantage of the air coach lines. We are doing it, as I said last night, under a "wrinkle" whereby all the railroads have to do, after their concerted action, is to file their reports on rates, whereas under the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, at least the Interstate Commerce Commission has the legal authority, if it wishes to exercise it, to require hearings, and to approve or disapprove.

As I read the bill and the conference report—I think I am right; but, as I said last night, if not, I wish to be corrected—if we adopt the conference report, the Interstate Commerce Commission will have no authority to disapprove the rates. We would make the Interstate Commerce Commission only the receptacle for the filing of rates.

Mr. President, that is dangerous, if we want to protect the antitrust laws of the country.

I close with this observation: This is a proposal to substitute delegation of authority for regulation. It would delegate to the railroads the power to act in concert, and then simply file with the Interstate Commerce Commission, as a receptacle, their new rates without the Interstate Commerce Commission having any power to disapprove them, however disadvantageous they might be to other transportation systems.

What justification do we hear offered most often? It is said that we might save the taxpayers some money in regard to certain shipments from military installations. So says General Lasher, of the Pentagon Building. I would like to see him before a committee, under examination, before accepting his figures.

But let us take his assumption for a moment. Let me tell the Senate what I consider more valuable to the consumers of America than $100 million. It is the importance of keeping protected, without any break, the great protective wall of antitrust authority, which is so

vital to America's businessmen and consumers.

Mr. President, I rest my case.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I think it is important that the Senator from Oregon and everyone else understand that when the Reed-Bulwinkle bill was passed, which became section 5 (a) of the act, it exempted railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, and freight forwarders from prosecution on the charge of acting in collusion or concert in making rates, first, to commercial houses and to commercial shippers. That was the understanding. That is what everyone thought could happen.

The question arose as to what is meant by rates. The word was interpreted by the Interstate Commerce Commission in a letter sent to me, which I have placed in the RECORD. It is a recent letter, more recent than any evidence which I heard quoted the other day, which I do not believe is to the point. In its letter to me the Commission stated that it had always understood that this protection was given to the railroads, motor carriers, and other carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act in dealing with the Government on section 22 rates, as well as in dealing with commercial houses.

Judge McGarraghy said, "I am going to let the railroads get together in concert and make certain rates to commercial houses. But we will not let them do that with respect to section 22 rates."

It is not a question of whether we like the Reed-Bulwinkle Act or dislike it. Some of us voted for it, and some of us voted against it. It was passed by a two-thirds vote in the House and Senate in 1948. I believe that a reasonable interpretation at that time was that naturally the act applied to all rates. It was never dreamed that a judge would come along and say, "Wait a minute; it does not apply to the Government, but we are going to apply it with respect to everyone else."

A case was filed in New Mexico in which the district court judge threw out this kind of claim made on the same point. So we have two district court judges disagreeing as to what was meant by the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I think it is so important that the case be decided "upstairs". We ought to wait until the judicial process has been completed.

The Reed-Bulwinkle Act, although it gave the railroads power to act in concert, did not provide that they might fix any rate they wished. The rates were subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. SMATHERS. That was a very difficult point for me to understand, too. I labored with the Interstate Commerce Commission to try to find out the meaning of the law.

Section 22 provides that the railroads can even give free rates, or anything below published rates; and the Interstate Commerce Commission, as such, could not approve or disapprove of such rates. That has been the law with respect to section 22 since 1887.

Initially the Government entered into an agreement with the railroads. It said, "We are not going to pay these published rates. We are a big shipper. We want you to give us the best rates you can." The Government could bargain with the railroads, up and down the scale. What the railroads had to do, first, was to submit to the Interstate Commerce Commission an agreement. Railroad A, railroad B, and railroad C, would get together in a certain area, either the Southwest, the Southeast, or the Senator's area, the Northwest, and establish a procedure which they would follow in fixing rates. The approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission is required if the agreement is to protect the carriers. The agreement, or the methodology, had to be approved, but not the specific rate itself, with respect to section 22 quotations.

It may be that the entire section ought to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say good naturedly that this proves to me that action on the conference report ought to wait until January.

Mr. SMATHERS. We have had one hearing already this year on the question as to whether section 22 should be eliminated. The Senate finally passed on that bill on June 12. We agreed not to eliminate it, because it would cost the Government such an enormous amount of money.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill was not presented for the purpose of eliminating section 22. The bill as it came from the committee contained only a provision for filing. The committee was not presented with the choice as to whether or not to eliminate section 22.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Interstate Commerce Commission sent to us a bill proposing to strike out section 22.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But that was not presented to the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was presented to our committee. As I told the Senator last night, I do not recall his being present. We held hearings for about a week and a half.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have to attend a great many committee meetings, and I did not know a thing about it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand. As I said to the "nonsked" airlines, "Where were you? We would have liked to hear from you."

The Senator from Ohio and I indicated at the start that we believed section 22 should be eliminated. It was only after we heard the testimony of the Government as to the $650 million traffic cost it had every year and that it would cost them in the neighborhood of $215 million extra if we knocked out section 22, that we finally decided we were wrong, and we, therefore, changed our minds. So we reported the amended bill to the Senate, and it was passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that under existing law the railroads can agree to act in concert with reference to the establishment of rates which affect commercial and private shippers, without violating the antitrust laws?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. But in the case of the Government, as a shipper, the railroads cannot act in concert in establishing freight rates without violating the antitrust laws?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is what the district court decision has just held. That has been held for the first time.

Mr. PASTORE. All that the bill before the Senate would do, if I am correct, is actually to put the Government, as a shipper, in the precise position a private shipper finds himself in today under existing law. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the Reed-Bulwinkle law, as it applies to shippers generally, certain standards have to be followed; that is, a tariff is set and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and then complaints can be filed, and notice must be given. Under the bill a different rule is applied to the Government, because under it the contract is made and it is carried out, and it then provides retroactive application, whether negotiated or renegotiated, after the service has been performed. Therefore, there is no advance proposal, which is provided for in the Reed-Bulwinkle Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Since I am speaking on my own time, I will say once again to the Senator from Tennessee that there is a difference between agreements and the rates resulting from agreements. There is that difference, as the Senator suggests and has put his finger on it, but has not said it in so many words. In the case of a commercial shipper, as the Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, not only do the railroads get together to make quotations of rates, but the rates must first be approved by

the ICC; but when they file the rates with respect to commercial shippers, they have to publish the rates. Under section 22, once they have filed the agreement, and the methodology and procedure has been approved—and section 22 has been in existence since 1887—they can make any rate—reduced or free—to the Government or for other reasons, and the ICC says on that particular type of rate the agreement is all right, and the railroads can make any kind of reduced rate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What is disturbing the junior Senator from Rhode Island—and I say this in all sincerity—is that I am one of those who believe that we ought to do very little to disturb the antitrust laws. I feel that the laws are for the common good and for the benefit of the people generally, and we ought not to take any steps which would weaken that philosophy and that system of law enforcement.

Mr. SMATHERS. I share the sentiments of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The situation, as I understand it now, is that today a private shipper can with immunity send his goods under a freight rate fixed by concert on the part of the railroads; but, when it comes to the Government, it would be a violation of the antitrust laws to do that. In other words, an individual is being placed in a better position than the Government itself.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under the decision of the district court, the Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. In the House I voted against the Reed-Bulwinkle bill because I felt it was a weakening of the antitrust laws. If I understand the court's decision, the effect of it is to put the Government at a disadvantage so far as rates are concerned, as compared with private, commercial shippers. Am I correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct; yes; under the court's interpretation.

Mr. JACKSON. The court decided, in effect, that, when Congress passed the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, it did not intend to include the Government with commercial shippers in the right on the part of the railroads to fix rates. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is what the court said.

Mr. JACKSON. I mean that is what the district court said.

Mr. SMATHERS. The district court; yes. That is the effect of the ruling. The effect is that the immunity from concert of action will apply with respect to rates for commercial shippers, but will not apply with respect to rates for the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. All I can say is that if shippers are to receive the benefits—if there are benefits, and I am not sure that there are many—from the provisions of the law, then I cannot understand on what basis we are going to permit the shippers to discriminate against the Government in the matter of freight charges.

Mr. SMATHERS. I can say to the Senator that there is only one basis——

Mr. JACKSON. I mean other than by repeal of the law.

Mr. SMATHERS. There is only one basis and that is the question whether we want to affect the suit of the nonscheduled airlines in the district court. The Senator is absolutely correct with respect to the equity of the matter.

Mr. JACKSON. So long as the law is on the books, it would occur to me it ought to be administered uniformly.

Mr. SMATHERS. The ICC thought so. The Defense Department thought so. The Members of the House and of the Senate who participated in the enactment of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act thought so. One district court also thought so. Another district court, however, has not thought so.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to hear what the other side has to say.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. From a practical point of view, am I to understand that if this procedure is sanctified by the enactment of the proposed legislation now before the Senate, making the position of the United States Government analogous to that of a private shipper, the result will be reduced rates in favor of the Government, which would inure to the benefit of the taxpayers of the country? Is that correct? In other words, is this procedure being inaugurated to lower freight rates on behalf of the United States Government, or to raise them?

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator refer to the procedure we are discussing here?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; under the pending bill, or under the conference report.

Mr. SMATHERS. What we are endeavoring to do is to reestablish the condition which existed prior to the decision of the district court. I will answer the question by saying "Yes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes. The Defense Department says, "We must have this procedure reestablished as it existed from 1948 to date, or it will cost us $100 million." There may be some question about the exact figure, but they say it will cost them a considerable amount of money if we do not take the action here proposed. The Atomic Energy Commission has sent us a letter saying, "If you do not reestablish the procedure, it will cost us about $4 million."

The General Services Administration has told us it would cost them about $13 million. It would cost the TVA $2 million, we have been told. And so it goes.

The only thing we can do is to accept the word of those agencies that we should reestablish the situation which existed prior to the decision of the district court. The only way we can do it is by the method the conference report proposes. In that way we would save the Government a considerable amount of money.

Mr. PASTORE. Without regard to whether there is involved a violation of the antitrust laws, is it not correct to say that the procedure in any event, whether it involves the United States Government or whether it involves a private shipper, is being instituted for the reason that the concerted action on the part of the various railroads will result in lower freight rates?

Mr. SMATHERS. To a certain extent. As I once again say, the Defense Department says it will. The Atomic Energy Commission says it will. The other agencies say it will. That is the only testimony we have to go on.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator know of any instance where the concerted action on the part of the railroads has resulted in higher freight rates?

Mr. SMATHERS. Not with respect to the Government, because section 22, which allows the carriers to deal with the Government, says that the carriers can offer to the Government free or reduced rates, meaning below published rates which go to the ordinary commercial shipper.

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask one further question?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the grievance or the objection to the proposed legislation chiefly the fact that we are permitting a violation of the antitrust laws, or is this to protect competition on the part of nonscheduled airlines?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

I wish to say in all candor, as I said before, and as I said this to the Senator from Minnesota last night, that we want to keep the nonscheduled airlines in this business, if we can, because naturally where there is one method of transportation competing with another method of transportation for Government business, the result will be a lower price for the Government.

What we want to do, as we agreed last night and in the other discussions we have had, is to try to put the nonscheduled airlines, at the beginning of next year, in the same competitive position with respect to getting Government business that the railroads and motor carriers occupy today. The reason we could not do it in the pending bill is that the bill proposes to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, whereas the nonscheduled airlines come under the Civil Aeronautics Act, as the Senator knows.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio desires to point out that shippers and the Interstate Commerce Commission support the passage of S. 939, as introduced, which would repeal section 22. That section, which is involved in this debate, provides for the Govern-

ment lower rates on the same basis as that of the rates given to private shippers. The argument in favor of section 22—which, according to Mr. Smith, saved the Government $215 million 2 years ago—was as follows: The railroads are charging so little to the Government, that the Government has been saved $215 million; and to the extent that the income to the railroads has thus been reduced, other shippers have to make up for it.

We did not accept that argument as a sound basis for repealing section 22. But the court decision substantially repeals it; and this measure contemplates an avoidance of that repeal.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I understand from the distinguished Senator from Ohio that there is absolutely no question in his mind that by permitting the railroads to act in concert with reference to the establishment of their rates, when the Government is a shipper, the result has been reduced rates to the Government and a saving to the taxpayers of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time the Senator from Florida has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield further to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I would answer the question of the Senator from Rhode Island by asking him to ask each member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and especially those on the small committee, what their conclusion is. The conclusion is that if section 22 is repealed, so that the Government is removed from that protective position, the result will be an additional cost to the Government, not of $100 million, but of more than $200 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has answered my question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to know why it is that the American Association of Railroads is so anxious to lose money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from Florida has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield to myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I pose the question again to the Senator from Florida, in light of the colloquy which has just occurred. The American Association of Railroads indicated in a letter which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on yesterday—a letter signed by the vice president and general counsel of the association, that following Judge McGarraghy's decision, they would refuse to submit section 22 quotations or bids to the Department of Defense; and they are insisting that section 22 be maintained.

My question is this: If it be true that the railroads give so much lower rates under section 22, and if it is true that that saves the Government so much money, why are the railroads so anxious to have section 22, which makes the reduced rates possible, retained? The Government has to ship troops and commodities, regardless of the rates which apply. So why are the railroads so anxious to have the Government have the benefit of low rates?

Mr. SMATHERS. I asked them that question. I asked them, "Are you ever forced to accept this business?"

They replied, "No; we are not."

Then I asked, "Would you ever accept business would result in a loss to you?"

They replied, "Well, in some cases we would—if it resulted in our taking our equipment across the country, where we would be able to have a profitable haul back."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am very much impressed with that argument, and surely the junior Senator from Rhode Island is not a protagonist of the railroads. But let me ask this question: Must we not rely on the statement which was made by the representative of the Department of Defense and the statement which was made by the representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the statements which have been made by the representatives of the other Government agencies which have shipping business? They have said to the committee, "Unless this measure is enacted, our transportation bill will be much higher." Does that not impress the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. As I said yesterday, I was primarily seeking information which had not been obtainable from any hearings, because there were no hearings on the Harris amendment, inasmuch as the Harris amendment was tacked on in the House of Representatives, and was railroaded through—to use the proper terminology—in the conference.

But here there is a conflict of evidence. The Bureau of Transportation Economics and Statistics, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, points out that the Government pays more under section 22 rates. That statement is included in the record of the House committee hearings of the 84th Congress.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission says that is not true. But I recall that at one time, when the committee was dealing with postal rates, and when a representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission was before the committee, when the committee was dealing with the so-called round-trip provisions in the case of the Post Office Department, wherein the Government of the United States was compelled to pay as much for the transportation of an empty railroad car as it was for the transportation of a full railroad car, there were 45 railroad attorneys against one post-office attorney, a gentleman from Chicago, Mr. Delany, a very able man——

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is speaking in my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well; I shall suspend. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Florida in permitting me to speak this long.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the principal allegation made was that the railroads were taking action in concert in order to offer rates as much as 50 percent below the published rates; and the district court found that to be the case. So, Mr. President, if they were trying to offer rates as much as 50 percent below the published rates, the Government was bound to be benefiting by such lower rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the point is that those rates were 50 percent below the published rates, in a situation in which there was competition. Certainly all that is involved in this matter is the old skin game, which is known to anyone who has ever run a corner drugstore, namely, if you have competition, cut your rates sharply, and cut them enough, and cut them long enough, until you can drive all your competition out of business. Then, when all your competition has vanished, you can raise your rates enough to make up for the cuts you made in the preceding period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from Florida has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota and I agree that, ordinarily, when there is no competition, the railroads quote a passenger rate only 10 percent below the published rates; but when there is competition, they reduce their rates as much as 50 percent below the published rates.

On the other hand, why have a situation in which the railroads cannot establish reduced rates for the Government?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may ask another question of the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded by the Senator from Florida to himself has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee will yield time at this point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 33 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in that case I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Minnesota makes a rather good argument. What disturbs me is that this situation does not apply to a private shipper, whereas all we are trying to do is give the United States Government the same advantages a private shipper has.

If action taken in concert actually, in the long run, hurts the United States, as a shipper, then does not the Senator think the law should be changed, so there would be a violation of the antitrust laws, without regard to whether the shipper was a private person or was the United States Government?

Mr. HUMPHREY. To be frank about the matter, my answer is "Yes." What the Senator from Rhode Island is saying is that the Reed-Bulwinkle Act is the source of the evil—and I agree—and that what we should do is, instead of scratching, perform major surgery.

However, we are not now in the operating room; we are only in the bandaging room. In short, what we have before us is the report of the conference committee.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Minnesota will today submit a bill to amend that, I will go along with him, and I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the point is that we cannot amend a conference report.

Mr. SMATHERS. But we could act on such an amendment in January of next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Congress will be on the job then, I trust. In fact, we may not leave here before then. I say that because I want everyone to have a bad day. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to have the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. This is not the place to try a lawsuit; but I wish to say that I completely disagree with my friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in regard to what the Reed-Bulwinkle Act provides. The act itself reads as follows:

(3) CHANGE IN RATES, FARES, ETC.; NOTICE REQUIRED; SIMPLIFICATION OF SCHEDULES

No change shall be made in the rates, fares, and charges or joint rates, fares, and charges which have been filed and published by any common carrier in compliance with the requirements of this section, except after 30 days' notice to the Commission and to the public published as aforesaid, which shall plainly state the changes proposed to be made in the schedule then in force and the time when the changed rates, fares, or charges will go into effect; and the proposed changes shall be shown by printing new schedules, or shall be plainly indicated upon the schedules in force at the time and kept open to public inspection: *Provided*, That the Commission may, in its discretion and for good cause shown, allow changes upon less than the notice herein specified, or modify the requirements of this section in respect to publishing, posting, and filing of tariffs, either in particular instances or by a general order applicable to special or peculiar circumstances or conditions: *Provided further*, That the Commission is authorized to make suitable rules and regulations for the simplification of schedules of rates, fares, charges, and classifications and to permit in such rules and regulations the filing of an amendment of, or change in, any rate, fare, charge, or classification without filing complete schedules covering rates, fares, charges, or classifications not changed if, in its judgment, not inconsistent with the public interest.

So I dispute the contention of the Senator from Florida that under the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, fare changes and rate changes do not have to be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I discussed this matter at great length on yesterday. We think the Commission is subject to severe criticism, and we think it should be thoroughly investigated, as we said on yesterday, on the floor of the Senate. The Commission has been accepting these changes without itself making any alterations in them. But under the statute, the Commission has the clear, mandatory duty, in my opinion, to see to it that any rate proposed as a result of action taken in concert meets with the approval of the Commission.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. First, Mr. President, I wish to say that in the present instance, the attempt being made is to breach the antitrust law. The present attempt is to make the Interstate Commerce Commission the receptacle of notices of rate changes, rather than to have the Interstate Commerce Commission make the railroads come before it and put the proposed new rates on top of the table, in advance of initiating them.

Consider the measure which is before us, particularly the language at the top of page 2, as follows:

At reduced rates for the United States Government, or any agency or department thereof, including quotations or tenders for retroactive application—

That is the jigger, that is the gimmick, in this particular bill—

for retroactive application whether negotiated or unnegotiated after the services have been performed, shall be in writing or confirmed in writing and a copy or copies thereof shall be submitted to the Commission by the carrier or carriers offering such tenders or quotations.

There is nothing the Interstate Commerce Commission can do, under that provision. It will just have to receive the copies or file them.

I am saying, let us wait until January. Let the McGarraghy decision go to the court of appeals. In my judgment, Judge McGarraghy found, in effect, that what railroads are doing is using traffic from military installations, Government business, to undercut other forms of transportation, in order to break the competition, and then they will be in a position, when the field is wide open, after breaking competing lines, to raise the rates, which the taxpayers would have to pay.

So what Judge McGarraghy is saying—and I am not so sure it is not a very wise statement; at least we should wait until the Supreme Court has a look at it—is that he is not going to sit still and let the railroads use the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies as a device for a cutrate program for shipment of goods in order to break other shippers who are serving the businessmen and commercial houses of America.

It makes a good argument to say we are going to save the taxpayers some money by shipping Government goods in that manner. What the judge is pointing out is that the railroads are using traffic from Government installations for cutting rates in order to put competition out of business. Then watch how high the rates will go after the competition has ended.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I voted against the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, because I felt that breaking the antitrust laws was bad and that in the end competition would be lessened; but is it not true that the same argument which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has just made, which is an able argument, applies with equal force where such rates are made for private commercial handlers?

Mr. MORSE. It surely does. Under the bill, with the Harris amendment in it, the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it is not holding hearings, is not approving of these rates and is not carrying out the language of the Reed-Bulwinkle provisions.

Mr. JACKSON. One reason why I voted against the Reed-Bulwinkle bill was that private commercial shippers could do the very thing the Senator has mentioned. What disturbs me is that the provision has been interpreted to apply to commercial shippers, but not to the Government. I am against the whole procedure. How can one justify discrimination against the Government in the matter of lower rates?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield the Senator from Oregon 3 minutes more.

Mr. JACKSON. How can one justify discrimination against the Government, with all the accompanying bad practices, when Congress has legalized the action as to private commercial shippers? I am against the Reed-Bulwinkle Act. I voted against the bill. What disturbs me is that the Government has a disadvantage so far as actual dollars are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. My reply is that we ought to wait until the higher courts have acted upon the decision of the district court. Then we could have hearings on the Harris amendment, which we have not had, and get testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Rhode Island is a member. Hearings could be held in January, and then we could decide whether or not it is desired to rewrite the whole bill. I do not know why we should, on the floor of the Senate, pass on a rider which has been added to the Senate bill by the House of Representatives.

Mr. PASTORE. I agree with the Senator. If there were something we could do to suspend the whole action until January, that would be all right, but I suppose we are going to vote the report up or down. When the question comes on a motion to recommit, I shall vote for it. I think discrimination ought to be removed entirely. I believe the law ought to apply as equally to the private shipper as it does to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. I shall vote against repeal of section 22 in January, if I get a chance to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall, too, but when the motion to recommit is put, I shall vote for it. If there is to be an up-or-down vote, I shall vote to give the United States Government the same kind of an advantage private shippers have.

Mr. MORSE. The question before the Senate is the Kefauver motion, which proposes to postpone action on the conference report until January.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall vote for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have made my case, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the argument which has been relentlessly pursued in this case—and it is a moving appeal to the citizenry—is that we are going to save the Government money. The answer to that argument is that we may temporarily chalk up or add up an economic saving, but at the expense, No. 1, of basic public statutes, the antitrust laws, which protect the free enterprise system ultimately at the expense of the users of transportation, because the history of this kind of activity is that when there are loss leaders, which is exactly what section 22 deals with, they drive competition from the marketplace. For every dollar the Government saves, the taxpayer ultimately pays far more in increased prices or rates.

If what is sought were permitted, it would be a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act, because it would legalize loss leaders, since that is what is contemplated, and in one sense there would not be competition in good faith, because there would be competition only in the areas where there was an attempt to destroy competition.

It is on that basis that I think the Senator from Tennessee has made a motion which is worthy of our favorable consideration. The Senator from Tennessee is not saying we should kill the conference report. The Senator from Tennessee is saying we should delay final action on it until the committees designated by Congress to undertake an investigation into this very complex field have an opportunity to do so. The complexities of the transportation laws are almost beyond human comprehension. The Senator from Tennessee has said, "Look, here comes a House provision on a conference report," and he is asking only that the Senate of the United States take enough time, until January next year, next session, so that we can really look into the question. As the Senator from Rhode Island has said, he would have serious doubts about voting nay on the conference report, which I think all of us would have, because after we return home people might say, "You voted to have the taxpayers pay $100 million more."

By the way, I remind Senators that the conference report contains retroactive provisions. Therefore, even if we should delay action until January, nothing will be lost even if the conference report should then be agreed to. In the meantime, Members of the Senate will know what they are doing.

I say to my colleagues that when we literally drive a bulldozer through the antitrust laws in the name of the Federal Government, and in the name of departments and agencies whose representatives appeared before Congress, with a letter as their testimony, then we are taking a pretty serious step. I am frank to tell my colleagues I am in doubt about many points in the conference report. It is not ironbound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PURTELL. I wonder if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think I have yielded to the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oregon about 10 minutes in order to argue the proponent's case. I think the Senator naturally would like to see that action reciprocated.

Mr. PURTELL. I understood the Senator from Oregon to state he quoted from the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon quoted from a law which he said was the Reed-Bulwinkle bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. PURTELL. As I understand section 7, that is not the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. The section is section 5 (a).

Mr. MORSE. I quoted section 6.

Mr. PURTELL. The Reed-Bulwinkle part is section 5 (a).

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, counsel advises me that I quoted from the rate section of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Counsel is incorrect.

Mr. PURTELL. Counsel is not correct. The Reed-Bulwinkle part is section 5 (a).

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut I quoted section 6 of the Interstate Commerce Act, of which the Reed-Bulwinkle bill is a part, and the rate part applies to the section of the act that includes the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. I have quoted the ratemaking section of the Interstate Commerce Act, of which the Reed-Bulwinkle bill is a part, and it is equally applicable to the procedures under the Reed-Bulwinkle section.

Mr. PURTELL. Of course, every part of the act is a part of the whole, as is the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, but the Reed-Bulwinkle bill specifically treats of this matter under paragraph 9, affecting immunity under the antitrust law. That is what the Reed-Bulwinkle bill provides, and it is not provided in section 6.

Mr. MORSE. It has nothing to do with the duty of the Commission to pass upon any rates.

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. That is what section 6 provides. It is the only rate-making section.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may I have another minute?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. PURTELL. I suggest that we have a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission which also points out that this not only covers rates, as one might interpret what rate means, but also agreements under section 5 (a).

Mr. MORSE. My question is, So what? The Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot change the law. I read the law to the Senator.

Mr. PURTELL. No, the Senator did not read section 5 (a). The Senator read section 6.

Mr. MORSE. I read the rate section, which applies to the Reed-Bulwinkle act.

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct, but that does not apply to section 22, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. It applies to any rate any railroad may make, under the Interstate Commerce Act, unless we pass the bill and the situation which is set up under it. Under the Interstate Commerce Act, the railroads cannot establish rates without getting approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. May I read section 22?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. PURTELL. Section 22 provides:

> That nothing in this part shall prevent the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States, State, or municipal governments, or for charitable purposes——

Mr. MORSE. For charitable purposes. Section 22 does not mean that in the absence of the legislation such as it is proposed we pass today the railroads can fix any rate they want to and not follow the regulations prescribed in section 6.

Mr. PURTELL. The regulations in section 5.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I suggest we ought to have a thorough investigation of what we are doing.

Mr. PURTELL. They can follow the regulations prescribed in section 5. If

the agreement is entered into and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Commission can grant to the railroad authority to charge the rate. They have been doing that since 1948.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I am talking about. They ought to get approval. The Senator has used those words himself.

Mr. PURTELL. They do get approval, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I was answering the argument that they did not have to get approval, and the Senator said that they did. I am glad the Senator is on my side.

Mr. PURTELL. I beg the Senator's pardon. I should like to be on the Senator's side, but I am not, because if I were I would be on the wrong side.

Mr. MORSE. Do they get approval, or do they not?

Mr. PURTELL. They get an approval of the right to agree, but not of the rates, as stated in section 5 (a).

Mr. MORSE. We cannot escape the language of section 6, which is applicable to section 5 (a).

Mr. PURTELL. I am not trying to escape the language of section 5 (a). I refer to the language of section 5 (a) and section 22.

Mr. MORSE. That is further evidence that we had better wait until January to find out about many things.

Mr. PURTELL. We have a clear understanding of it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator thinks he does, but he had better wait until the courts get through with it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Florida desire to yield some time now?

Mr. SMATHERS. I have less time remaining than has the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee this question: In the event that action is postponed on the conference report, will the result be that the Government will be able to proceed as it has proceeded heretofore, before the case was brought in the district court, or will the Government be prejudiced in any way, in view of the decision rendered by the court?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is no prohibition against the Government proceeding, under section 22, to enter into any contract with any carrier for the hauling of goods at a reduced rate. It can continue to proceed in that manner.

The only thing which the carriers could not do would be joining together for the purpose of getting Government business. That is what is covered by Judge McGarraghy's opinion. The carriers could proceed to reduce the rates and make any rate they wanted to for the purpose of getting Government business, so long as they did not act in a conspiracy in violation of the antitrust laws.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand that the decision has been appealed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The decision has been appealed to the court of appeals. The court of appeals will decide the case this fall.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the judgment of the district court stand as the law until the appeal is heard, or does the appeal automatically vacate the opinion of the court pending the appeal?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As the matter now stands, the railroads, if they entered into a conspiracy, would be taking a chance of violating the antitrust laws. Whether they are willing to take the chance, I do not know. Personally, I think they are in direct violation of the antitrust laws in what they have done, under the McGarraghy opinion.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator from Tennessee realizes what the problem of the Senator from Rhode Island is. I have already indicated that I should like to see action on the conference report postponed. Now I understand from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that we cannot postpone it, because in the meantime, from now until we take action in the Congress, the decision handed down by Judge McGarraghy will be in effect. Is that correct, or incorrect? I should like to know the answer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a half minute, with regard to the question which has been asked?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the attention of counsel. Counsel cannot speak, but he can speak through me.

It is my understanding that at the present time there is no injunction in effect. The court of appeals has stayed the injunction. The appeal will be heard on September 9.

Counsel advises me that that is the correct understanding. The appeal will be heard September 9.

Mr. PASTORE. Therefore, as the matter now stands, we can proceed, and go along as we did before the case was taken to the district court, under the law as it was understood at the time.

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. While the injunction has not taken effect, if the court of appeals and the Supreme Court finally decide as Judge McGarraghy decided, in my opinion the small air companies, in the absence of the proposed legislation, would be able to win the judgment against the railroads. But if Judge McGarraghy is overruled, they would not be able to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me the point which needs to be clarified, insofar as the law which is under discussion is concerned, is the exact interpretation relating to section 5 (a) and section 22. We keep kicking these two sections around. I should like to see if I have a proper understanding of them.

Section 5 (a) is in fact the Reed-Bulwinkle Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Section 5 (a) provides for concerted ratemaking, but subject to the plenary jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Section 5 (a) provides for concerted ratemaking, but the carriers have to file a notice for 30 days and make an appearance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And anybody can file an objection.

Mr. PURTELL. It is simply necessary to get approval.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is necessary to get approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That matter is subject to the jurisdiction of the ICC.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the rates must ultimately be subject to ICC authority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding. Section 22 does not refer to rates, but refers to reduced rates.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Or contracts for charges.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the phrase reduced rates is used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand the reduced rates, as defined in section 22, are not subject to ICC jurisdiction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So on the one hand, while the procedure the Senate has cited may be the practice where rates are agreed to in concert under section 5 (a), the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, at least the theoretical authority is within the Interstate Commerce Commission to adjust those rates, to hold them within minimums and maximums, as the ICC Act states, and, therefore, the matter is under the plenary jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Section 22, since it refers to reduced rates, does not come under the ICC jurisdiction. In other words, those rates are immune from any regulation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And if the conference report bill shall be enacted the standards of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act will not apply to Government business. It will be possible to contract, and then—after the fact—retroactively file the papers with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And there would be no standard of regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as is ordinarily the case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Interstate Commerce Commission becomes a depository.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or an archive, so to speak, for action which is about to take place or has taken place.

I invite to the attention of my colleagues a reference which was brought to my attention as of yesterday, which I did not mention.

In the 79th Congress, I believe it was, there was an investigation made of Government payments to railroads for the shipment of war goods, materiel, and personnel. Those payments were made under the reduced rate schedules within the confines or the purview of section 22. It was discovered at that time, demonstrated by the testimony of the ICC itself, that the Government was in a helpless position insofar as the ICC was concerned, in order to obtain any kind of relief or action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to overcharging under section 22.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So it seems to me that the history relating to section 22, the economic history insofar as the Government is concerned, is not one of reduced rates which are meaningful in terms of real cost, but rather one of excess charges, where the Government makes payments of excess charges and is unable to recoup that which even its own instrumentality of Government says it deserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator yield to me, to allow me to ask a question?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wanted to save the remaining time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will conclude on that note, because it appears to me, Mr. President, that what we are doing here, if we are not very careful, is standardizing, and really making it possible to do under the law what has been an abuse of practice in the past.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me 1 minute to refer to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator from Minnesota clear in his recollection as to the information he received, that the matter discussed in the 79th Congress referred to section 22?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my understanding.

Mr. PURTELL. I suggest to the Senator that he might wish to check his source of information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My information, if the Senator will permit me to reply, is that there were Senate hearings on House bill 2536 in the 79th Congress, when evidence was presented by the Justice Department, on the part of the Government, seeking to obtain some relief. The United States Government had been demonstrated to have been the victim of concerted action under section 22 practices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, what time is left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 7 minutes, and the Senator from Florida has 14 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Florida has more time remaining than I have. Does he wish to yield any time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Florida would be willing to answer a couple of questions.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to try to answer them.

Will the Chair stop me at the end of 3 minutes?

Mr. CLARK. Am I correct in saying that before the lower court decision the procedure under the Reed-Bulwinkle Act had been operating smoothly for almost 9 years, and the railroads had been making arrangements with the Government for the transportation of people and goods, and that there was no controversy over the procedure?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not also true that during that period the nonscheduled airlines very much increased their share of the transportation of this kind of Government traffic, as compared with the share which they had at the beginning of that period?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. The chart behind the Senator will show the history and the percentages for the past 3 years.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that all the conference agreement purports to do is to continue the status quo before the lower court decision?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. So no drastic change in existing law is proposed. This is not a situation in which we are violating the antitrust laws and getting into something brandnew. It is proposed merely to continue the situation which has been the law for 9 years.

Mr. SMATHERS. As it was understood by all the Government agencies, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroads.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not also true that the conference report protects the right of appeal of the nonscheduled airlines, by reason of the proviso in the amendment?

Mr. SMATHERS. We attempt to do so in every way. That is a matter of legal interpretation. We have tried to protect them, and I think we have.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. An answer was given to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as to what effect the action taken by the conference committee might have upon the carrying of Government goods.

The information we have indicates that the railroads would be very reluctant to operate under section 22, fearful that ultimately they might find themselves in violation of the law. Therefore they will not grant the low rates to the Government at this time or until such time as action is taken by the court or by the Congress.

I wish to make it clear that I have no interest in the railroads or the nonscheduled airlines. Nor am I trying legislatively to displace a court decision.

We have heard a great deal about section 5 (a) and section 22. What do these sections provide? Section 5 (a) provides as follows:

> Any carrier party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers relating to rates, fares, classifications, divisions, allowances, or charges (including charges between carriers and compensation paid or received for the use of facilities and equipment), or rules or regulations pertaining thereto, or procedures for the joint consideration, initiation, or establishment thereof, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6) if it finds that, by reason of the furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (9) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement.

Paragraph (9) is the one which affects the entire area we are discussing. It reads as follows:

> Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under this section and other persons are, if the approval of such agreement is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6), hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commission.

That means, as I read it, that any agreement which has been approved by the Commission, to the extent that the agreement points out what it is for, would be free of the antitrust laws. But it certainly does not mean that any operation by the railroads or any other carriers outside the aggreement approved by the Commission would not be in violation of the antitrust laws.

Let me point out one thing further with respect to section 5 (a), which we have been discussing.

Paragraph (7) of section 5 (a) reads as follows:

> (7) The Commission is authorized, upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to investigate and determine whether any agreement previously approved by it under this section, or terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, is not or are not in conformity with the standard set forth in paragraph (2), or whether any such terms and conditions are not necessary for purposes of conformity with such standard, and, after such investigation, the Commission shall by order terminate or modify its approval of such agreement if it finds such action necessary to insure conformity with such standard, and shall modify the terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted to the extent it finds necessary to insure conformity with such standard or to the extent to which it finds such terms and conditions not necessary to insure such conformity. The effective date of any order terminating or modifying approval, or modifying terms and conditions, shall be postponed for such period

as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship.

What I am trying to point out is that it is felt that relief was provided in that such agreements had to be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, covering section 22 rates. It was felt that there was recourse to the Commission, and that complaint could be made. I do not know that any such complaints have been made. My understanding is that no complaints of that nature have been registered.

That is the situation under the Reed-Bulwinkle Act. What we are trying to do is not to determine what the courts should do, and not to act upon what the court has done. My study has convinced me beyond question that section 22 was covered by section 5 (a). I want to see the status quo maintained until court decisions may indicate otherwise. I do not wish to see any change at this time by way of legislation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator agree with the Senator from Florida that the bill protects the right of appeal of the nonscheduled airlines in a pending case?

Mr. PURTELL. I am not interested in the nonscheduled airlines. I am not interested in the railroads. Frankly, what they have done under the antitrust laws is something for the court to decide.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining time on my side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 7 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the discussion in the Senate today is a most eloquent argument in favor of the motion I have made to postpone consideration of the conference report until January 30, 1958, at 2 o'clock p. m.

We are dealing with one of the most intricate and complicated subjects of legislation. It is highly technical. There have been arguments back and forth as to the meaning of section 5 (a) and section 22. There have been arguments back and forth as to whether the Government will lose money or make money, and as to the merits of section 22.

The very confusion which exists here today is ample reason why we should have some committee guidance and direction on this very complicated subject. The reason we are not getting committee guidance and instruction is that a bill providing merely for a report to the Interstate Commerce Commission was passed by the Senate. That was what was presented to the House. The railroad company lost its lawsuit, and, as railroads have done so frequently, it comes to Congress and tries to have a law enacted, in order to win its lawsuit before the legislative body, when it should fight it out in the courts.

Let us talk about some of the issues in dispute.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator has said that the railroads have come to Congress for relief. Is it not a fact, as has already been indicated, that it was the Defense Department which came to Congress and complained? It was the Defense Department which asked for some relief.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator does not know that the railroad lobby is working, he has not been around to see about it.

Mr. PURTELL. Lobbies are active on both sides.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator says that lobbies are active on both sides. I presume he is correct.

It has been stated that section 22 has always been considered to be covered by the Reed-Bulwinkle law. That is not true. Even in April, before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] were present, Mr. Clarke, the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, made this statement:

> The Commission has no power or authority at the present time to interfere in any way with the section 22 rate. We can't compel it to be raised or lowered. It is outside our jurisdiction entirely.

I invite attention to the history of the debates. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the debates printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The hearings held by the Committee on Interstate Commerce have never been printed. They are not available to Members of the Senate. The bill was passed in the House on December 10, 1945, came to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The committee held some hearings during the spring. I do not know why they have not been printed and are not available to the Members of the Senate, but they are not. No one outside the few members of the committee who were present at the time knows what the testimony was. Frequently, when bills have been brought up in the Senate, Senators have even objected to their consideration until the hearings could become available, and no one seriously questioned the propriety of such a request for postponement.
>
> Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator from Kentucky making this point very clear. Here we have a very highly controversial bill, involving one of the most complicated subjects in the entire American economy, that of freight rates, on which hearings were held for several weeks, and we are asked to take up the bill and consider it without having been able to secure a copy of the hearings and read them. The members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce may have had the hearings available, and may have had an opportunity to hear the witnesses themselves. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Reed] is familiar with these subjects by virtue of his long background in dealing with public-utility matters.
>
> Mr. President, this bill affects my State. It affects litigation which the Supreme Court of the United States has permitted my State to file in that Court, and which has been referred to a master for determination. In view of the fact that I have not been able even to secure copies of the hearings, to see what the witnesses submitted in behalf of my State, I certainly feel justified in using any means at my command which are legal to see that the bill is not passed by the Senate, or taken up for consideration, in view of the fact that we have had no opportunity whatever to read the hearings. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Kentucky has made that point clear.
>
> I ask the Senate in all seriousness, how often and to what extent are we to constitute ourselves into a supreme court in order to take away from the court litigation which has gone there properly under the law, in order that we may cut the ground out from under the Supreme Court in determining what is the law in regard to these situations? That is what this bill attempts to do.
>
> Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; very similar. The introduction of such bills seems to have become a habit here. If someone brings a lawsuit in the Federal court, and it gets to the Supreme Court, or does not get to the Supreme Court, a case which involves an interpretation of the laws which Congress has passed to protect the American people, instead of fighting the question out in the courts and allowing the courts to exercise their jurisdiction, Congress is asked to enact a law passing upon the question in advance of the courts having an opportunity to pass upon it. I think it is a vicious practice; I think it is a vicious habit; it ought never to have been indulged in.
>
> It seems to me that for the Congress to start out on the career of undertaking to nullify lawsuits, undertaking to set itself up an a master in chancery in the Supreme Court to determine what are the rights of these litigants, is an unjustified invasion of the jurisdiction of the court.
>
> Mr. HILL. And the Senate at this moment does not even have the hearings, does not even have the testimony, does not even have the evidence on this bill available to it for study.
>
> I know that investigation of the subject was made. Under this bill the Department of Justice would have no occasion to make such an investigation to determine the facts, because we are proposing to say to the Government of the United States, to the Department of Justice, and to the Federal courts, "The railroads are to be put on an island of safety, beyond the reach of the antitrust laws."
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. As I read that provision, the bill would not interfere with the litigation before the Supreme Court. If certain railroads have violated the antitrust laws, they certainly should be punished. The last thing I would wish to do would be to interfere with a suit for the punishment of such railroads.
>
> Mr. RUSSELL. The State of Georgia sought injunctive relief against the railroads from the conspiracy which was alleged, a conspiracy to combine to fix rates which were detrimental to the State of Georgia. If we pass this bill it will permit the railroads to get together and fix rates. The very heart will be cut out of the case of the State of Georgia which seeks to enjoin the conspiracy to discriminate against the State of Georgia and other States similarly situated.
>
> Mr. BARKLEY. I respectfully submit that it would do the State of Georgia, or any other State in the United States, no good simply to obtain a decision of the Supreme Court holding that what the railroads did at the time stated in the complaint was unlawful, when we are proposing to make it lawful hereafter for the railroads to do the same things which are involved in the lawsuit in the Supreme Court. The decision would be moot. It would not grant any relief. There would be no particular efficacy in having the Supreme Court decide that something which happened a year or two ago was unlawful then, and to have the Congress say that from now on it shall be lawful to do the same thing.
>
> Mr. FULBRIGHT. This matter is as important to Arkansas as it is to Georgia. I cannot understand why there is any urgency that the bill be considered. It seems to me that it would be wholly inappropriate to have

the Senate consider the bill at this time. The hearings have not been printed, and it is obvious that the subject matter of the bill is controversial.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Representatives Bulwinkle, Reed, and others stated that the Reed-Bulwinkle bill applied only to rates which were under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; that the section 22 rates, being reduced rates or special rates for Government service, were not under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is what Mr. Clarke said. That is what the sponsors of the bill said. That is what Judge McGarraghy has said. There may have been some statements to the contrary, but I have read the statement of the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it the position of the Senator from Tennessee that ever since 1948 the railroads and the Government were, in effect, violating the antitrust laws, without any escape clause?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The railroads, if they have been conspiring and working together to get Government business, have, in my opinion, violated the antitrust laws.

Mr. CLARK. And that has been going on for how long?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know how long it has been going on. There is nothing to prevent a railroad from going to the Defense Department and saying, "We will move this camp for so much." That is what section 22 provides. However, when the railroads act together, they violate the antitrust laws.

Mr. CLARK. Then is it the view of the Senator from Tennessee that for the first time the law was properly established by Judge McGarraghy?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; it has been the law right along. The sponsors of the bill want these things put under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Section 22 is not under its jurisdiction, and it never has been.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, these agreements have been made by the railroads for the past 10 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I assume some of them have been. I do not know whether the railroads have been conspiring. If they have been conspiring, they have been violating the law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I cannot yield at this time. I should like to finish this point. The Reed-Bulwinkle Act does not apply to the specific end products. The conference report does more than merely bring section 22 under the Bulwinkle Act. The Bulwinkle Act prescribes standards. The bill also has retroactive application. It applies to something that was done prior to the effective date of this paragraph. Therefore, under the bill the railroads can get their price after the contract has been performed. Retroactively, after it has been negotiated, they can get their price, without public notice, and without any of the standards set forth in the Reed-Bulwinkle Act. All they do is simply file with the ICC what they have done, and they are immunized from the application of the antitrust laws.

On the question of whether the Government will lose any money, I should like to say that, in the first place, the Interstate Commerce Commission itself has said that for the years 1950 to 1954, section 22 rates were 13 percent higher than the regular commercial rates. Mr. Earl B. Smith, the Director for Transportation and Petroleum Logistics of the Defense Department, testified to that effect on April 16, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. He said that the regular commercial rates were lower than section 22 rates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMATHERS. In essence what we are endeavoring to do, as we have repeatedly said, is to reestablish the status quo as it has existed since the passage of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, since 1948. We are not arguing the merits of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act. Perhaps we should. The fact is that Congress passed that act in 1948 by a two-thirds vote of both Houses. There is no doubt in the mind of most people, certainly not in the mind of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and certainly not in the mind of the Defense Department or the Atomic Energy Commission, that the protection given by the Reed-Bulwinkle Act applies not merely to commercial shippers and people in ordinary business, but to Government rates under section 22 as well.

The first time we ever had an idea that there was any question about such immunity was when, on July 5 of this year, the District Court of the District of Columbia entered its order.

In view of that order, we must take some action. Why must we do so? If we do not do it, the railroads and the motor carriers and the water carriers can say, "We can no longer do business with the Government under section 22. If we do, we will be subjecting ourselves to further lawsuits."

The only thing we are trying to achieve is to put ourselves back in the status quo until such time, possibly, as some Senators who are so much interested in fighting monopoly introduce a bill to hit directly the question of the repeal of the Reed-Bulwinkle Act.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee to give me his attention on this point, because I wish to say to him that he has inferred we are carrying the banner of the railroads. I would respectfully point out to him that we are not carrying the banner of the railroads, but that, unwittingly, he is carrying the banner of the railroads. Who gains if we fail to act in this situation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? He has mentioned my name.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not have the time to yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator has referred to me in the debate.

Mr. SMATHERS. If we do not act, it will cost the Defense Department $100 million, the Atomic Energy Commission $4 million, and the General Services Administration $13 million. If we do not act, the nonscheduled airlines will get a judgment of $45 million. They will get that money from the railroads, but the railroads will get even more money from the Government. By a little arithmetic, we can see that the railroads will get about $120 million. Taking $45 million from that, leaves the railroads with about $75 million net. Not only that, but when the lawsuit is over, they get another cool $120 million. Who gets it? The railroads get it. That is why for many years they have wanted section 22 stricken out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator has mentioned my name. Will he yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator has mentioned my name many times. I refer to a letter written to us by the Defense Department. They say that what worries them about the situation is that if the court decision stands there will be claims made against the Defense Department for having used below-published rates, and the railroads can come forward and demand from the Defense Department, as the Department puts it, an incalculable amount. How much? We know it will be $120 million for 1956. It will be $120 million for 1955. It will be $120 million for 1954. Consider the Korean war, it will be $200 million or $300 million. Eventually the claims will amount to almost a billion dollars.

Who will get that money? The railroads will. Therefore I submit that the only practical thing we can do is not to open this little door so that the railroads can make themselves rich. They have not been lobbying. They have been playing it cozy. They know that whichever way this goes, they are bound to win. If we fail to do anything about it, then obviously they can come forward and say that the district court decision holds they have been giving the Government below-published rates, and they are therefore entitled to get that money back. I submit that this amounts to a billion dollars.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, just prior to the vote on the Kefauver motion, a letter written to me by General Lasher which is self-explanatory, including an attached memorandum.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AGENCY,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1957.

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMATHERS: In response to your telephone request, I am inclosing a

memorandum as to the legal requirements of a carrier to collect tariff rates.

I am happy for the opportunity of assembling this information and hope that it may be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. R. LASHER,
Major General, United States Army,
Executive Director.

MEMORANDUM

Section 6 (7) of the Interstate Commerce Act provides that no carrier shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or less or different compensation for the transportation of passengers or property or for any service in connection therewith between the points named in such tariffs than the rates, fares, and charges which are specified in the tariff filed and in effect at the time. The only exception to this is that provided in section 22 which permits carriers to transport persons and property free or at reduced rates for the United States Government and for others specifically named in that section.

As stated by the United States Supreme Court in *Pennsylavnia R. Co.* v. *International Coal Min. Co.* (230 U. S. 184), "The statute required the carrier to abide absolutely by the tariff. It did not permit the company to decide that it had charged too much and then make a corresponding rebate; nor could it claim that it had charged too little, and insist upon a larger sum being paid by the shipper. * * * The tariff, so long as it was of force, was, in this respect, to be treated as though it had been a statute, binding as such upon railroad and shipper alike." The United States Supreme Court in *Lowden* v. *Simonds, Etc., Grain Co.* (306 U. S. 516), stated: "Until changed, tariffs bind both carriers and shippers with the force of law. Under section 6 of the Interstate Commerce Act the carrier cannot deviate from the rate specified in the tariff for any service in connection with the transportation of property. That section forbids the carrier from giving a voluntary rebate in any shape or form."

Therefore, if, as found by Judge McGarraghy in United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action 875–57, "1. The antitrust immunity conferred by section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act does not apply to concerted section 22 quotations made to the United States Government." * * * and "4. The concerted section 22 quotations of defendants are illegal per se under the antitrust laws.", there is good argument to support a legal requirement upon the carriers to file claims against the United States Government for the difference between the section 22 rate found "illegal" and the tariff or legal rate.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the RECORD, prior to the yea-and-nay vote on this issue, telegrams and other messages which I have received from representative leaders of the various railroad brotherhoods in the State of Oregon, as well as telegrams from some of the national officers of the same organizations of railroad labor.

The messages all bear upon the question which is before the Senate, and I believe my colleagues will be interested in studying or perusing them.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
August 14, 1957.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We railroad employees are very much interested in the passage of House bill 3233, regarding nonscheduled airlines. Our passenger trains are cut to the limit, which is affecting our economy. This will cost the taxpayers approximately $1,500,000. We are looking forward to your favorable support.

ALFRED F. CONDREY,
Chairman, Railroad Employees Committee of Klamath County.

BAKER, OREG., *August 13, 1957.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Relative to H. R. 3233 I am asking your support for the conference committee reporting, including the Harris amendment. Unless this is adopted the nonscheduled airlines will automatically receive preference over the railroad which will contribute to railroad unemployment. According to my information H. R. 3233, as amended, will also save the taxpayers about $140 million. Best wishes.

PAT DAVIS,
The Railroad Employees Association.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 13, 1957.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request favorable consideration H. R. 3233, including Harris amendment. This would protect employment railroad personnel, prevent giving this business to nonscheduled air flights, saving Government $140 million.

F. W. MADDEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Railroad Brotherhoods Legislative League of Oregon.

SALEM, OREG., *August 14, 1957.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our understanding H. R. 3233, as amended, still permits ICC to control rates. Strongly urge adoption House version in order to prevent the transfer of business from the railroads to nonscheduled airlines. Railroad employment and taxpayers would otherwise suffer.

R. C. MCCORMICK,
Chairman, Railway Employees Committee.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 14, 1957.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that the conference committee has reported out H. R. 3233. This bill includes the Harris amendment which allows the railroads to keep the business they have had rather than give it to the nonscheduled airlines. This bill is important to us for three reasons. 1. It protects our employment, 2. is supported by the Department of Defense, and 3. saves the taxpayers approximately $140 million. We, the Portland Redcaps, respectfully solicit your support of this measure.

Redcap JASON C. DANCEY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *August 15, 1957.*

Hon. Senator RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I urge your support of conference committee report on S. 939 to amend section 22 of Interstate Commerce Act. Carriers should be permitted to work together when it means reduced charges to Federal Government for transportation, and railroads should not be penalized for cooperating in this effort. No single line can accomplish this by itself. I seek your help in having conference committee report adopted this session.

H. E. GILBERT,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *August 15, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of conference committee report on S. 939 to amend section 22 of Interstate Commerce Act. Carriers should be permitted to work together when it means reduced charges to Federal Government for transportation, and railroads should not be penalized for cooperating in this effort. No single line can accomplish this by itself. We seek your help in having conference committee report adopted this session.

W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 16, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, I respectfully urge your support of conference committee report on S. 939 to amend section 22 of Interstate Commerce Act. Railroads should be permitted to work together to provide reduced charges to Federal Government for transportation and should not be penalized for cooperating to that end. No single railroad can accomplish this by itself. Therefore, your help in having conference committee report adopted this session will mean much to the taxpayers, railroads, and employees.

R. O. HUGHES, *President.*

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *August 14, 1957.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of more than 70,000 members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers manning the locomotives on the Nation's railroads, I urge you to support the conference committee report on S. 939 and assist in having it adopted at this session. We believe the railroads should be encouraged to work together in reducing charges to the Federal Government covering transportation of both troops and freight without becoming subject to antitrust penalties.

GUY L. BROWN,
Grand Chief Engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to postpone, until January 30, 1958, at 2 o'clock p. m., further consideration of the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to postpone the further consideration of the conference report until January 30, 1958, at 2 p. m.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky will state it.

Mr. MORTON. On this question, a vote "nay" will be in favor of sustaining the position taken by the conferees, will it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "nay" will be in favor of having the Senate proceed at this time with further consideration of the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not correct that a vote "yea" on the pending question will be in favor of postponing the further consideration of the conference report until January 30, 1958, at 2 p. m.; and a vote "nay" will be in opposition to the taking of that course?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. A vote "nay" will be to sustain the position taken by the conferees, will it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The vote is being taken on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to postpone the further consideration of the conference report until January 30, 1958, at 2 p. m.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is absent on official business attending the Economic Conference of the Organization of American States at Buenos Aires.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] are absent because of illness.

Then Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate, in order to represent the Senate at the Latin American Economic Conference in Buenos Aires.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—19

Carroll	Javits	Pastore
Cooper	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Scott
Gore	McNamara	Sparkman
Green	Morse	Wiley
Hill	Murray	
Humphrey	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—62

Allott	Hayden	Morton
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Barrett	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Hruska	Potter
Bennett	Ives	Purtell
Bible	Jackson	Revercomb
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Lausche	Stennis
Dirksen	Long	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Malone	Thurmond
Ervin	Mansfield	Thye
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
Goldwater	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy
Bridges	Chavez	Neely
Butler	Church	Payne
Byrd	Ellender	Yarborough
Capehart	Hennings	

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if it is agreeable, I shall yield back my time on condition that the minority leader will do likewise, and the Senate can adopt the conference report and then proceed to other business. If Senators will let us do that, they can then proceed with routine business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if there is any request for time on this side of the aisle on either side of the question. If not, I am prepared to yield back my time, and I do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO BERNALILLO COUNTY, N. MEX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9023) to amend the act of October 31, 1949, to extend until June 30, 1960, the authority of the Surgeon General to make certain payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care to certain Indians, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. COOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY APPROPRIATION BILL ON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the atomic energy appropriation bill tomorrow.

I should like to announce that I am informed by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee that there is no controversy over the bill, that the amount provided in the bill is below that provided by the House and below the budget estimates, that it is important that the Senate consider the measure, and I should like to have it considered tomorrow. It is agreeable to the minority leader and members of the committee, and I hope it will be agreeable to the Senate. Therefore I ask that it be in order to consider the bill tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What time will the Senate convene tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That has not been agreed upon, but I think, at the moment, it will be 12 o'clock. I want to discuss it with the minority leader.

MUNICIPAL YIELD INDEX CLIMBS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the fifth straight week the Dow-Jones municipal yield index shows a rise. The latest figure is 3.58 percent, an increase of 4 points over last week and the highest yield recorded since September of 1935. Interest rates, even on tax-exempt bonds, continued to rise.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on rising municipal bond yields, from the Wall Street Journal of August 19, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of August 19, 1957]

MUNICIPAL YIELD INDEX CLIMBS 4 BASIS POINTS, HITS NEW 22-YEAR HIGH

The steady attrition of municipal bond prices continued last week, and the Dow-Jones yield index on tax exempts today registers 3.58 percent, the highest level since September 1935, and an increase of 4 basis points over last Monday's 3.54 percent figure, the previous 22-year record.

The Dow-Jones index, comprised of 20 representative 20-year bonds, moves inversely to municipal security prices.

Main reason given by dealers for the dwindling value of their wares was the continued high volume of municipal securities coming to market. This swollen money demand, acting in conjunction with the Federal Government's anti-inflationary, tight-money practices, has beaten down bond prices and forced yields up to heights not seen since the midthirties, they note.

With municipal bond yields greater than those realized on many stocks and carrying their tax-free attraction besides, municipal traders discerned a mild swing from stock to bond purchases by individual investors. These investors from the stock market sought primarily short-term maturity bonds and were lured by yields from municipal bonds actually more attractive than those of the thirties. Corporate and income taxes were far less weighty 20 years ago than now.

Confronted with the possibility of a further drop in bond prices, dealers evaluated issues last week with an eye to rapid movement. Reception by investors at retail varied from good to so-so. The $44 million Los Angeles school districts issue was last week's biggest success, reporting a sellout soon after the reoffering. On the other hand, by late Friday only a little over half of New York City's $40 million securities were reported sold. Nearly a third of the $35 million Connecticut issue of 2 weeks ago was still unsold. And realistic price cuts reportedly were anticipated.

Some dealers in municipals felt the prices quoted last week were close to rock bottom. Most other dealers, however, could see no basic change in the conditions that were depressing the bond market; i. e., tight money policies of the Federal Reserve System and the heavy demand of municipalities for money they felt prices would continue to dwindle until those conditions were changed.

The visible 30-day supply of tax-exempt bonds coming to market now stands at $318,153,019, up from last Monday's figure of $304,329,614, according to the Daily Bond Buyer. The blue list total of unsold municipal and housing bonds held by dealers today of $175,318,100, also increased from last Monday's $167,086,000.

Larger issues coming up for sale this week are $21,002,000 Nassau County, N. Y., bonds today, and $19,600,000 Kansas Turnpike Authority bonds and $19 million Massachusetts obligations on Tuesday.

A NEW ISOLATIONISM—RIPPLES OR TIDE?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times magazine for August 18, 1957, entitled "A New Isolationism—Ripples or Tide?" written by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It is a very fine article, which stimulates thinking on a problem which we in this Congress and in future Congresses will have to meet. I recommend its reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine of August 18, 1957]

A NEW ISOLATIONISM—RIPPLES OR TIDE?—ITS SIGNIFICANCE CANNOT YET BE RECKONED, BUT, AS SENATOR DOUGLAS SEES IT, THERE IS MOUNTING OPPOSITION TO OUR FOREIGN AID AND TRADE PROGRAMS—HERE HE DISCUSSES ITS CAUSES

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

WASHINGTON.—Now that Congress is considering the various measures proposed by the administration, I am offering the following personal comments for what they may be worth:

"I think the United States should get out of the United Nations, and get the United Nations out of the United States.

"Isn't it time to call a halt on all this foreign aid? What has it bought for us so far?

"I can see no difference in this administration's foreign policy and that of previous Democratic administrations.

"Can't John Foster Dulles stay home for a while?"

Thus writes one of the many thousands of my Illinois constituents who have vehemently protested against the administration's foreign policies. Many of my colleagues tell me that their mail is substantially similar.

Because of this and because of numerous manifestations in Congress, many have concluded that a new tide of isolationism is rising in the country. These people point for example to the strong opposition to the foreign-aid program of the administration, to the deep indifference, or worse, regarding a more liberal immigration policy and to widespread enmity toward the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and hostility against the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC).

Thoughtful students of public affairs are asking themselves: How significant are these tendencies? Are they, for example, deeply rooted or adroitly manufactured by business and isolationist groups? What are the basic emotions and what are the philosophies which cause them? It would take more than a Senator to consider these questions fully, but perhaps I can make a beginning.

As to whether the opposition is spontaneous or organized, it is my impression that the outburst started with voluntary protests. But 2 weeks after Secretary Humphrey appealed for a big cut in his own administration's budget, the protesting letters swelled into an organized torrent. From then on they gave the impression of being largely stimulated by corporations, both big and small, and by many, although not all, of the various chambers of commerce.

In analyzing my own mail, I find that the largest number come from the western, northwestern, and northern suburbs of Chicago. These areas are overwhelmingly Republican and populated chiefly by junior and senior executives of the big corporations which increasingly dominate the industrial scene. These people are members of the group described by William F. Whyte in his book The Organization Man. They, and indeed most of the small- and medium-sized so-called independent businessmen, are followers of what C. Wright Mills terms "the power elite." After reading such letters carefully, I have concluded that the protests of these men and women on foreign aid are primarily a business revolt against the high cost of government.

Some of the opposition to our foreign policy is countrywide and more or less universal, while other elements are regional and cultural.

In the first place, it should be frankly recognized that it is hard for any nation to be constantly helpful and cooperative in foreign affairs for long periods of time. It has now been 12 years since World War II ended. One emergency has followed another and the American public has risen to each. We saved Europe from starvation with our support of UNRRA, then came the French and British loans, then the Marshall plan, then NATO and following that, Korea. We have been forced to build up huge armaments, send again hundreds of thousands of young men overseas, spend no less than $60 billion on overseas aid of one form or another and increase our own national budget to $70 billion a year.

It is indeed a source of wonder that the American people have done so well under these strains. Probably no other nation in human history has ever exerted itself so intelligently to preserve its own safety or to be so helpful to others. But it is natural for even the most tireless and far-sighted advocates of international cooperation to grow weary as year follows year and no respite appears.

Just as liberals became "tired" in the twenties, so there are clear signs that the internationalists are tiring rapidly now. For example, when I recently tried to rally some low-tariff economists to defend the principles which they had always espoused, I found no response. They had retired from the struggle. The resistance to isolationism is therefore being greatly weakened by this emotional and intellectual fatigue. Moreover, a period of relative prosperity, such as the present, makes most men and women complacent and reluctant to think deeply about issues.

But what about the positive forces making for isolationism? Here it may be helpful to consider this in terms of the four major sections of the United States, namely, the Middle West, the Northeast, the Far West and the South. Let me start with my own region, the Middle West, which is naturally the one I know best.

The German-American elements in our area, for example, have been subjected to severe emotional strains during the last 40 years. Feeling themselves to be loyal Americans, they have nevertheless found our country ranging itself twice against the beloved land whence they and their ancestors sprang. It is but natural therefore that these groups should, in the main, have resented our involvement in foreign affairs and have desired that we isolate ourselves from Europe so that we would not be tempted to go to war again.

But while this feeling is still strong amongst the German-Americans, it is much less so than it was during the hectic days of 1938–41. This is due to the increasing amalgamation of the German stock with other elements of the population, to honest revulsion over the crimes committed by Hitler, and to increasing awareness that the United

States is the strongest protection of West Germany against communism and the best friend of Chancellor Adenauer.

There is also a strong degree of isolationist sentiment among many other nationality groups in the Middle West. This is partially caused by the age-old distrust of Great Britain and by the belief that in foreign affairs we ultimately play the game of that nation. It is the fashion of British writers and eastern editors to belittle this distrust as false and improper. However, it stems in part from the justified resentment aroused by the superiority complex shown by both Englishmen and the New England stock toward the other residents of the Middle West.

I well remember how, in the heyday of Big Bill Thompson in Chicago, that worthy suddenly shouted at an election rally that, if he were elected mayor, he "would bust King George on the snoot." The answering roar of applause showed that he had touched a raw nerve. This human resentment at being treated as inferior is still a powerful force in midwestern isolationism. This feeling also arises in part from memories of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 and of the way in which Great Britain favored the South in the Civil War. Such memories are raised to greater intensity by justified resentment over the abuses practiced by the British against the Irish from the days of Cromwell to those of the Sinn Fein Rebellion. The policy of certain midwestern papers has in turn both reflected and intensified this anti-British sentiment.

And yet this feeling for isolationism, reinforced as it was by geographical remoteness and a deep revulsion against foreign wars, was never as strong as many eastern pundits represented it. William Allen White, after all, came from Emporia, Kans. This conclusion is reinforced by my own personal experience. When I first ran for the United States Senate in 1948, I campaigned for active participation by the United States in the struggle against communism and in support of the United Nations and the Marshall plan. Although I was fought bitterly by nearly the entire press of the State—including, of course, the Chicago Tribune—I nevertheless was elected by a majority of 408,000, the second highest in the history of Illinois. Again, in 1954, I waged my campaign on the same general lines and, despite the fact that I faced both my usual opposition and that of the Eisenhower administration, which threw its full strength against me, I again won—in an off year and with a lowered turnout—by no less than 241,000.

My general conclusion about the Middle West, therefore, is that while isolationism is still strong in the great heartland of America—and has been recently reinforced by business desires for lower expenditures and a tax cut—it is basically not as strong as it once was. What, then, about sentiment in the three other main sections of the country, namely, the Northeast, the Far West, and the South?

The northeast coast, stretching from Lubec, Maine, to Washington, because of its close cultural and economic ties with Europe, has since 1916 been predominantly internationalist and interventionist. Most of the suburbanites and exurbanites who dwell along the Atlantic coast have different opinions on these matters from those of their midwestern cousins. The labor movement in these areas, notably in the clothing trades, has also realized the need for international cooperation.

The Far West has been somewhat isolationist, so far as Europe is concerned, but the coast States have been intensely interested in Asia and in the control of the Pacific. This tendency has been shown by the 1954 senatorial victory in Oregon of the able and well-informed RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. The election of Senators CHURCH from Idaho and CARROLL from Colorado, together with various Congressional elections in those same States, suggests that isolationist sentiment is also abating in the Rocky Mountain area. This region, despite its geographical distance from both Europe and Asia, seems increasingly aware of international realities even though on grounds of economy it may want some reduction in foreign aid.

Far more serious than the continuing isolationist feeling centered in the Middle West, however, has been the rapid change of sentiment in this direction in the South. Formerly, the South was a strong force for both interventionism and internationalism. This was partially caused by the strength of the military tradition and by the almost total absence of pacifist sentiment. Every southern hamlet had its highly honored officers and noncommissioned officers in the Navy, Army, Air Force, and Marines.

Furthermore, since the prosperity of the South was largely built upon the export of raw cotton and tobacco to Europe, southerners naturally desired low tariffs at home and a free and democratic market to which they could sell abroad. We Democratic liberals of the North and West who believed in the principles of international cooperation in support of democracy, and who defended our position against bitter and unrelenting opposition, found this southern attitude a strong support. We might differ with the southerners on domestic policies, but we were united on foreign policy. We took pride in the good work done by Senators Connally, George, and Fulbright.

It is different now. The first signs of the change came when the Reciprocal Trade Act was up for renewal in 1955. In the House of Representatives, virtually every Congressman from the Piedmont region, stretching from Danville, Va., to Birmingham, Ala., joined the Republican protectionists against this measure and failed by only one vote to defeat it. In the Senate, the defection of the hitherto low-tariff southern Senators led to a critical weakening of the bill which almost emasculated it.

This shift of opinion was due to the fact that the textile industry—cotton, woolens and synthetics—has virtually withdrawn from New England and has moved into the foothills of the South. In the process, the industries have brought with them their protectionist prejudices. Just as New Englanders—despite the economic teachings of their colleges—used to be predominantly protectionists, so the entire Piedmont area is now rapidly moving in the same direction.

In the last year, still another factor has appeared. As economic aid has been liquidated in Europe, the demand for possible future work has shifted to the Middle East and to Asia. But the development of the great river valleys of the Nile, the Jordan, the Tigris and Euphrates, and the Ganges, and the use of these waters for irrigation, will inevitably lead to the production of more raw cotton. The cotton planters of our coastal plains and of the Mississippi delta believe, with some reason, that this will decrease the market for southern cotton. Hence, they look with bilious eyes upon proposals to grant large sums of money to these countries. "Why," they ask, "should we be taxed in order to subsidize our rivals?"

This new fear is affecting our foreign policy. There was, therefore, more than a casual connection between the rough treatment which the Senate Appropriations Committee gave to Mr. Dulles' foreign-aid program last year and the decisive and brusque manner in which he almost immediately afterward discontinued our support of the Aswan Dam project. As we all know, Mr. Dulles' action then triggered off Colonel Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal a week afterward and his defiance of the Western World.

These same forces are currently operating against any long-term economic commitments in the Middle East and India. For such commitments would inevitably move us out from the county-agent type of technical aid, which was the original core of the point 4 program, into the economic development of the river valleys and the better utilization of that desperately scarce resource of the East, namely, water. The cottongrowers dislike all this. Thus the majority of southern Senators were recorded against the mutual-security bill. In addition, the same fear of Japanese textiles is holding back our joining the OTC and ratifying GATT. It is also causing many groups to want closer trade relations between Japan and Red China in order to divert Japanese exports from this country.

There is, therefore, a very strong prospect that the alliance between the conservative Republicans of the Midwest and the southern conservatives, which has dominated Congress for the last 20 years, will be revived once the current civil-rights fight has subsided. Both groups agree on opposition to further foreign aid, advocate a return to protection, and support a less cooperative attitude on foreign affairs.

Unless a countervailing movement sets in, the foreign policy of this country may therefore grow increasingly in the direction of isolation. Such a countervailing force may lie, of course, in the growing awareness both of the international danger of Communist aggression and the earth-destroying nature of atomic and hydrogen warfare.

But perhaps we should not try to base our case for foreign aid exclusively on the grounds of national security or direct economic interest. These are real and powerful considerations, and they should not be muted. But why should we be ashamed of wanting to be friends to other people and seeking to help them? For it is just this type of friendliness which the world needs most.

It is, of course, hard to persevere in well-doing after a decade of intense and superficially unappreciated service. But if we reach down to the ethical bases for our action, and not merely weigh prudent economic and security factors, we can tap new sources of strength. We need not shrink from being scornfully branded as do-gooders by the isolationist press. For is not the greatest do-gooder of all time the very one who in our hearts we most honor and would most like to resemble?

We should not let the zeal of the professional public relations men who now largely determine our foreign policy obscure the fact that the only real way to make a friend is to be a friend. In the long run, effective mutual help, rather than words, is the best creator of friendship and of peace. As we create better relations and raise the standard of living elsewhere, we shall build bastions of freedom where democracy can thrive.

And if we hesitate over such a decision, we should let the spirit of the Galilean enter our worldly and power-obsessed hearts, and remember His words: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me also."

Perhaps we might then realize that the neighbors whom He told us we should love as we do ourselves are those who anywhere are in need of aid and friendship.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF COMPENSATION INCREASES TO WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 25 is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the pending business Calendar No. 389?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Calendar No. 389,

which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 25) relating to effective date of increases in compensation granted to Wage Board employees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Nevada be recognized.

CONSTRUCTION OF A STADIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
OREN HARRIS,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
SID SIMPSON,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

CORNELIA S. ROBERTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 714, a private bill, H. R. 4240, for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts.

I ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to give a brief explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4240) for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $3,500 to Cornelia S. Roberts, of Bowie, Md., for her erroneous overpayment of Federal income taxes for the year 1945.

Mr. President, I can explain the bill further if any Senator so desires.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement relating to the bill, for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue show that, in filing her income-tax return for 1945, Mrs. Roberts reported as a credit against her tax liability payments of estimated taxes amounting to $19,122.80, whereas, payments actually had been made amounting to $22,622.80. No claim for refund was filed within the applicable 3-year period of limitation for such claims following the due date of her return. Accordingly, when the claimant subsequently sought to have either a refund or a credit for the amount of overpayment, her requests were denied, pursuant to section 322 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The report of the Treasury Department states:

"No audit was made of the taxpayer's return for the year 1945, as it is not the policy of the Internal Revenue Service to conduct audits of returns on which adjustments are clearly barred by the statute of limitations."

Further, in 1946, a similar mistake, also in the amount of $3,500, was made but, unlike the return of 1945, an overpayment of $433.74 was indicated. Although the error of $3,500 in stating the payments of estimated taxes was not discovered until after the expiration of the statute of limitations, the Internal Revenue Service held that the return for 1946 should be considered as a claim for refund of this $3,500. Similar administrative action with respect to the claimant's 1945 return was not believed to be justified, however, since the 1945 return did not indicate any overpayment.

The claimant states that during these periods her tax accounts were handled by a bookkeeper employed by her and that the error made by the bookkeeper was not discovered until after the running of the statute of limitations for both returns.

The Treasury Department does not favor enactment of the instant bill.

The committee has been informed that the factual situation, under which the mistake took place, is simple. Claimant was making quarterly payments which were paid every 3 months. After the third payment the claimant filed her formal return for the year (1945) including a check to make up the difference between the amount paid in first 3 quarterly installments and the amount due. When the time came for the fourth installment claimant received a bill from the collector and the fourth installment was paid by check in due course by claimant's secretary. The secretary sent the check thinking that, inasmuch as the Bureau had sent a notice or bill, the amount was due. This is borne out by photostats of the checks in question in the committee files. In other words, the Bureau received a tax return from the claimant showing the amount due to be $19,122.80 and received checks in the amount of $22,622.80. The Treasury Department admits the added $3,500 was not due, and was a windfall to the Government, but objects to the bill on the grounds of the running of the statute of limitations.

The committee has been informed that an attorney has rendered substantial services in connection with this claim and the attorney's fee provision has been retained.

After careful consideration of the above facts the committee feels that in all equity the claimant is entitled to the return of her money and accordingly recommends that the bill be favorably considered.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report of the Treasury Department on a similar bill of the 84th Congress, together with other pertinent documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that it is our purpose to consider today and tomorrow Calendar No. 389, S. 25, relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to Wage Board employees; Calendar No. 1054, S. 2205, to amend section 116 (4) of chapter 10 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act; Calendar No. 577, S. 2377, to amend chapter 223, title 18, United States Code, to provide for the production of statements and reports of witnesses; Calendar No. 706, S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; and Calendar No. 814, S. 2672, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to increase the salaries of certain executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

I wonder if my friend, the Senator from Florida, or my friend, the Senator from Washington, can give me the calendar number for the bill relating to rights of vessels, which we had up the other evening.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is Calendar No. 861.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend, the Senator from Washington, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I should like to inform the Senator from Washington and the other Members of the Senate that we expect to motion up Calendar No. 861, S. 1483, to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relating to the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in the territorial waters of foreign countries, but we

shall not do so today. We hope to be able to do that tomorrow.

In addition, we will take up for consideration the Atomic Energy Appropriation Act tomorrow, as well as any conference reports which may be available.

I do not intend, unless some emergency develops of which I am unaware at the moment, to have a session on Saturday. I hope Senators will realize that this is the latter part of the session and that it may be necessary next week to have some evening sessions.

I hope that the chairmen of the committees will again review all measures pending before each committee, in the hope that proper consideration can be given to them, particularly measures embodying recommendations of the Executive. If they can be approved, I hope they will be approved and reported to the Senate, because they will be considered if they reach the calendar. If they cannot be reported, I hope that hearings will be announced and plans will be made to consider them either later in this session or early in the next session. If it is found in the wisdom of the committees that certain measures should be rejected, I hope they will be rejected, so that the departments will be on notice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said:

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I expect to move to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1078, S. 314, to assist the United States cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market.

I wish to add that bill to the list of measures I previously announced which we may possibly consider this week.

I should also like to give notice of the possibility of proceeding to the consideration of Order No. 892, S. 2363, to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, there is at the desk a message from the House of Representatives regarding an amendment made by the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1568. I ask that the Presiding Officer lay the amendment before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1568) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, as used in this act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' shall mean the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) The term 'Commission' shall mean the Colorado River Commission of the State of Nevada.

"(c) The term 'State' shall mean the State of Nevada.

"(d) The term 'transfer area' shall mean all lands or interests in lands owned by the United States and located within the exterior boundaries of the area described in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to segregate from all forms of entry under the public land laws of the United States, during a period of 5 years from and after the effective date of this act, the following described lands, situated in the State of Nevada and comprising approximately 126,775 acres:

"(1) All of south half, township 23 south, range 63 east, with the exception of the following areas: east half section 22; four 5-acre tracts located in section 26 and described as follows: south half southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter and south half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter; and those portions of the northeast quarter section 23, and north half section 24, within the Lake Mead national recreation area.

"(2) Fractional sections 25 and 36, township 23 south, range 63½ east.

"(3) All of sections 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, township 23 south, range 64 east.

"(4) Fractional sections 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, township 23½ south, range 64 east.

"(5) All of southeast quarter of township 24 south, range 62 east.

"(6) All of township 24 south, range 63 east.

"(7) All of township 24 south, range 64 east, except sections 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, and 36.

"(8) All of township 25 south, range 62 east.

"(9) All of township 25 south, range 63 east.

"(10) All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 25 south, range 64 east.

"(11) All of sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, and 14, township 26 south, range 62 east.

"(12) All of northwest quarter, township 26 south, range 63 east.

"All range references contained in the foregoing refer to the Mount Diablo base and meridian.

"SEC. 3. The Commission, acting on behalf of the State, is hereby given the option, after compliance with all of the provisions of this act and any regulations promulgated hereunder, of having patented to the State by the Secretary all or portions of the lands within the transfer area. Such option may be exercised at any time during the 5-year period of segregation established in section 2, but the filing of any application for the conveyance of title to any lands within the transfer area, if received by the Secretary from the Commission prior to the expiration of such period, shall have the effect of extending the period of segregation of such lands from all forms of entry under the public land laws until such application is finally disposed of by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. Prior to conveying any lands or interests in lands of the United States to the State, the Commission and the Secretary shall comply with the requirements set out following:

"(a) The Commission, within 1 year after the effective date of this act, shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development for the entire transfer area, which plan shall include but need not be limited to the general terms and conditions under which individuals, governmental agencies or subdivisions, corporations, associations or other legal entities may acquire rights, title, or interests in and to lands within the transfer area.

"(b) At any time after submission of a proposed plan for the entire transfer area, as required by the preceding subsection, the Commission may select for transfer from Federal to State ownership such land units within the transfer area as contain not less than 18 sections of land in reasonably compact tracts, taking into account the situation and potential uses of the land involved. All applications for transfer of title to any such land unit shall be made to the Secretary and shall be accompanied by a development and acquisition planning report containing such information relative to any proposed development and acquisition payment plan as may by regulation be required by the Secretary. No acquisition payment plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless such plan provides for payment by the State into the Treasury of the United States, within 5 years of the delivery of patent to the Commission, of an amount equal to the appraised fair market value of the lands conveyed.

"(c) Upon receipt of any application for transfer of title to any land unit the Secretary shall cause an appraisal to be made of the fair market value of the lands within the unit proposed to be transferred, including mineral and material values if any, but in arriving at such value the Secretary shall not include factors reflecting enhancement of the value of the lands within the unit involved by reason of development or improvement of other lands within the transfer area which have previously been patented to the State.

"(d) As soon as a proposed unit development and acquisition planning report is found by the Secretary to comply with the provisions of this act and with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe as to the contents thereof, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate a contract of sale with the Commission and to prepare appropriate conveyancing instruments for the lands involved.

"Thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress, for reference to the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, copies of the Commission application, proposed unit development and acquisition planning report, and proposed contract of sale and conveyancing instruments, together with his comments and recommendations, if any.

"(e) No contract of sale or instrument of conveyance shall be executed by the Secretary with respect to any lands applied for by the Commission prior to 60 calendar days (which 60 days, however, shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 calendar days to a day certain) from the day on which the Secretary makes the submissions required by the preceding subsection unless the Congress, prior to the expiration of said 60 days, approves the execution of such contract of sale and instrument of conveyance.

"SEC. 5. The conveyance or conveyances authorized by this act shall be made subject to any existing valid rights pertaining to the lands included within the transfer area.

"SEC. 6. If the State selects and purchases under this act any lands which are subject on the date the purchase by the State becomes effective to a lease, permit, license, or contract issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended (39 U. S. C. 181 and the following), the State shall be required to purchase all the lands subject to that lease, permit, license, or contract which are included within the boundaries of the transfer area. The purchase of lands subject to a lease, permit, license, or contract shall neither affect the validity nor modify the terms of the lease, permit, license, or contract in any way, or affect any rights thereunder, except that the State shall assume the position of the United States thereunder, including any right to rental, royalties, and other payments accruing on or after the date on which the purchase by the State becomes effective, and any right to modify the terms or conditions of such leases, permits, licenses, or contracts.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this act. He shall give particular attention in so doing to including in any conveyancing instruments executed under the authority of this act such provisions as will in his judgment protect existing or future uses by the United States of lands within the transfer area, including, but not limited to, provision for reversion of title therein to the United States upon failure of the State or its successors in interest to strictly comply with the terms and conditions of any such conveyancing instrument. In establishing any future Federal easements, however, no lands shall be included upon which substantial improvements have been placed by the State or its successor in interest."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to recommend that the Senate disagree to the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives, and to move that the Senate request a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. MALONE the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JACKSON SCHOOL TOWNSHIP, IND.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives relating to Senate bill 807, for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind.; and I desire to move, when that is done, that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 807) for the relief of Jackson School Township, Ind., which was, on page 1, line 6, strike out "$275,000" and insert "$193,352."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. As the bill passed the Senate, it authorized a payment of $275,000 to the township for the loss of its school property. The House has reduced the amount to $193,352, and the authors of the bill are willing to accept this amendment. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, in his usual diligent fashion, has urged the majority leader to move to consider some nominations on the executive calendar. We have considered about 43,000 nominations this year, and there are only a few nominations left on the executive calendar.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John S. Hastings, of Indiana, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit, vice J. Earl Major, retired;

W. Lynn Parkinson, of Indiana, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit, vice H. Nathan Swaim, deceased; and

Robert A. Grant, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana, vice W. Lynn Parkinson, elevated.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Peter T. Dracopoulos, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce, vice Mark Taylor, resigned; and

Harry Surle, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce, vice Eugene W. Geniesse, resigned.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Richard Jackson, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy; and

Brig. Gen. Theron Baldwin Herndon, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Cabot Lodge to be a representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. S. J. CARNAHAN to be a representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of WALTER H. JUDD to be a representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Meany to be a representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herman B. Wells to be a representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miss Irene Dunne to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation at this time. I shall not raise any objection to the nominations of the alternates to the United Nations. The State Department has made the recommendations and the President has submitted the nominations. I understand that at least three or four of the alternates are members of one political party. I am informed that that is not unusual, and that it has happened in the past under Democratic administrations. I wish to express the hope, however, that it not become a strictly Republican United Nations, and that we will try to balance the nominations as nearly as possible. Even though my own administration may have erred in that regard in the past, I hope this administration will not continue in that error and load the United States representation with nominees from its own party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations of alternate representatives to the U. N. be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I make the same request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of collectors of customs are confirmed en bloc.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry Edwards to be Surveyor of Customs for customs collection district No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harvey G. Straub to be a member of the Board of Parole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States district judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas H. Trent to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations placed on the Vice President's desk, referred to at the bottom of page 5 of today's Executive Calendar, be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader calls my attention to the nominations of three judges, which have been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, but which have not been printed on the calendar. Since there is no objection to the nominations, I have agreed that they be considered now, as a courtesy to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of W. Lynn Parkinson to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert A. Grant to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John S. Hastings to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EXAMINERS IN THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, are there any other nominations which have been reported but which have not been placed on the Executive Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two nominations of chief examiners in the Patent Office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They have been reported by the Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry Surle to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Peter T. Dracopoulos to be an examiner in chief in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope this notification reaches the President himself. We have confirmed more than 3,000 nominations this year. I know the Senator from California is aware of the problems we have had, but it should be noted that in the closing days of the session we do not have one nomination remaining on the Executive Calendar. Some persons may be disappointed, but I hope that is not true in the case of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, and I say this both on behalf of the President of the United States, who has sent the nominations to the Senate, and in my own behalf, as minority leader, our deep appreciation of the way in which the majority leader, with whom I have frequently consulted, has accelerated the handling of these matters in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to state that within the next day or two the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report approximately 100 or more post office nominations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 215) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain public hearings, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 293. An act 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;

H. R. 3658. An act to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits;

H. R. 6952. An act to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries;

H. R. 7458. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7697. An act to provide additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8755. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social-security coverage, under its agreement, separately for those of its employees who are covered by a retirement system and who desire such coverage, to include Alabama, Georgia, New York, and Tennessee among the States which may obtain social-security coverage for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system on the same basis as other State and local employees, and to extend the period during which State agreements for social-security coverage of State and local employees may be made retroactive; and

H. R. 8892. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social-security purposes and to permit such a minister to include, for social-security purposes, the value of meals and lodging furnished him for the convenience of his employer and the rental value of the parsonage furnished to him, and for other purposes.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 215) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain public hearings, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROGRESS IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, without a question of a doubt, history will record that the first half of this century

marked the golden age of rural electrification. Bringing electricity to the farms and ranches throughout the length and breadth of our country is one of the outstanding social and economic developments of this generation.

In the first 35 years of this century a small but persistent group endeavored by every means at their disposal to promote interest in farm electrification. Strange as it may seem, their movement was referred to with letters somewhat similar to our own REA. It was called CREA, the abbreviation for Committee on the Relationship of Electricity to Agriculture.

The purpose of their organization was to investigate the application of electricity to farm needs and to devise plans for promoting farm electrification. Despite the efforts of these groups, rural electrification made slow progress.

The rural electrification program was brought into being by an executive order in 1935 under conditions which made it a part of the Federal Government's general program for relief of unemployment. The immediate task of REA was to promote rural electrification in such a way as to get funds rapidly into channels of commerce and thereby stimulate employment. At least 25 percent of the funds were required to be spent directly for labor, with the further provision that 90 percent of the labor would be obtained from the relief rolls. The pattern in the use of relief funds had been grants, loans, and other forms of subsidy. However, this temporary organization was unable to discover ways and means of employing grants and it was unable to develop a satisfactory plan for utilizing unskilled labor from relief rolls for construction of rural power systems.

Through the executive order issued in May 1935, the President established REA as a lending agency charged with responsibility of promoting rural electrification through a program of interest-bearing self-liquidating loans.

When the Rural Electrification Administration was first created in 1935, only 10.9 percent of the farms of our country had central station electric service. Generally speaking, these farms were adjacent to urban areas such as dairy farms or irrigated farms that required electric power in large quantities. In most areas of the country very few farms were hooked up to power lines because the cost of the connection was higher than farmers generally could afford.

In May, 1936, the Congress passed the Rural Electrification Act, which gave REA statutory authority for the promotion of rural electrification. In the first year of operation the Rural Electrification Administration worked with established electric companies, as that appeared to be the most expeditious way to use the funds made available by the Congress for the program.

Various reasons have been cited for the failure of the electric companies to take the initiative in the rural electrification program. Whatever the reasons may have been, the fact is that few electric companies submitted loan applications. A study was also made of the possibility of using municipal systems as an instrumentality for extending electric service to the farms, but likewise few cities or towns were interested. It shortly became apparent that the rural electric cooperative was the most promising vehicle to develop a nationwide program of rural electrification.

The task of developing the program in the formative years through rural electric cooperatives was not easy. The cooperatives had to be locally organized and incorporated under State law. In many States enabling legislation was required. The cooperatives had to develop a plan for their electric distribution plant which had to be soundly engineered and capable of serving the members' needs. They had to demonstrate that the system would operate successfully and repay the loan. They had to arrange for wholesale power at reasonable cost. On many occasions these and other difficulties appeared insurmountable to the organizers. There was no precedent to serve as a guide. It is apparent now that from the beginning the strength of the rural electrification program has been the intense desire of farm and other rural people to obtain for themselves dependable electric service at reasonable cost.

Considering the overwhelming obstacles these groups were obliged to overcome, it is fair to state that over the years the accomplishments of the rural electrification program have been little short of phenomenal.

From Maine to California, from Texas to the Canadian border, this splendid self-liquidating loan program is providing a vital and essential utility service to the rural people of our great land. The REA program has meant so much to the farmers of America that it is exceedingly difficult to measure its immense contribution to the general welfare and economy of our country. The story of rural electrification is a story of people. It cannot be told in terms of the vast sums invested or measured by the millions of consumers served. The people in the farming communities in every section of our country will gladly testify to the solid worth of the program. Power has released the farm wife from drudgery of the washboard. It has lightened her home chores and has given her more leisure time for family activities and participation in civic affairs. Rural folks who got city lights for the first time nearly a quarter century ago were understandably grateful. For some it meant an end to pumping and carrying water or to emptying the drip pan under the icebox.

It is only recently that our farmers have begun to move into this wondrous electrical age. This is clearly indicated by the upsurging in kilowatt-hour sales and in the growing number of new all-electric farm homes, as well as by the revolution in dairy farming. Electricity is truly the modern, efficient, low-cost miracle worker for the farmer. Electricity makes living and working conditions in the country more attractive to farm youth; and, as a result, the rural areas are keeping more of their ambitious, capable young people at home. They have all the advantages and home comforts of city living—radio, TV, lighted schoolrooms with instruction opportunities provided by electric equipment, shop and household appliances.

Unlike the days of long ago, the farm home of today compares quite favorably with the city home for comfort and convenience. The electrification of the farm water systems has made it possible to protect the family against many causes of ill health, and refrigeration safeguards the family food supply.

The primary objective of the program is to provide a means whereby our farm people can obtain for themselves the indispensable utility service so necessary for improved living conditions and for efficient farm operations. Service, rather than profit, is the fundamental concept of the program.

Along with farm mechanization, as symbolized by the tractor, rural electrification has brought about almost revolutionary changes in both rural living and productive capacity on our farms and in rural areas. In the years ahead when the history of this era is written, rural electrification may well go down as the greatest of all federally sponsored farm programs.

The REA was originally set up as an independent agency, but since 1939 it has been a part of the Department of Agriculture. The Rural Electrification Act empowers the REA to make self-liquidating loans to qualified borrowers, with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations, for the construction of power facilities to persons in rural areas without central station service and for financing the purchase of electrical appliances and equipment by rural consumers.

Since 1949, under an amendment to the Act, the REA has been empowered to make loans for the purpose of extending and improving telephone service in rural areas.

The Federal loan program for rural electrification today serves the electric power requirements of more than 4 million rural consumers. At this time it is expanding at top speed to keep pace with the increasing use of power in every section of the country. It is in splendid financial condition. There are 978 active borrowers, with facilities in more than 2,600 of the Nation's 3,000 counties.

In the telephone program there are 540 borrowers, whose plans call for new or improved dial service to about 845,000 rural subscribers in 44 States. This program also is moving ahead at the greatest possible speed.

During the 6 years preceding World War II the number of electrified farms tripled. Working with newly organized rural electric cooperatives, REA succeeded in reducing construction costs. This was achieved through the application of mass construction techniques and through the development of new and lower-cost construction designs adapted to rural service needs. When World War II ended, the rural electric cooperatives and the power companies quickly resumed their efforts to connect the remaining unserved farms; and

today about 95 percent of the farms are served with electricity compared to 10.9 percent in 1935.

Mr. President, the tremendous growth in rural electrification in the past 22 years is clearly evident in a table which I ask to have printed in the RECORD. It indicates by States the total number of farms in 1935 and in 1954 and the number and percentage of such farms electrified in 1935 as compared with the number and percentage electrified in 1956.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Number and Percentage of Farms Electrified with Central Station Service, by States, 1935 and 1956

Area	Farms Jan. 1, 1935 (number) [1]	Farms receiving central station electric service Dec. 31, 1934		Farms November 1954 (number) [3]	Farms receiving central station electric service June 30, 1956	
		Number [2]	Percent		Number [4]	Percent
United States	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	4,782,393	4,507,050	94.2
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	176,956	162,500	91.8
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	9,321	8,150	87.4
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	145,075	136,950	94.4
California	150,360	81,093	53.9	123,074	119,050	96.7
Colorado	63,644	7,145	11.2	40,749	36,150	88.7
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	12,753	12,600	98.8
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	6,297	6,050	96.1
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	57,543	52,200	90.7
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	165,524	157,250	95.0
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	38,735	37,550	96.9
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	175,543	170,050	96.9
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	153,593	151,100	98.4
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	192,933	189,300	98.1
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	120,167	109,050	90.7
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	193,487	178,750	92.4
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	111,127	106,750	96.1
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	23,368	21,950	94.0
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	32,500	30,650	94.3
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	17,361	17,100	98.5
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	138,922	136,100	98.0
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	165,225	157,300	95.2
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	215,915	188,250	87.2
Missouri	278,454	17,893	6.4	201,614	191,050	94.8
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	33,059	28,450	86.1
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	100,846	94,850	94.1
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	2,857	2,100	73.5
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	10,411	10,200	98.0
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.6	22,686	22,500	99.2
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	21,070	17,600	83.5
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	105,714	103,500	97.9
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	267,906	257,500	96.1
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	61,939	52,300	84.4
Ohio	255,146	48,048	18.8	177,074	172,500	97.4
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	118,979	108,100	90.9
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	54,442	52,950	97.3
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	128,876	124,400	96.5
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	2,004	1,950	97.5
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	124,203	113,100	91.1
South Dakota	83,303	2,939	3.5	62,520	54,200	86.7
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	203,149	191,550	94.3
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	292,946	272,650	93.1
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	22,825	22,150	97.0
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	15,981	15,700	98.2
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	136,416	126,850	93.0
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	65,175	64,150	98.4
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	68,583	63,750	93.0
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	153,558	148,550	96.7
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	11,392	9,650	84.7

[1] United States Census of Agriculture, 1935, 1940, and 1950.
[2] Edison Electric Institute.
[3] United States Census of Agriculture, 1954, preliminary.
[4] REA estimate.

Mr. BARRETT. According to the census record, 275,000 farms do not now receive central station electric service. Half of that total are farms in the States of Alabama, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. A table which I now ask to have printed in the RECORD shows the number of farms by States together with the percentage of the total number of farms in the country not presently receiving central station electric service.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

	Farms without central station electric service June 30, 1956	Percent of total
United States	275,250	100
Alabama	14,450	5.2
Arizona	1,150	.4
Arkansas	8,150	3.0
California	4,000	1.4
Colorado	4,600	1.7
Connecticut	150	.1
Delaware	250	.1
Florida	5,350	2.0
Georgia	8,250	3.0
Idaho	1,200	.4
Illinois	5,500	2.0
Indiana	2,500	.9
Iowa	3,650	1.3
Kansas	11,100	4.0
Kentucky	14,750	5.4
Louisiana	4,400	1.6
Maine	1,400	.5
Maryland	1,850	.7
Massachusetts	250	.1
Michigan	2,800	1.0
Minnesota	7,900	2.9
Mississippi	27,650	10.0
Missouri	10,550	3.8
Montana	4,600	1.7
Nebraska	6,000	2.2
Nevada	750	.3
New Hampshire	200	.1
New Jersey	200	.1
New Mexico	3,450	1.2
New York	2,200	.8
North Carolina	10,400	3.8
North Dakota	9,650	3.5
Ohio	4,550	1.6
Oklahoma	10,900	4.0
Oregon	1,500	.5
Pennsylvania	4,500	1.6
Rhode Island	50	0
South Carolina	11,100	4.0
South Dakota	8,300	3.0
Tennessee	11,600	4.2
Texas	20,300	7.4
Utah	700	.2
Vermont	300	.1
Virginia	9,550	3.5
Washington	1,000	.4
West Virginia	4,850	1.8
Wisconsin	5,000	1.8
Wyoming	1,750	.6

Mr. BARRETT. About 55 percent of all the electrified farms of America are served through loans of the Rural Electrification Administration. Only Connecticut and Rhode Island do not have facilities financed by REA. It should also be noted that REA borrowers are serving Alaska and Puerto Rico. During the past 10 years more farms have been connected to REA lines than by all other electric systems combined. The constantly increasing percentage of electrified farms served by REA borrowers from 1935 to date is apparent from a table which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Percent of Electrified Farms Served by REA Borrowers

1935	0
1940	23.6
1944	34.7
1947	39.6
1950	50.5
1953	53.8
1956	54.5

Mr. BARRETT. At the present time REA borrowers are connecting new consumers at the rate of about 100,000 per year. It is reasonable to assume that in the years that lie ahead these rural systems will continue to add new consumers. Our constantly growing population and the trend toward country living contribute in a major way to the increasing number of consumers served by REA-financed systems. At the end of 1956 the REA borrowers were serving about 4,361,000, although the average for that year was 4,229,000 consumers. A table, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, shows that in 1956 about 58 percent of these consumers were farms, 34 percent were rural residential consumers located in small towns and in the country, and the remaining 8 percent were mostly commercial, industrial, public buildings and irrigation loads.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Consumers Served by REA Borrowers, by Class of Consumer, 1956

Farm	2,431,795
Residential (town)	281,701
Residential (nonfarm, rural)	1,074,261
Residential (seasonal)	85,381
Schools, churches, public buildings	85,715
Small commercial and industrial	228,691
Large commercial and industrial	9,172
Pump irrigation	26,346
Public street and highway lighting	3,497
Other utilities	120
Other electric service	2,485
Other REA borrowers	45
Total	4,229,209

Mr. BARRETT. From the very beginning the Rural Electrification Administration endeavored to encourage rural electric service in all sections of the country. The rural electric cooperatives are committed to the principle of serving all those without electric service within their service areas who can be served without impairing their financial status. Their area coverage resolutions generally provide that service will be extended at no expense to the applicant except a nominal fee, usually $5, for membership in the cooperative. The area coverage principle has made it possible for the rural electric cooperatives to construct at one time all of the plants required to serve all consumers in sections of their service area and thus realize the economies of large-scale mass construction. The area coverage principle has also operated to avoid unserved "pockets" within service areas.

A total of 1,078 electric systems have obtained loans from the REA, and 88 of these borrowers have paid off their entire indebtedness.

The loan agreements between REA and its borrowers provide for the repayment of principal on an installment basis. Interest on the amount of principal outstanding is also due and payable with each payment on the principal.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for having so clearly given this excellent report on the status and accomplishments of the REA. No law ever enacted by Congress has been so beneficial to the rural population as the REA Act. Nothing has brought greater comfort and safety to the farm home than electricity has brought. No longer are the farmer and his family dependent on the old-fashioned lamp, which was such a fire hazard. The same thing is true of the lantern in the stable. No longer are farm homes without running water and all the conveniences which electricity brings to the home. Today the farm child has the same opportunities in the farm home that his city cousins had in the years of yesterday.

I commend the distinguished Senator for having brought to us such a clear outline of the achievements of the REA and what it has meant to the American farmers.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator for his splendid contribution. For a good long time he has been a consistent and loyal supporter of the REA.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my State, like the State of the Senator from Wyoming, is largely a rural and agricultural State.

Mr. BARRETT. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Kentucky has 1 large city, Louisville, and 3 or 4 other cities of less than 100,000 population, and many small communities; but it is essentially an agricultural State. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying about REA. Years ago I was a county judge in Kentucky, in a rural county. Prior to that time I spent all my life in a rural section of Kentucky. I can say that no Government agency or cooperative has reached more farm people and brought greater advantages to farm people than the REA.

I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any other agency which through the cooperatives has brought into the business of management and operation more people who live in the rural sections of the country than has REA.

Mr. BARRETT. I know of no other agency. I believe I can say, without any possibility of doubt, that the REA has proved to be the most popular governmental program in the history of our country. It has brought more benefits to people on the local level than any other agency. Certainly the people can take credit for it, because they operate and manage the cooperatives themselves, and they have done a very good job of it.

Mr. COOPER. One aspect of the program which interests me particularly is that the management of REA cooperatives has drawn its people from farms and small communities. They manage their property as well as any group of people anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. I am sure that is true of Kentucky, and I know it is true in my State.

Mr. COOPER. I am speaking of the whole record throughout the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct to say that the rate of loss on loans is phenomenally small, if there is any loss?

Mr. BARRETT. It is very, very small. I will touch on that point in a moment. There is hardly any loss at all. It is so small that it amounts to very little, indeed.

Mr. COOPER. Many cooperatives are far in advance in the payment of their loans. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARRETT. That is true. As a whole, they are in splendid financial condition. There is no reason why that condition should not continue in the years ahead.

Mr. COOPER. In my short service in the Senate I have been impressed by the great interest the Senator from Wyoming has shown in REA and the way he has worked for it. I am happy that he is making his presentation today.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. I know he has been a vigorous supporter of REA on all occasions. As a matter of fact, the Republican Party has consistently supported the REA program.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I hope I am not anticipating some of the Senator's remarks. However, is he going to insert in the RECORD, at a later point in his remarks, some of the percentages and amounts of repayments of REA loans?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall do that, if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not want to anticipate anything. In the meantime I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming. He has been a very strong and ardent supporter of REA. As he well knows, most of the States in the West have taken a great lead in REA, even though the distances are great, in bringing electricity to their ranches and farms through the medium of nonprofit organizations which are commonly called REA's, but are, in fact, cooperators.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that my State is probably in worse shape in that regard than his own, because of the tremendous distances between farms and ranches in Wyoming. However, Colorado and Wyoming, and other Western States, have been able to overcome that difficulty. We have established a splendid record of bringing electricity to the ranches and farms in the West.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that is true. I know that in the State of Colorado the percentage was 87 percent a year ago, and in a little less than a year that percentage has gone up seven-tenths of 1 percent, which brings it to about the national average.

Mr. BARRETT. I think that is a little better than the national average. I know the Senator's great interest in this program, and that he has taken the floor during the past week to defend the administration of REA by his fellow citizen from Colorado, Dave Hamil, who is doing a wonderful job. I hope the Senator will bear with me for a while, so that I may get to the point in my remarks where I discuss the record of Mr. Hamil.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be most happy to do so.

Mr. BARRETT. Repayment of long-term debt on an installment basis is unusual in the utility business. The long-term debt of utility companies is generally in the form of bonds due on a certain date. In most cases they are replaced at maturity by another issue of long-term debt. This is in contrast to the practice of REA borrowers of repaying the principal of each loan during the loan period.

During the fiscal year 1957 the amount of payments on principal was $71,259,516 and on interest was $39,342,578. On June 30, 1957, the total amount repaid on the principal of loans was $468,533,673 and the total interest paid was $285,471,883.

In addition to the scheduled payments, REA borrowers have made payments in advance of the due date. These advance payments are generally referred to as a "cushion of credit." Advance payments may be used at the option of the borrower to meet scheduled payments of interest or principal, or to pay a note in full. As of June 30, 1957, 756 borrowers had a "cushion of credit" amounting to a total of $109 million. This was an increase of approximately $13 million over the amount of "cushion of credit" which had been built on June 30, 1956.

At that time for the electric program as a whole, $200,602.29 in principal and interest was overdue more than 30 days. This figure represents less than one-thirtieth of 1 percent of the principal and interest payments due. This also is a decrease from the amount of $233,-

872.22 which was overdue more than 30 days as of December 31, 1956.

In any loan program it is expected that some loans will go sour; and the REA is no exception to that rule. During its lifetime, the REA has foreclosed two loans, on which a total loss of $44,478.13 was incurred. Mr. President, that is less than two one-thousandths of 1 percent of the total funds advanced to borrowers. One loss amounted to $7,248.08, in the case of a borrower which was never able effectively to commence construction; and the other amounted to $37,230.05, in the case of a borrower which suffered severe storm damages which decreased the revenue of the company to the point where it could not meet its obligations to the Government.

There are 988 active borrowers, of which 927 are cooperatives, 42 are public power districts, 15 are municipal corporations, and 4 are power companies. I have before me, Mr. President, a table which shows the type of borrowers of the REA, active and repaid. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REA Borrowers

Type of borrower	Total	Cooperatives	Public power districts	Other public bodies	Power companies
All borrowers	1,078	978	49	27	24
Active, total	988	927	42	15	4
Distribution type	949	893	40	13	3
Power type	37	32	2	2	1
Refrigeration type	2	2	0	0	0
Loan repaid, total	88	50	7	12	19
Distribution type	55	18	7	11	19
Power type	3	2	0	1	0
Refrigeration type	30	30	0	0	0

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the REA is presently serving about 52 percent of the total number of farms while other suppliers serve about 43 percent and 5 percent are not electrified. REA borrowers have energized almost 1.4 million miles of line, including more than 32,000 miles of transmission line. They have installed more than one million kilowatts of generating capacity. Over $3.5 billion in loans had been placed under contract to electrification borrowers as of June 30 last. I have before me, Mr. President, a table which shows the growth in net electrification and telephone loans since inception of the two programs. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fiscal year	Electrification	Telephone
1936	$13,903,412	
1937	45,032,805	
1938	29,236,219	
1939	139,064,513	
1940	41,736,000	
1941	100,054,672	
1942	91,152,724	
1943	6,700,978	
1944	31,930,124	
1945	25,731,055	
1946	$289,372,488	
1947	254,521,172	
1948	313,023,099	
1949	448,859,597	
1950	375,151,456	$3,426,500
1951	221,733,800	37,828,500
1952	165,425,811	41,005,718
1953	137,379,160	35,883,500
1954	155,923,014	66,434,324
1955	164,187,315	49,602,000
1956	188,131,345	78,211,000
1957	298,704,669	78,748,000
Total	$3,536,955,428	$391,139,542

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the greatest growth in electrification loans occurred during the 5 years following World War II, when construction material, equipment, and manpower again became available for civilian undertakings. The second 5-year postwar period witnessed a leveling off in electrification loans. The trend in the past 2 years has been upward, reflecting the substantial increase in energy consumption by rural consumers and for the attendant need for increasing and heavying up service facilities. REA has geared its operations to meeting promptly all legitimate loan needs of its borrowers.

During the initial year in which electrification loans were made the interest rate to borrowers was set at 3 percent by administrative determination. The loan funds which REA used in its fiscal 1936 lending operations were provided without interest charge to REA by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935.

Now under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the interest rate to borrowers from fiscal year 1937 to September 21, 1944, was established by a formula based on the average rate of interest payable by the United Sates on its obligations having a maturity of 10 or more years. The interest rate so determined ranged from 2.46 to 2.88 percent during this period.

The loan funds used by REA during this period were obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at a cost of 3 percent, and from the Treasury by direct appropriation without interest.

The Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 fixed the rate for past and future loans by REA at 2 percent and prescribed a rate of 1.75 percent for REA borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Act also authorized extension of the term for all loans from 25 to 35 years. The objective of the 1944 amendments was to make it possible to extend electric service on an area coverage basis when materials again became available while complying with the statutory requirement that the loans be self-liquidating.

The Agriculture Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1948 amended the Rural Electrification Act by substituting the Treasury for the RFC as the source of REA loan funds. The Act transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all REA obligations to RFC and authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish loan funds to REA either without interest or at a rate of interest per annum not to exceed the rate provided for REA loans to borrowers. The 2 percent rate fixed in 1944 for REA loans to its borrowers was not affected by this Act. By administrative agreement the rate of interest paid by REA to the Treasury was to be determined by the computed average rate payable by the Government on its outstanding marketable public-debt obligations at the close of the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth but not to exceed 2 percent. From the fiscal year 1949 to date the range of interest rates paid to the Treasury by REA was from 1.75 to 2 percent.

The computed average interest rates paid by the United States on all marketable public-debt obligations were used in REA loan transactions only as a means of determining the interest rate to be paid to the Treasury by REA from 1943 on. Prior to that year the rate paid to RFC was fixed by law and bore no relationship to the cost of money to RFC or to the Treasury. During the period of RFC financing of the REA lending program, the source of RFC funds was relatively short-term public borrowing or borrowing of special funds from the Treasury at interest rates substantially below those paid by REA. No interest was paid to the Treasury by REA on loan funds which were made available to it by direct appropriations. However, at all times all interest received by REA in excess of amounts required to be paid by REA was deposited with the Treasury. The interest rate charged by REA to its borrowers exceeded the computed average rate paid by the Treasury on its marketable issues in all but 7 of the 19 years in which the Treasury rate is determinable. However, this spread is not a valid measure of monetary profit or loss to the Government from REA lending operations, since the source of funds advanced to REA by the Treasury was not identified.

Mr. President, I have before me a table which shows the interest rates paid by the REA for the funds advanced from Government sources and also the rates charged REA borrowers as well as the computed annual interest rates paid by the United States Treasury on interest bearing marketable securities from 1936 to date. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fiscal year	Source of loan funds	Interest rate paid by REA	Interest rate charged by REA on new loans	Computed annual interest rate on marketable Treasury issues
1936	ERA	None	3.00	[3]
1937	RFC	3.00	2.77	[3]
1938	REA [1]	None	2.88	[3]
1939	REA	None	2.73	2.525
	RFC	3.00	2.73	
1940	REA	None	2.69	2.492
1941	RFC	3.00	2.46	2.413
1942	RFC	3.00	2.48	2.225
1943	RFC	3.00	2.57	1.822
1944	REA	None	2.67	1.725
1945	RFC	1.75	2.00 [2]	1.718
1946	RFC	1.75	2.00	1.773
1947	RFC	1.75	2.00	1.871

[1] Direct appropriation.
[2] During the period July 1–Sept. 20, 1944, REA charged 2.49 percent on new borrowings and paid RFC 3 percent.
[3] Comparable data for years 1936–38 are not available.

Fiscal year	Source of loan funds	Interest rate paid by REA	Interest rate charged by REA on new loans	Computed annual interest rate on marketable Treasury issues
1948	Treasury	1.75	2.00	1.942
1949	do	1.875	2.00	2.001
1950	do	2.00	2.00	1.958
1951	do	1.875	2.00	1.981
1952	do	1.875	2.00	2.051
1953	do	2.00	2.00	2.207
1954	do	2.00	2.00	2.043
1955	do	2.00	2.00	2.079
1956	do	2.00	2.00	2.427
1957	do	2.00	2.00	2.707

Source: Computed annual interest rate on marketable issues, Treasury Bulletins, U. S. Treasury Department. Interest rates charged by REA obtained from records of the Agency.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it is clear that for some years at least the Rural Electrification Administration paid more in interest to the Treasury than it cost the United States to hire money for the same period of years. It seems to me that it would be a bit unfair to take advantage of that situation, and then, when the cost of money to the Treasury increases, immediately to call upon the REA to increase the interest due on its loans. Because I thought it was eminently unfair to increase the interest rate for the REA's, I submitted a Senate resolution some time ago expressing the conviction that the interest rate to the REA should be maintained at 2 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is making a most informative and interesting speech. I have told him privately that I support the resolution he has submitted, to continue the REA loans at the present rate of interest, although I see no indication that any administrative recommendation has been made to do anything other than that which has been provided in his resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that David Hamil, the Administrator of REA, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, both have recommended that the interest rate for REA loans be maintained at 2 percent. I cannot believe, and do not believe, that the Administration will recommend an increase in the interest rate for the REA, and I am equally certain that if it did so that the Congress would not enact any such legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. I know that to be correct; I also have conferred with them.

Even so, I have told the Senator from Wyoming that if there are in the country persons who are worried about the matter, and if it would tend to give them peace of mind, and if it would tend to establish this as even more definitely the policy—and I have told the Senator from Wyoming this in private conversation—I would support the resolution he has submitted; and I take this opportunity to say so publicly, on the record.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has been a very strong and ardent supporter of the REA; and I am sure that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which he is a member, he has given powerful help to the REA in maintaining the 2 percent interest rate. I cannot believe, and do not believe, that the Administration will recommend an increase in the interest rate.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee's subcommittee which deals with REA appropriations, it has been my pleasure not only to vote for, but also in many instances to initiate by motion, the necessary funds required by the REA in order to continue its steady and constructive program of expansion.

I want to commend the Senator from Wyoming for pointing out, as he has done, from his statistical study, that there have been periods of time over quite a few years when the Federal Government actually has made a profit from the interest which the borrowers of REA have paid to the Federal Government. Consequently, while we are at the moment in a period of comparatively higher interest rates, which may be of long or short duration, at this time there is no justification, immediately when interest rates get a little higher, to try to put a penalty on the REA by virtue of the fact that they have established, as it were, credit in the bank during the years when they were paying higher interest rates than would have been called for ordinarily.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. I can say, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the subcommittee which deals with REA funds, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, nobody in the administration has suggested to me, directly or indirectly, that an effort is to be made to increase the interest rates of REA.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Let me call attention to the fact that power requirements of REA-financed electric systems are expected to more than triple in the next 10 years. These projections are based on the actual input of the systems and are a part of a study of future power needs and resources of REA borrowers. In the past power needs of REA-financed electric systems have doubled almost every 4 years. This rapid growth was due in part to increased consumption by existing consumers and in part to new consumers coming on the lines. With 95 percent of the Nation's farms now electrified, greater usage by present consumers is expected to be the principal factor in the increased demand for power in the future. According to the Edison Electric Institute, "during the next decade it is estimated that about 124 million kilowatts of net generating capacity will be added."

REA borrowers' proportionate needs are expected to parallel or even exceed those of industry, primarily as a result of the continuing sharp increase in average consumption by their consumers.

Since inception of the REA program, wholesale power has been purchased from commercial power companies, municipal electric systems, TVA, Federal power marketing agencies, and REA-financed generation and transmission cooperatives. The following table, Mr. President, indicates the quantity of energy purchased by REA borrowers by type of supplier during selected fiscal years 1940 to 1956 inclusive.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

	Total kilowatt-hours purchased	Power companies	Municipal systems	Public bodies	TVA	Federal agencies	REA co-op borrowers
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1940	406,530,264	53	16	3	23	1	4
1942	1,086,221,222	50	14	4	25	2	5
1944	1,988,266,708	42	11	5	19	18	5
1946	2,367,780,748	52	11	4	20	7	6
1948	4,151,635,089	57	8	5	19	6	5
1950	7,138,326,685	57	5	5	20	6	7
1951	8,974,458,974	54	4	5	21	8	8
1952	10,764,660,930	54	3	5	20	10	8
1953	12,458,469,815	52	2	6	20	11	9
1954	14,309,755,359	49	2	7	19	13	10
1955	16,216,442,800	46	2	7	19	14	12
1956	18,373,165,900	44	2	7	19	18	10

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, REA borrowers are interested in getting a dependable supply of power at the lowest cost for their consumers. There are some who believe that private and public power are completely incompatible, that we must have all of one and none of the other. To my way of thinking that position is completely unwarranted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with what the Senator has said, that there is room in this country for both private and public power. In those areas where private power is unable to provide, at proper economical rates, the power required by the people, those are the places in which public power should function. In those areas where private enterprise—which pays taxes—is able economically to generate and distribute power at reasonable rates which people can afford to pay, then it seems to me that is where private enterprise of the country should function and where public power should not be interjected. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is entirely correct. Certainly it is entirely consistent for a person to be a rather firm supporter of REA and still be opposed to public power where private in-

dustry is ready, willing, and able to undertake construction of a power project.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the Senator in that regard that, in my opinion, as I understand REA and as I have advocated REA on the floor of Congress and in committee rooms, I consider REA to be private power, cooperatively owned——

Mr. BARRETT. There is no question about that.

Mr. MUNDT. REA is private power owned by the farmers who comprise the co-op. I do not think REA is public power at all, and those who identify REA as public power render a great disservice to REA, because it is no more public power than the local farmers' and merchants' oil company in my hometown is a public-ownership filling station. It is a co-op, organized under the cooperative laws of the State and the Nation, owned by the farmers. The profits go to the farmers and are paid to them in the nature of patronage dividends.

Mr. BARRETT. A co-op is private enterprise in the strictest sense of the word. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I think we should keep clearly in mind the distinction. Public power, which we think of in terms of Federal power, is owned by the Federal Government, operated by the Federal Government, with profits, if any, which may accrue, going to the Federal Government, and with losses, if any, being paid by the taxpayers of the entire country. The persons who would be running REA's today, if they were public power, would be politicians in a bureaucracy in Washington, rather than the farmers elected by the patrons of REA in various cooperative districts of the country as is presently the program. Is that statement not correct?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In the long run, I think there is a greater danger to our farmer-owned, farmer-operated REA co-ops in this country from Federal power, from national, socialized power, than there is from private power. There is a greater danger that the farmer-owned and farmer-operated co-ops will be snuffed out by a great flood of public-power enthusiasts and public-power legislation than that they are ever going to be snuffed out by private utilities.

It must be remembered that the co-ops are operated by the farmers and owned by the farmers and they borrow money from the Government as they might from banks and pay that money back with interest. I see no way in the world that a privately owned cooperative can fall into the hands of a private utility unless the board of directors some night goes out on a grand and glorious drunk and votes to sell it to a private utility. A private utility cannot take away from the farmers the co-op which the farmers own. But Congress could. Public-power enthusiasts could. People with a glint in their eyes about public power could. People who would socialize and nationalize all industry could. Congress could pass a law which could compel the farmer-owned, farmer-operated co-ops to divest themselves of their ownership. We could absorb their loans. We could take over their liabilities. We could require them to sell out to the Government. We could run the co-ops from a bureaucracy, from the center. We could operate them as nationalized institutions, the way the power facilities in Russia are operated today under communism. We could—but I sincerely hope we never do.

I call to the attention of the farmers of this country that they must protect their vested interest in farmer-owned and farmer-operated co-ops. Certainly they must protect them against letting a greedy private utility buy them out or bribe their boards of directors to sell out to them. They must also be protected against misinformed and ill-advised enthusiasts and political leaders and ideologists who would like to flood this country with a great wave of national Federal power, public power in its genuine sense, and thereby have legislation enacted divesting farmers of ownership which they rightfully have in the co-ops, of which they are members and of which they are a part. REA power is privately operated; our REA's are privately owned. They must be on guard equally against socialistically inclined public power lobbyists and private utility magnates.

Does the Senator agree?

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is eminently correct. I am quite certain the persons who have organized and operated the REA's, at least those in the western part of the country, are fully aware of the problem, and they know full well their interests are not identical at all with those who want to have Federal projects constructed at Government cost of hundreds of millions of dollars and operated for the benefit of certain areas to the disadvantage of other areas in the West when the projects can be built by private industry. They know that their best interests are going to be served by working for the REA's entirely and not by identifying the rural electric cooperatives with public power.

Mr. MUNDT. I am mighty happy to have the Senator say that. I am glad to have that confirmation in the RECORD as I was sure we would have it. May I say that if this colloquy this afternoon does nothing else, I hope it buttons down for all time the fact that REA's are privately owned and privately operated, as any other co-op is; that they are not public power, and that those both inside and outside REA who try to delude the farmer owners and operators of REA by endeavoring to make them feel that they are part of a big public ownership socialized segment of our economy are either ill informed or ill intentioned. Such public power enthusiasts are mischief-makers who are doing a disservice to our farmers and to REA which would deprive them of the very existence of REA. Farmers desirous of maintaining this fine rural electrification program, which has been proved so wonderful for so long, and which has been supported by Democrats and Republicans in the administrative and executive branches, would do well to look with a jaundiced eye on visitors in their midsts who would make them believe they are part of a public power combine. America's farmers are private enterprisers. They believe in private ownership. They practice it in their personal lives and they practice it in REA. They do well, therefore, to examine the motives, the financial backing, and the personal or political ambitions of any who write, or speak, or campaign in an effort to identify REA with public power rather than with private, cooperatively managed, ownership.

If REA owner-patrons ever fall for that kind of a fallacy, they may wind up entirely out of the REA, with the politicians down in Washington running it, owning it, and operating it. Then we will have destroyed one of the great grassroots developments of this country which, in partnership with the Federal Government as a loaning agency, is bringing not only light but telephone communications to the farm homes all over America.

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. GOLDWATER addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARRETT. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The Senator from Wyoming is making an excellent speech tracing the record and accomplishments of the rural electrification program.

The other Senators have made a material contribution toward clearing the air in the thinking about the REA program and what it means to rural America.

I have some very definite feelings about Federal public power. What I am about to state as my feeling on the subject is a position I have declared through the years, publicly and privately, at home and in Washington. That feeling is this: Whenever the Federal taxpayers are called upon to build, and it seems wise to build, a conservation project, such as an irrigation project or a flood-control project, and it is expedient and necessary that the Federal Government do so, then in that case Federal money should be spent to develop the public power in order to lower the cost of the multiple-purpose project.

Mr. BARRETT. Or, I may say to my distinguished colleague, to operate the project.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. To use the power for operation of the project or for the farmers on the project.

Mr. CURTIS. I would go further. I would say in order to lower the cost of an irrigation project or a flood-control project, which are Federal functions, it is wise and expedient to firm up the power with steam or other means in order to make it marketable to the best advantage. Within reason that should be done. I would say that powerlines should be built to market the power to the best advantage for all concerned.

That is the program I have consistently supported as a Member of the Senate and as a Member of the House. I have declared that position publicly and privately, at home and here in Washington.

However, when we are considering a different type of project, a project which in the main is not for the purpose of expanding irrigation or for the purpose of providing necessary flood control, but involves purely and simply taxing the Federal taxpayers in order to generate

power, in the main for power in order to socialize the power industry, I have not favored such projects. I do not believe they are in the public interest.

Mr. BARRETT. Certainly not, when private industry is ready, willing, and able to undertake the construction of the project and to furnish the power which the people of the particular area need.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree. If the projects are not a part of the overall development, certainly the Federal Government should not undertake to construct them. If private sources can do the work, or if the local people can do it themselves, through municipalities or otherwise, the Government should not do so.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Senator from Nebraska is eminently correct. I invite his attention to the fact that the Commissioner of Reclamation made the statement in Colorado the other day that the first use of Federal funds for the development of our water resources should be to apply the water to the land.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. And that if hundreds of millions of dollars are appropriated by the Congress for the purpose of building power projects, when private industry is willing and able to undertake their construction, then necessarily the amount of money which will be made available for the construction of reclamation projects and the bringing of water to the parched lands of the West will be restricted and limited by the same amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The rural electrification program is so well accepted all over the United States that it is the one program which has had unanimous support in the Congress. I cannot remember ever hearing a speech made in the Congress of the United States against the REA. I have never known of that being done.

Mr. BARRETT. I have never heard of one, either.

Mr. CURTIS. The authorization legislation is carried in the agricultural bills. The appropriations are made annually. While there may at times be some disagreement as to how much money should be spent in a given period of time, the program has been unanimously supported.

I think the farmers and others who are interested in REA have been misinformed and misguided by being advised that certain groups and individuals are fighting REA, when there is not a thing on the record to indicate that anybody is opposing this fine program. I cannot imagine anyone suggesting that we abandon electricity and go back to the lighting and power devices which were used before this program developed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, in my State the private power people have worked hand in hand with public power for more than a quarter of a century. Only recently private power has started construction on a large 100,000-kilowatt steam plant that will help relieve the power shortage in our State. We need both public and private power working together to supply the needs of our State if we are to develop our natural resources and bring new industries into our State.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for the remarks he is making today. I feel they are long overdue. I believe they will help to clear up a condition which has been muddied by political interference and by the operations of a group in Washington who, I feel, do not have at heart the best interests of the people we have in mind.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he knows of any diminution of activity in the REA field since January of 1953.

Mr. BARRETT. Of course not. The program has gone ahead by leaps and bounds since 1953. Greater progress has been made during the last year than was made for a long time, with the exception of the years immediately following the war when there was a large backlog to be picked up, and a Republican Congress took care of that need at that time in a splendid way.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Is the Senator aware of any large Federal electric projects having been completed since January of 1953?

Mr. BARRETT. Not any large ones.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There have not been any large ones completed. That leads me to the next question, which I think the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] was discussing with my friend from Wyoming. Is there any connection at all between REA and public power?

Mr. BARRETT. Not in the least. The REA's are free enterprises, working at the local level for the benefit of the people, managed by the people, and operated by the people. The REA is certainly an operation in connection with which the only interest of the Federal Government is in the nature of providing loans permitting the REA's to construct their lines.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senate of what the Republican platform had to say on this question in 1952, because I wish to bring out that the administration, by allowing the free-enterprise system to operate in a freer manner than it has operated since 1932, has actually provided more power for the REA's. The Republican Party said in its platform in 1952:

> We support the principle of bona fide farmer-owned, farmer-operated cooperatives and urge the further development of rural electrification and communication, with federally assisted production of power and facilities for distribution when these are not adequately available through private enterprise at fair rates.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say that we have carried out that plank.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is what I wanted to point out to my colleagues. The Republican administration has carried out that plank, and has, without spending the taxpayers' dollars on large Federal power projects, enabled more and more farmers to enjoy electricity, as a result of private enterprise entering the field and moving ahead.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator to yield further.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to develop a point with which I feel not many people are acquainted.

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator acquainted with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association?

Mr. BARRETT. I have heard of the organization. I get the magazine. I have had occasion to read their articles from time to time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me remind the Senator and the Senate that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association describes itself as a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of rural electric cooperative public power districts and public utility districts in the United States and Territories, an entirely independent private cooperative service organization in no way affiliated with the Rural Electrification Administration.

I desire to point out that this association describes itself as a nonpartisan organization. If this organization is nonpartisan, why do the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives receive copious quantities of mail when such projects as Hells Canyon, TVA, and atomic power come up?

Mr. BARRETT. I may say to my colleague, the Senator from Arizona, that I think the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] made it abundantly clear a few moments ago that the interests of the REA cooperatives are not identical with the interests of those who advocate public power and attempted to exploit it in the proposed Hells Canyon legislation. It seems to me that REA cooperatives have been ill advised and there are those who attempt to lead them to believe that their interests are identical with the interests of those who want to construct big power projects at public expense.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yet every time Hells Canyon comes to the floor of the Senate, or TVA comes to the floor of the Senate, I hear from my constituents in Arizona that I should vote for Hells Canyon or for TVA. I believe the Senator from Wyoming will say that he has had the same experience.

Mr. BARRETT. I certainly have; and I think every other Senator can say the same thing. A barrage of propaganda has been fired at the farmers of America in an effort to convince them that they are obliged to support the public power program when their cooperatives, as the Senator has well pointed out, are private-enterprise systems in the true sense of the word.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. BARRETT. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Did the Senator from Arizona say that the National Association of REA Cooperatives is a nonpartisan organization?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I read from their current description of themselves:

A nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of rural electric cooperatives—

and so forth.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been my observation that in election year after election year they have been in partisan politics. One of their principal officers, Mr. Ellis, arrived in my State—I assume at the expense of that group—last fall, prior to the presidential election, and he attacked the present administration of the REA. He charged the administration with attempting to destroy the REA. A few months before that, in my own State of Nebraska, the largest REA loan in history had been granted, to build a steam plant; yet Mr. Ellis came there and delivered a partisan blast as soon as he got off the airplane, obviously for the purpose of playing politics.

The voting charts and other material which they distribute at election time are directed toward the same end. In order to make this account entirely impersonal, our late beloved friend, Senator Hugh Butler, was a leader in this body for REA. He went all the way for it. Yet when election time came, and one read the charts, he would find Hugh Butler pictured as an enemy of REA. I am astounded at the claim of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association that it is nonpartisan.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Why are Senators and Members of the House pictured as enemies of the REA? Because they vote against public power. I know that the farmers in my State, users of REA service, do not believe in public power. Yet when public power projects come before this body, they are incited by Mr. Ellis and his organization to telegraph me and my colleagues to vote for public power.

Mr. CURTIS. It goes further than that. I think they are opposed because of their party affiliation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Where do they get the money with which to operate?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be very happy to explain that. The Association has a system of dues. The NRECA dues structure varies with the type of member organization. A nonprofit rural electric distribution system pays an initial membership fee of $10, and annual dues of between 10 and 12½ cents per connected customer. The dues vary.

Mr. Ellis reported, at the 1957 annual meeting, that the dues income had increased sevenfold since 1943, to 1946, or to a total of $400,000.

Why should the people of Arizona who enjoy REA power—and I believe our farms are 96 or 97 percent electrified—pay dues to an organization in Washington which is solely for public power?

I do not believe the farmers of my State believe in public power. Yet Mr. Ellis, the general manager, with $400,000 a year at his beck and call, can spread false propaganda. He can speak over the radio; he can go to my town or the town of the Senator from Nebraska, or the town of the Senator from Wyoming, and say, "These Senators are no good." Why? Because I voted against Hells Canyon, which is about 2,000 miles from Arizona; and because I voted against TVA, which is about the same distance from Arizona.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is the Senator from Arizona aware that the source of funds he has mentioned is not the only source of funds with which the association carries on its propaganda campaigns? Is he aware that twice in the past 2 years a national campaign has been organized to solicit REA's for propagandizing public power, and that many REA local cooperatives, under the mistaken apprehension that public power was a part of their purpose, because of the constant propagandizing, contributed money as a result of the two campaigns in addition to their annual dues to the NRECA?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARRETT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator from Colorado brought up that question.

Two years ago, during the debate on the Hells Canyon bill, I placed in the RECORD a list of contributors to the Hells Canyon Association. Let me read the list of contributors:

Northwest Public Power Association, $2,000.

Montana REA, $200.

Montana is close to Idaho, but not close enough to get electricity from it.

Southwestern Washington Public Utilities District Commissioners Association, $1,030.

Eastern Washington Public Utilities District Commissioners Association, $500.

Idaho REA, $500.

Wasco Electric Cooperative, $425.

NRECA, with headquarters here in Washington, $2,000.

Oregon REA, $2,000.

Water and power users of Santa Clara County, $27.

APPA, $1,750.

Washington REA, $200.

Cooperative League of the United States, $25.

Individual REA's, $19,266.70.

These contributions aggregate $29,925.70, of the total kitty of more than $100,000 which was raised.

These moneys come from people who have been told that if dams like Hells Canyon are not built, or if TVA is not expanded, or if atomic power is not developed by the Government, the REA will fall on its face.

I am surprised at Mr. Ellis spreading such propaganda, in view of the evidence that in this administration the REA, operating with power produced by private sources, has shown the greatest increase in its history, except for the years immediately after the war, when the demand was heaviest.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to anyone being for or against public power if it is not connected with multipurpose dams. I have no objection to individuals raising money to get their side of the story across, if they are for public power, but I think it should be done forthrightly and honestly, and it should not be confused with the rural electrification program.

Mr. BARRETT. I agree with the Senator 100 percent.

Mr. CURTIS. Money should not be collected from farmers, making the cost of their local unit more expensive, under the pretense that it is necessary to maintain a lobby in Washington in order to get the REA program over, when the money is used for other purposes. I certainly condemn the action of an organization which misrepresents the voting record of Members of the Congress with respect to the support of authorizations for the rural electrification program. I am convinced that some of the leaders in the national association to whom reference has been made have been doing that for some time.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

I was one of the organizers of the Niobrara Rural Electric Association at Lusk 17 years ago and I yield to no man in my support of REA, but, at the same time, I realize the need and importance of encouraging private enterprise to do its full part in providing the power that we will need in the years ahead. There is a place today and tomorrow for both private and public power with REA-financed systems maintaining their proper place as a growing and influential part of private power. Both private and public power are needed to do the Nation's power job. Each can serve to keep the other member of the power team on its toes.

Where power generated by Federal agencies is available under the statutory preference clauses of the Flood Control Act, REA-financed cooperatives, municipalities, public power districts and other political subdivisions should have access to such power. Many REA borrowers serve sections of the country where area coverage is possible only through the availability of low-cost power generated by Federal agencies.

During the early years of the program REA borrowers found it necessary to purchase or generate their electric power at costs ranging from 1.5 cents to 2.5 cents per kilowatt-hour. Due to increase in the consumers' usage, improved efficiency, better understanding of the program, and cooperation from the electric industry, the average cost of wholesale power purchased has been reduced from 1.09 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1940 to .72 cents in 1956.

A table, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, shows the quantity and the cost of energy purchased by REA

borrowers during selected fiscal years 1940 to 1956 inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Kilowatt-hours purchased	Cost of energy purchased	Average cost per kilowatt-hour
			Cents
1940	406, 530, 264	$4, 426, 643	1.09
1942	1, 086, 221, 222	10, 192, 747	.94
1944	1, 988, 266, 708	16, 656, 009	.84
1946	2, 367, 780, 748	20, 760, 680	.88
1948	4, 151, 635, 089	37, 014, 736	.89
1950	7, 138, 326, 685	61, 505, 793	.86
1951	8, 974, 458, 974	73, 694, 738	.82
1952	10, 764, 660, 930	85, 569, 592	.79
1953	12, 458, 469, 815	97, 215, 856	.78
1954	14, 309, 755, 359	108, 979, 050	.76
1955	16, 216, 442, 800	119, 806, 774	.74
1956	18, 373, 165, 900	132, 403, 246	.72

Mr. BARRETT. Electricity has brought much more business to our rural communities than was anticipated by its most optimistic friends.

Expenditures by rural consumers for electric equipment and wiring is already estimated in the billions. Farm sales of power equipment continue to increase. In addition, availability of power is attracting new residents from the cities and is bringing new industry to the country. Electricity is driving the wheels of progress in rural America. Electricity is enabling the farmers of America to meet successfully competitive postwar conditions.

Electricity has moved factory efficiency to the farm, increasing production with less labor. Electric equipment has improved the quality of farm products. Sterilization and refrigeration equipment has meant higher-grade milk for the protection of the consumer. Electric brooding equipment has saved chicks and pigs. Losses due to spoilage have been greatly reduced by electric refrigerators, food freezers, and hay and grain dryers.

The growth of rural electric usage has exceeded even the rosiest expectations. Recent developments indicate that the increase will continue. Air conditioning, electric house heating, water pumping for irrigation, and crop drying are just beginning to appear in farm areas but already give evidence of their usefulness and popularity with rural consumers. Electric heating, for example, can add 10,000 to 15,000 kilowatt-hours to the average annual consumption per residence. This figure now is about 2,500 kilowatt-hours. Experience with irrigation as a load builder in Western States indicates that farm loads will increase spectacularly with wider adoption of this practice.

This achievement has been accomplished by the rural people, the electric industry, and the Government working together within the framework of our free enterprise system. One of the strong points of the program and one which receives full endorsement of the Republican Party is its private enterprise nature.

The rural electric cooperatives are private enterprise in the strictest sense. They are incorporated under the laws of their respective States. They are owned and controlled by their member-consumers. Their relationship with REA is that of a borrower to a lender. As long as they are current in their payments of principal and interest, the REA exercises over the cooperatives the minimum control essential to the security of the loans. REA expresses policy on matters relating to loan security but refrains from interference with the management of the systems. The cooperatives' purpose is to render dependable electric service to their members at the lowest cost consistent with sound management of the system. They operate under the control of their boards of directors who are elected by the members and who determine the objectives, establish the policies, and hire the personnel required to carry on the management and administrative functions of the organization. Margins in excess of expenses realized through operations by the cooperative belong to the members.

It is a matter of record that the Republican Party has consistently supported the rural electrification program. The late Senator George W. Norris, Republican, of Nebraska, was coauthor of the Rural Electrification Act. He was fighting for rural electrification long before the Act was adopted. The lights that burn in the farm homes of the Nation symbolize his interest and leadership in helping establish the rural electrification program. The Republican Party down through the years has stood firmly for a sound rural electrification program—one that would be expanded to meet the needs of our rural people. In fiscal years 1948 and 1949, when rural electric construction was at a peak, a Republican Congress voted the largest appropriation on record for the program.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. First of all, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senators who have expressed appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming for outlining the history and achievement of REA. With reference to my State of Nebraska, I believe the Senator from Wyoming will be interested to know that during the past 22 years, since REA began operations, more than $125 million has been advanced to cooperatives, which embrace an area of some 60,000 square miles, and serve approximately 95,000 farms. The cooperatives have paid since that time approximately $11 million in interest and approximately $14 million in principal on the loans made to them. Their payments are well ahead of schedule.

Indicative of the fine fashion in which the respective cooperatives have been managed, their payments are approximately $4½ million ahead of schedule. As of July 1 this year not one account was more than 30 days in arrears, indicating a perfect record of payment.

Mr. BARRETT. The State of Nebraska is entitled to be commended on that achievement and to take great credit for that splendid record.

Mr. HRUSKA. I believe that is a record which is not much different from the record of many other States. I am confident that the record of our neighboring State to the west, so ably represented, in part, by the Senator from Wyoming, is undoubtedly equally as up to date and as far along in the program.

Mr. BARRETT. My own State also has a very splendid record.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say it was with some interest that I listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wyoming with reference to some of the activities of NRECA. I could not help being reminded in that connection of instances of the association having gone into questions involving public power, and issues such as the Hells Canyon Dam proposal.

Not long ago there came before the Senate the Niagara Power Authority bill. In that instance, as in other instances, there was an injection of the public-power issue into a proposition in which no Federal funds were involved. In the development of the Niagara Falls, there was involved the New York State Power Authority, which will resort to no Federal funds. Yet REA local cooperatives throughout the Nation were circularized and asked to contact Members of Congress for the purpose of inducing them to support a Federal preference clause in the Niagara power bill. In that project no Federal money was involved, and no Federal loan was involved. It was totally a State-developed project. Yet the effort was made to inject the public-power philosophy into the consideration of that project.

It seems to me that that is another instance of an attempt by NRECA to lend political and public-power color to the Niagara project. NRECA has received some financial support from REA's which, as has been so ably pointed out by the Senator from South Dakota and by the Senator from Wyoming, are truly privately owned, rather than public-power institutions.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator for his splendid contribution. I hope the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska and the statements by many other Senators on the floor today will show the members of REA throughout the length and breadth of the land that they are truly private entrepreneurs and that their interests are not in any sense identical with public power.

Mr. HRUSKA. There would be no direct influence on the REA's of either the State of Nebraska or the State of Wyoming even if the preference clause were or were not attached to the Niagara Falls situation. I have the idea that we would function just as happily and as successfully with or without it.

Mr. BARRETT. I am sure we would. I thank the Senator.

As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] so well pointed out a few moments ago, the Republican Party had a very strong plank in its 1952 platform supporting rural electrification.

We had a similar declaration in the 1956 platform.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am interested in the Senator's statement that in 1948 and 1949 the 80th Republican Congress made available the largest appropriation in the history of our country for the Rural Electrification Administration. That is a fact, is it not?

Mr. BARRETT. Indeed it is.

Mr. COOPER. I know that it is correct, yet it is a fact hardly every stated. There are very few farmers, I believe, who know it. Those who want to make a partisan issue of REA, against the Republican Party, certainly conceal that fact. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated it. I am glad that our party, when it was in power in the 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948, made the largest appropriation to REA on record.

Mr. BARRETT. I think it is only fair to say that the Republican Party has stood foursquare for REA at all times. That is true, any statement to the contrary notwithstanding. I am sure that every Republican Member of the Senate and of the House has supported REA on all occasions.

Mr. COOPER. I was called out of the Chamber for a few moments. I do not know whether the Senator has yet discussed the fact that during the last 4 years the backlog of applications for REA funds has been greatly reduced under the leadership of both Mr. Nelsen, the former REA Administrator, and the present Administrator, and at a faster rate than during the preceding administration.

Mr. BARRETT. That is Mr. Hamil. The Senator is anticipating me a bit. I will develop that point a little later in my remarks. But that is certainly the record, one of which we are very proud. It shows again that the Republican Administration is doing everything it can to promote the best interests of the REA program.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield, to permit me to refer to an experience had in Kentucky, in the last few years, in regard to the REA?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall be delighted to have the Senator from Kentucky do so.

Mr. COOPER. In 1940, an application was made by a distributing cooperative in Kentucky, called the Eastern Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative, for funds with which to build a steam plant to generate power to be furnished to a number of cooperatives in Kentucky, and to reach approximately 90 counties. I want to be fair. Of course, World War II came along; and during the war years it was impossible to make the loan available, chiefly because it was impossible to obtain the necessary supplies and equipment. But after the war ended, the years passed, but the REA made no loans to that cooperative.

In 1953, when President Eisenhower's administration came into power and when Mr. Nelsen became the Administrator, the Eastern Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative renewed its application. Mr. Nelsen was very careful in making the review; at times it was even charged in Kentucky, in some quarters, that he was not giving the matter fair consideration. But the important thing was that after a fair consideration, the loan was made. I do not remember the exact amount of the loan, but it was approximately $22 million. The application had been pending for 13 years; but under this administration, under Mr. Nelsen, the loan was made.

Mr. BARRETT. Under the Republican administration the job was done.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Last fall, the same cooperative made application for an additional $12 million or $13 million, as I recall. Mr. Hamil took the application under consideration; and within a period of 4 or 5 months he had thoroughly reviewed the application and had made the loan.

I have never received any complaint of any delay in connection with the loans, or to the effect that loans were not made, when properly applied for, to any cooperative in Kentucky under Mr. Nelsen or Mr. Hamil.

Mr. BARRETT. I venture to state that, strange to say, in Kentucky there are persons who will say that this administration is opposed to the REA, despite that splendid record.

Mr. COOPER. No; to the contrary the director of our cooperative and members are very much pleased with the treatment they have received and with the expeditious way in which their requests have been handled. Again I commend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] for his great support and work for REA.

Mr. BARRETT. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to the statement contained in the Republican Party's platform.

With this statement as a guideline, the administration under President Eisenhower moved forward with an expanded and businesslike program. The overall policy was to give the program the best possible service at the least cost to the taxpayer. Under this administration the Rural Electrification Administration speeded up the process of making loans. The volume of loans to meet legitimate needs started an upward trend. In the fiscal year 1954, the first full year of operation under the Eisenhower administration, REA loans increased nearly $2.5 million over those in the previous year. They increased again in 1955 and 1956. In 1957 the gross loans reached $300.5 million, the fourth largest loan-year in the 22-year history of REA.

More than 600,000 rural consumers will get service for the first time as a result of these loans, hundred of thousands of people on the lines will get better service through system improvements, and all will get power at the lowest rate in REA history. In the fiscal year 1956 that rate averaged 7.2 mills per kilowatt-hour, a reduction of 7.5 percent under the 1953 rate. In addition, it should be noted that the average retail rate to consumers on the lines of the rural cooperatives dropped to an all-time low of 2.8 cents.

Since World War II the average kilowatt-hour consumption per farm consumer served by REA borrowers has tripled—from 90 kilowatt-hours monthly in 1946 to 270 kilowatt-hours last year. The total input of REA financed systems has increased even more spectacularly—from less than 2.5 billion kilowatt-hours in the fiscal year 1946 to 21 billion kilowatt-hours in the fiscal year 1957, an 840-percent increase.

In 1956 the Republican Party's platform not only declared its support of the rural electrification program, but also recognized the growing power needs of our rural areas and the necessity of doing something about them. It made this pledge to rural people: "To expand rural electrification through REA loans for generation and transmission." That pledge has been kept.

It should be made clear, Mr. President, that the REA makes loans to finance the construction of generation and transmission facilities only where no adequate and dependable source of power is available to meet the consumers' needs. From the standpoint of the Nation's farmers, it is indeed fortunate that the REA has the right to finance generation and transmission systems, even though it is unnecessary to exercise that right. That in itself gives the REA's strong bargaining power. There have been cases in which such loans have made it possible for REA borrowers to proceed with area-coverage programs.

Of course, Federal appropriations should be used in the first place to bring basic electric service wherever feasible to the few rural areas which are still without it. In the second place, Federal funds should be used to increase the load on rural lines in order to provide adequate power for those already receiving service from cooperatives.

Where private industry is ready, willing, and able to provide generating capacity, it should be permitted to do so and thereby relieve the Federal Treasury from that obligation. I can see no good reason, Mr. President, why private and public power should not work together wherever private industry is unable or unwilling to undertake projects necessary for the general welfare of our people. Then, of course, the Congress is amply justified in authorizing the construction of such projects. On the other hand, the budgetary requirements of the Federal Government make it imperative that we encourage free enterprise to assume its share of the construction and operation of these projects.

In the fiscal year 1957 over $120 million was loaned to finance new generation and transmission facilities. A total of 740,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity has been approved under this Administration. As of June 30 of this year the REA has made loans to 40 generation and transmission borrowers. It has loaned to these borrowers $744,832,130 for the construction of generation and transmission facilities.

I have before me a table which shows the generation and transmission facilities provided by REA loans during the

fiscal years 1953 to 1957 inclusive. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fiscal year	Miles transmission line	Kilowatt generating capacity
1953	1,337	30,205
1954	1,659	73,200
1955	1,724	98,940
1956	2,677	188,834
1957	2,245	379,466

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that the rural electrification program has developed a significant wholesale power market for electric utilities. The volume of power-company sales to cooperatives over recent years is shown in a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fiscal year	[In millions of dollars]
1956	64.3
1955	59.4
1954	57.0
1953	54.1
1952	49.3
1951	43.2
1950	37.6
1949	30.7

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the continuing success of the rural electrification program has been due largely to the selection of two outstanding REA Administrators by President Eisenhower. His appointment of Ancher Nelsen in 1953 and of David A. Hamil in 1956 placed the REA lending operations in the hands of experienced businessmen who had already demonstrated competence and integrity. Both men were born and reared on farms in our great agricultural West. From their farm and ranch experience they brought to the REA a deep appreciation of the rural need for top-quality electric service at reasonable cost.

Both Administrators had helped sign up their neighbors for electric service from cooperatives, and both had served as directors of their local rural systems. They came to Washington strong believers in the REA loan program and completely dedicated to extending its benefits.

It is to their credit that both of these fine Administrators chose to use with a minimum of change the existing staff of civil-service employees already familiar with the work at the REA. Both contributed vigorous leadership and brought about more efficient procedures in the organization, and they developed in the REA a new and meaningful concept of the relationship between the Government and the citizens it serves.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming will bring a warm glow in the hearts of the members of the rural electric cooperatives all over the country. The record which Ancher Nelsen and his successor, Mr. Hamil, as Administrators of the REA, have made is well known.

The other day I had occasion to comment, on the floor of the Senate, on the great backlog of loans which existed when Ancher Nelsen took office. I am very happy to state that during the subsequent administration of Dave Hamil that backlog has been constantly whittled down, and the loans made by the REA to the cooperatives have expanded each year.

As a Coloradan, I wish to extend, for both my fellow Coloradan, Mr. Hamil, and myself, our very deep appreciation of the remarks the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has made.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I wish to say to him that I consider Dave Hamil to be one of the outstanding administrators in the entire Government service. He is doing a magnificent job for the rural electrification program. The Senator from Colorado has anticipated the statement I am about to make about Mr. Hamil's record. I shall discuss that in a few minutes, and I hope the Senator from Colorado will make some comments in that connection.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the cooperatives and other borrowers of REA funds have been given increasing opportunity under the present administration to develop their operations as local, independent business enterprises, free from unnecessary controls and restraints from Washington. This is in keeping with our best traditions and goes far in assuring continued freedom for the individual in these days when the tendency is to center power and authority in the Federal Government.

To the credit of this administration and of these fine Administrators, Nelsen and Hamil, it must be said that the program has been managed and operated wholly and completely on a nonpartisan basis. This is as it should be, for the REA program is a program of the people, not of any one political party or of any one group of people. I would be the first to voice strenuous objection to partisan operation.

Under the leadership of these men rural electric cooperatives today find themselves in the strongest financial position in the entire 21-year history of the REA. Their loan needs have been met with record promptness. In the past 4 years processing time for loan applications has been reduced in some cases up to 50 percent, with resultant savings to taxpayers of millions of dollars annually in administrative costs.

When this administration came into power there was a backlog of $192 million in electric loan applications, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado so well pointed out. But by the adoption of streamlined business procedures that backlog was reduced to $90 million by the end of last year.

In the last full year of the Truman administration the gross electric loans totaled $165 million. This compares with gross loans of $190 million in 1956 and $300.5 million in 1957.

Marked improvement in administrative and operating efficiency in the Rural Electrification Administration in recent years has saved millions of dollars in tax money. In 1952 it cost $6,630,000 to administer the electric program. Today the administrative costs of the electric program are about $4,500,000, with no reduction in essential services and with a marked advancement in helpfulness to borrowers. Under this administration electric program administrative costs have been reduced by nearly $10 million.

Under this administration REA has worked closely and diligently with rural electric cooperatives to improve their financial position.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to make a comment, rather than ask a question, on the improvement in administration which has taken place in the past 5 years. I believe that in many programs which are formulated for the purpose of helping our citizens, one of the most frustrating aspects is the seemingly endless lapse of time between the time citizens organize to take care of a need or a program and the time they actually receive the benefits of the program.

I hope the Senator will agree with me that in the ending of that frustration and the instillation of confidence in the people who use these programs, the two administrators who have been mentioned have accomplished a most constructive purpose, which is the essence of the program, namely, that of letting persons know that when they apply and proceed along the lines the law sets forth, they are going to get positive and quick action on their applications.

Mr. BARRETT. The record shows that both Administrators have done a remarkable job.

From the beginning of fiscal year 1954 to the end of fiscal year 1957 their gross revenues jumped more than 60 percent, and their net worth went up by more than 50 percent. During this same period the borrowers were able to pay REA nearly $432 million in principal and interest on their loans. This compares to a total of $431 million paid in the entire period from 1935 to 1954. They have increased their payments ahead of due dates to a record high of a total of $109 million. At the beginning of fiscal year 1954 the records show that 34 rural electric systems were delinquent in their payments to REA, whereas today improved economic strength and greater attention to correcting weaknesses of the cooperatives has resulted in a reduction of the number of delinquents to 9.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. First, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for the

splendid statement which he is making with regard to REA and its benefits to the farmers and the people of the Nation. Secondly, I want to join with him in commending the administration for two outstanding men in the REA program, Ancher Nelsen, who was placed in charge of the REA in 1953, and, later, David Hamil, of Colorado, who is the present Administrator.

I have received a telegram from Harry Miller, executive director of the Kansas REA, in which he states that he not only has great faith in the ability and the efforts of David Hamil, but the organization in our State is supporting him wholeheartedly in the fine program he is carrying out.

Again, I want to say to the Senator from Wyoming he has rendered a real service to the Nation and to the REA by the speech he has made on the Senate floor.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his kind remarks. I say to him I could not agree with him more completely than I do, that Ancher Nelsen and David Hamil have done a wonderful job for the REA during the past 5 years of this administration.

In order that the loan needs of rural electric systems could be estimated to the Congress with a maximum of accuracy, the REA instituted in 1954 an annual survey of the construction and financial plans of borrowers. To meet loan needs during fiscal years 1954, 1955, and 1956, the REA had loan funds on hand totaling $556 million which, by the way, was $32 million more than was required to meet needs totaling $524 million.

With loan approvals clearing through REA in record time, rural electric cooperatives had to their credit on June 30 of this year an aggregate of $595.7 million in loan funds approved but not drawn down. These funds were available to them on requisition.

The charge has been made, Mr. President, that Secretary Benson has removed from the hands of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the authority to approve loans in excess of $500,000 and delegated that authority to a member of his immediate staff. The fact is that the Administrator of the REA has the full and complete authority to make the decision on loans. It is true that he does seek the counsel and advice of Kenneth Scott, the Director of the Agricultural Credit Services of the Department of Agriculture, on certain loans, but the fact remains that no one, not even the Secretary of Agriculture, exercises any veto power of any kind over the Director of the REA on the matter of granting of loans by that agency. I submit, Mr. President, that the loan-making authority of the REA is being administered strictly in accordance with the expressed will and direction of the Congress. There are budgetary problems, Mr. President, and a member of the Cabinet has obligations not only to the President, but to the Congress as well, that make it necessary that he be concerned with major expenditures in his department. The Administrator of the REA is appointed on the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, and so I submit, Mr. President, that it is ridiculous to charge that the law is being circumvented merely because the Administrator counsels and advises with the Secretary or his Chief of Credit Services.

In recent years it has become increasingly evident that the job of rural electrification is a continuing task which must take account of the service responsibilities of these rural systems. Borrowers are making inventories of the remaining unserved units in their areas preparatory to connecting those desiring service wherever possible. They are taking a greater interest in the development of the economy of their service areas. They are laying plans for the years to come, with proper attention to the affairs of their cooperative.

The consumers served by these systems are dependent on them for electric service. Service responsibility of these systems include planned growth of the system in order that they can meet their consumers' growing needs on a financially sound basis.

Service from the rural electric cooperatives is high-quality service. The dependence of rural consumers on electric energy for family living and for farm production requires that energy be available in adequate quantities, at dependable voltages, and with service outages held to the lowest possible frequency and duration. The cooperatives have established an excellent service record, and they have moved ahead in recent years with improvements in their systems aimed at assuring even better service for the ever-increasing rural loads. As the need is established by periodic engineering surveys, the capacity of distribution plants is being increased. Loop feeds providing double access to the source of supply are being built to reduce further the incidence and duration of service outages. Generation and transmission facilities are being constructed in record volume to provide the additional power supply needed. Most borrowers have installed radio communications systems to speed up action on service calls.

The success of the rural electrification program is a tribute to the hard work and vision of untold thousands of rural men and women who were determined to find the way to get electricity to the farms of our country. At all times since the program began in 1935 the grassroots support of the rural electrification program has been these same farm people who joined together to do the organizing, to conduct the member sign-up campaigns, and serve on the boards of their cooperatives. These cooperatives exemplify local private enterprise at its best and are rendering a vital service to the community, State, and Nation. The members are justly proud of their cooperatives' accomplishments. They can be expected to control and direct their cooperatives in the future with the same degree of vigor and reason which has characterized them to date. The farmers of this country are sound and conservative people. Historically, they have arrived at sound conclusions and decided on effective courses of action when they have been given the full facts.

These characteristics are a reassuring factor with respect to the future of the rural electrification program.

Mr. President, of course the REA will continue to serve fully and effectively the financing needs of rural electrification. We shall make available adequate loan funds. We shall continue to operate the programs with the measure of economy and honesty that all of us as taxpayers have come to expect. We shall extend to the cooperatives and other borrowers the assistance they require, and we shall do it with a minimum of regulations and supervision. In this way, rural people and their Government can continue to work hand-in-hand in order to achieve greater productivity and higher levels of living for the farmers of our country.

This, Mr. President, is no partisan matter. We have a splendid record of support for the rural electrification program over the years. By our actions, now and in the future, let us show the farmers and ranchers of America that their friends on both sides of the aisle, in both the Senate and House, stand ready to support REA effectively and courageously.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 336. An act for the relief of Angela Ferrini;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Willem Woeras;

S. 398. An act for the relief of Benjamin Wachtfogel;

S. 441. An act for the relief of Jose Ramirez-Moreno;

S. 463. An act for the relief of Pedro Ampo;

S. 465. An act for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi;

S. 485. An act for the relief of Luigi Lino Turel;

S. 499. An act for the relief of Daniela Renata Patricia Zei;

S. 524. An act for the relief of Robert F. Gross;

S. 562. An act for the relief of Hideko Takiguchi Pulaski;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Vida Djenich;

S. 660. An act for the relief of Ursula Rosa Pazdro;

S. 662. An act for the relief of Howard I. Buchbinder;

S. 796. An act for the relief of Zacharoula Papoulia Matsa;

S. 976. An act for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi;

S. 1035. An act for the relief of Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee);

S. 1050. An act for the relief of Hrygory (Harry) Mydlak;

S. 1153. An act for the relief of Zdenka Sneler;

S. 1167. An act for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias;

S. 1175. An act for the relief of Helene Cordery Hall;

S. 1241. An act for the relief of Edward Martin Hinsberger;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of Lee-Ana Roberts;

S. 1293. An act for the relief of Eithaniahu (Eton) Yellin;

S. 1306. An act for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung;

S. 1307. An act for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola);

S. 1308. An act for the relief of Carmen Jeanne Launois Johnson;

S. 1335. An act for the relief of Sandra Ann Scott;

S. 1370. An act for the relief of Wanda Wawrzyczek;

S. 1387. An act for the relief of Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy);

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Ansis Luiz Darzins;

S. 1496. An act for the relief of Nicoleta P. Pantelakis;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Sic Gun Chau (Tse) and Hing Man Chau;

S. 1736. An act for the relief of Rosa Sigl;

S. 1767. An act for the relief of Eileen Sheila Dhanda;

S. 1783. An act for the relief of Randolph Stephan Walker;

S. 1804. An act for the relief of Marjeta Winkle Brown;

S. 1815. An act for the relief of Nicholas Dilles;

S. 1817. An act for the relief of John Panagiotou;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Charles Douglas;

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi);

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Maria West;

S. 1902. An act for the relief of Belia Rodriguez Ternoir;

S. 1910. An act for the relief of Salvatore Salerno;

S. 1962. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain tract of land owned by the United States to the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, Bowie, Md.;

S. 2003. An act for the relief of Jozice Matana Koulis and Davorko Matana Koulis;

S. 2063. An act for the relief of Guy H. Davant;

S. 2095. An act for the relief of Vaclav Uhlik, Marta Uhlik, Vaclav Uhlik, Jr., and Eva Uhlik;

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Gertrud Mezger; and

S. 2434. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution favoring the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission for the publication of certain documents; and

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document and for additional copies of the report of the Commission on Government Security.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 1558. An act for the relief of Phillis Guyadeen;

H. R. 1678. An act to provide for the quitclaiming of the title of the United States to the real property known as the Barcelona Lighthouse Site, Portland, N. Y.;

H. R. 1741. An act for the relief of Ikuko Morooka Mahoney;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Donald Adamson;

H. R. 4854. An act for the relief of Victoria Galea;

H. R. 8284. An act for the relief of Innocenza Guarascio; and

H. J. Res. 368. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following joint resolutions of the House:

H. J. Res. 338. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 373. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 387. Joint resolution for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States;

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 194) granting permanent residence to certain aliens.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION GRANTED TO WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the unfinished business by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill relates to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage-board employees. It could also affect decreases. It happens that in the past everything has been going up, as we all know, but it could go the other way.

Mr. President, the pay of Federal employees in recognized trades or crafts or in unskilled, semiskilled, or skilled manual-labor occupations is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates in private industry.

There are some 650,000 such employees.

Congress in granting agencies the authority to fix the pay of these employees assumed there would be a close relationship between the pay of employees in industry and those in Government. However, that is not always the case.

Here is why.

Pay increases are granted by industry. At some later date, employees of Government whose pay is supposed to be related to that of employees in industry petitions their agency for a wage survey. The agency considers the petition, makes a preliminary examination to determine that increases have been granted by industry, and finally an official survey is ordered.

The data collected in the survey is then analyzed and eventually a new pay scale developed.

This process has on occasion taken up to 6 to 8 months.

The net result is that, although the Government is presumed to be paying its blue-collar workers in accordance with prevailing rates in private industry, they are not doing so during this long intervening period.

Public hearings were held by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on similar legislation last year.

Following the hearings, the committee unanimously reported S. 3465, which was approved unanimously in the Senate July 16, 1956. That bill was identical to this bill S. 25.

S. 25 provides that the effective date of increases shall be not later than the beginning of the first pay period which begins on or after 30 days following the start of the survey. This allows agencies reasonable time in which to conduct adequate surveys.

The committee believes that if agencies plan their work well there will be little, if any, occasion for the payment of retroactive wage increases.

The committee believes that the bill is amply liberal from the standpoint of the time allowed agencies to conduct wage surveys and develop new pay schedules.

The committee believes further that there is no justification for long delay in making the adjustments that should be made under existing law. I dislike to say it, but it seems that some agencies string the process out in order to keep from putting into effect the increase to which the workers are clearly entitled.

I believe that explains the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, in line 2 on page 2 of the bill, to strike out the words "ordered to be made" and insert the word "completed" in lieu thereof.

In line 13 and in line 22 on page 2 of the bill, strike out the word "ordered" and insert the word "completed" in lieu thereof.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has accurately described the action taken by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which was unanimous in reporting the bill. However, after the bill had been reported I was advised that the Department of Defense was opposed

to the bill. For the record, I should like to read a statement which has been submitted to me.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that this report was not available—or at least we did not have it—at the time the committee considered the bill.

The statement from the Defense Department reads:

The position of the Department of Defense with respect to possible amendments to the bill is that the Department is opposed to any legislation that would provide any retroactivity whatsoever for wage increases, but if Congress feels that some legislation of this type should be enacted the least opposition would be to legislation that would provide retroactivity to the first pay period that begins more than 30 days from the date of completion of the survey, as would be provided by H. R. 5273. The amendments that we favor are attached to this note.

That is the amendment, Mr. President, that I have offered.

Under present procedures, if a new schedule of wage-board rates is made effective, retroactive to the first pay period beginning 30 days after the start of a survey, that will add an increased average added time period of 10 weeks. Assuming an average increase of 12½ cents an hour per employee, or $50 per employee for the 10-week period, the additional increased payroll cost would be approximately $15 million for the Army and the Air Force and $11½ million for the Navy, for a total additional cost of approximately $26½ million for the 10-week period. The Defense Department contends that it will take them 4 weeks to conduct this survey; it will take 4 weeks to analyze the survey; and that to put the new rates into effect will take an additional 2 weeks.

It was for this reason that I offered the amendment, which the Defense Department had submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "ordered to be made" and insert "completed"; and on page 2, line 22, to strike out the word "ordered" and insert the word "completed."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in my opinion this amendment would make the law much worse than it is at the present time. Personally, I believe that if the Department can make its survey in 4 weeks, which is less than 30 days, that would leave approximately 15 days in which to analyze its report. If the Department cannot analyze its own report in 15 days, something is wrong. Our own bill would take away from the workers about 45 days additional pay, if there is to be an increase. It would not go into effect until after about 45 days. I do not think that is the intention of the law at the present time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator is suggesting that the 30-day provision be left in the bill, adding such additional language as would require the time used in making the surveys not to include Saturdays and Sundays, making a total of 45 days?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I have no authority to speak for the committee. I have not consulted with the committee, and I could not agree to any amendment to the committee bill. We discussed the question in the committee thoroughly, and we held hearings on the subject last year. Last year the committee was unanimous. This year the committee was unanimous. Last year the Senate passed the bill with practically no discussion. So we think that 30 days is sufficient.

Mr. CARLSON. Would the chairman be willing, if I should withdraw the amendment which I have offered, to permit me to offer an amendment which would insert the words "exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays" in lines 1, 12, and 21, on page 2?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Rather than quibble over a few days, naturally I would not object; but, as the Senator knows, the committee decided upon 30 days as the proper time. We did not say whether Saturdays and Sundays should be counted or not, but I would not argue that particular question.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have offered, and offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated, in its place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 1, 12, and 21, following the word "day" it is proposed to insert the words "exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays."

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope the chairman will accept that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will not object to that amendment, under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever, pursuant to a wage survey, an increase in rates of basic compensation is granted to any employees of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates under authority of section 202 (7) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such increase shall be made effective not later than the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 30th day, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays, following the date on which such survey was ordered to be made.

SEC. 2. (a) Retroactive compensation shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which the increase is granted, except that such retroactive compensation shall be payable (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 30th day, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays, following the date on which the survey was ordered and ending on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which the increase was granted, for services performed during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the 30th day, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays, following the date on which the survey was ordered and ending on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which the increase was granted, by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, such increase shall be considered to have taken effect prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date on which the increase was granted.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1054, Senate bill 2205, a bill to amend the Federal Bankruptcy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2205) to amend section 116 (4) of chapter 10 of the Federal Bankruptcy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and it was reported from the Judiciary Committee. As I understand, it was unanimously approved by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

The purpose of the amendments reported by the committee is to make the bill conform to the recommendations of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The amendments have the effect of providing that the exemption is with respect to chapter 10 of the

Bankruptcy Act, rather than the entire act.

There was rather distinguished testimony on the subject, and, so far as I recall, although I was not a member of that particular subcommittee, no objection was raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there is on the calendar a companion House bill, Calendar No. 1079, House bill 7671.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 7671, as a substitute for Senate bill 2205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7671) to amend section 116 of chapter X of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, to make certain equipment trust provisions applicable to aircraft and aircraft equipment of air carriers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7671?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2205 is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 814, Senate bill 2672.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2672) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to increase the salaries of certain executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has an order been previously entered concerning the time of meeting tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No previous order has been entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour tomorrow, for the transaction of routine business, and that under the heading of "Morning Business" speeches be limited to not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF STUDY ENTITLED "THE INTERNATIONAL PATENT SYSTEM AND FOREIGN POLICY" (S. DOC. NO. 63)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a study of the international patent system and foreign policy was written for the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Judiciary Committee by Raymond Vernon, who served as Chief of the International Business Practices Division and as Acting Chief of the Office of Economic Defense and Trade Policy of the State Department for several years. At the present time he is directing a study of the economic life of the New York metropolitan region, under the auspices of Harvard University and the Regional Planning Association.

While the study was made under the authority of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, it is not to be regarded as a statement of the committee or of any member of the committee.

It has, however, been in substantial demand, both at the office of the subcommittee and at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office. As of today, I am advised by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents that 1,287 copies of this document have been sold at 20 cents a copy. Demands for additional copies are being received daily by the committee. After consultation with the members of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, and with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am authorized to request that this committee print be issued as a Senate document.

I should like to add that to date the Superintendent of Documents has sold 17,921 copies of the 5 regional studies which have been published by our subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a report of sales by the office of the Superintendent of Documents with respect to these five studies, as of July 30, 1957.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of sales by the Superintendent of Public Documents, Government Printing Office, of the Research Studies, July 30, 1957

	Copies sold
Study No. 1: Proposals for Improving the Patent System (Bush)	6,962
Study No. 2: The Patent System and the Modern Economy (Frost)	3,416
Study No. 3: Distribution of Patents to Corporations (Federico)	3,539
Study No. 4: Opposition and Revocation Proceedings in Patent Cases (Federico)	3,075
Study No. 5: The International Patent System and Foreign Policy (Vernon)	1,129
Total sold	17,921

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JURISDICTION OVER WHOLESALING ACTIVITIES OF MEATPACKERS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post of this morning a letter to the editor by Mr. Aled P. Davies, who identifies himself as director of the department of livestock of the American Meat Institute. Mr. Davies' letter took issue with a Washington Post editorial of August 19, 1957, written in support of Senate bill 1356. This bill would return to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction of the wholesaling activities of meatpackers.

I ask unanimous consent that my comment on the editorial and Mr. Davies' reply letter be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

There appeared in the Washington Post, this morning, a letter to the editor from Mr. Aled P. Davies, who identifies himself as director, department of livestock, American Meat Institute. Mr. Davies' letter took issue with a Washington Post editorial of August 19, 1957, written in support of S. 1356. As you know, this bill would return to the FTC jurisdiction over the wholesaling activities of meatpackers.

Since S. 1356 shortly will be before the Senate for debate, I feel it incumbent upon me, as one of the sponsors of the bill, to point out to the Senate the many misstatements of fact which this letter contains, as well as other liberties the AMI has taken with the facts in an attempt to defeat this bill.

It is to be expected that the big national packers, who seem to dominate the American Meat Institute, since the big 4 packers provide 55 percent of the dues, would keep up a constant volley of rebuttal against S. 1356. It cannot be disputed that these 4, and 6 other packers, dominate the meat industry, since, although there are about 2,000 packers engaged in interstate commerce, 10 meatpacking firms market 66.1 percent of the meat slaughtered and eligible for shipment in interstate commerce. When these 10, and perhaps a few other large packers are suddenly faced with the prospect that jurisdiction over their trade practices may suddenly be shifted from the USDA to the FTC, an effective and specialized enforcement agency, human nature being what it is, their reaction to S. 1356 through the AMI is understandable, even if not commendable.

I do not believe that the bulk of the packers are opposed to S. 1356, simply because testimony given to the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust & Monopoly seems to indicate just the opposite: The AMI told the subcommittee that it had 435 members (hearings, S. 1356, p. 247); however, the Western States Meat Packers Association, which supports S. 1356, indicated that 462 firms, mostly small businesses, comprise its membership (hearings, S. 1356, p. 96). The

answers of these small independent packers, as well as some 28 other organizations representing all phases of the livestock and food industry, to the questions and observations posed by Mr. Davies' letter are given in the pamphlet What's So Different About Meat?, which can be obtained from the Western States Meat Packers Association, room 704, 917 15th Street N. W., Washington 5, D. C.

S. 1356, as the following analysis of Mr. Davies' letter to the editor indicates, was not born of false or faulty allegations, as alleged, but rather of 36 years of noneffective USDA administration of title II of the Packers & Stockyards Act, and a genuine bipartisan concern to remedy this situation.

1. Challenged AMI Davies statement: "The first sentence of the editorial implies what a bit later is stated to be a fact—that there has not been effective policing of monopolisic or unfair trade practices in the meatpacking industry."

Answer: The Packers and Stockyards Act vests the Secretary of Agriculture with authority to issue cease and desist orders with respect to packers who engage in unfair trade practices under title II. While a small number of such cease and desist orders, in and of itself, obviously is not a good indicator of whether title II has been and is being enforced, a small number of cease and desist orders, however, do indicate nonenforcement in my judgment, when coupled with these facts: (1) USDA has never asked for sufficient funds to enforce the act; (2) the packers and stockyards branch, since the early 1920's has been understaffed and spread too thin to do the job title II requires; and (3) the growing volume of complaints of unfair trade practices by packers which the USDA has done little or nothing about.

No, to say the least, it is unlikely that the small number of cease and desist orders—32 since 1921—is attributed to any other fact than noninterest and nonconcern on the part of the USDA since the early 1930's. Since 1921, 18 of these 32 cease and desist orders have been issued to packers under title II for refusal to pay for or accept livestock.

In the past 36 years the USDA has issued but six cease and desist orders involving weight and grade frauds in the buying and selling of livestock. The remaining eight cease and desist orders issued to packers involved actual unfair trade practices in the form of restraints, preferences, price fixing, and discriminations. Seven of these cease and desist orders were issued against packers involving restraints, preferences, price fixing, and discriminations in the wholesaling of meat. But it is important to note that in the last 18 years the USDA has issued only one such order. Not since the mid-1930's has the Department evidenced any concern in this area. More significant still is the fact that the USDA has never issued a cease and desist order against a packer which involved the wholesaling or retailing of nonmeat food products or nonfood products.

2. Challenged AMI Davies statement: "To support this contention, the supporters of the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill say that not many cases alleging such practices have been brought by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture does not have sufficient personnel to police the industry."

On July 6, 1956, I introduced S. 4177 in the Senate. The Senate Agriculture Committee to which it was referred requested a report from the USDA on July 10, 1956. In the meantime, the USDA's 1958 fiscal year budget request went to the Bureau of the Budget. Its request for new obligatory authority to administer the Packers and Stockyards Act amounted to $178,000 which was for the purpose of posting additional stockyards under title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Not $1 of new obligatory authority appears to have been requested by the USDA for expansion of its enforcement activities under title II of that act for the 1958 fiscal year, although the packers and stockyards branch requested $200,000 of additional new funds for title II enforcement, which the USDA itself turned down.

Notwithstanding this background the USDA on December 21, after the Department's 1958 fiscal year request had gone to the Bureau of the Budget, rendered a report recommending against enactment of S. 4177.

By contrast with the vigorous activities in earlier years under title II, as described by Mr. Millard J. Cook, head of the Packers and Stockyards Branch from 1945 to 1955, in testimony presented to the subcommittee in June 1956, responsibility for prevention of unfair trade practices by meatpackers today not only under title II but under title III as well as here in Washington, D. C., is vested in the Trade Practices Section of the Packers and Stockyards Branch of the Livestock Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service. This Trade Practice Section was staffed by two marketing specialists and a stenographer at the time S. 1356 was introduced, and I presume the section is still so staffed, since I have not received information to the contrary.

Neither one of these two marketing specialists, nor a single employee in any of the 20 understaffed field offices maintained by the Packers and Stockyards Branch, is engaged full time in title II enforcement. A review of the USDA's April 4, 1957, self-appraisal report on the Packers and Stockyards Act administration indicates, as does the Department's appropriation request, that nearly 90 percent of the work of this section and the Packers and Stockyards Branch itself is spent in title III enforcement; any action taken under title II being incidental to its title III activities relating to operation of stockyards.

This self-appraisal report alluded to by Mr. Davies in his letter does state that "the organization that is maintained in administering the Packers and Stockyards Act permits a high degree of flexibility in planning and conducting major investigations and in meeting the fluctuating demands of different district offices. This is because the entire field force may be actively utilized in such an investigation whenever necessary" (p. 8).

This statement appears to be a self-directed gratuity rather than a fact, as is revealed by examination of Mr. Earl Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. D. M. Pettus, Acting Director, Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, before the Senate subcommittee. Consider the following colloquy between these gentlemen and myself:

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. Secretary * * * is it not true that in the Ogden, Utah, area you have 2 marketing specialists and 1 clerk—3 people to regulate 26 packers in 3 States, 12 of them in Utah, 13 in Idaho, and also 1 in Oregon?

"Mr. PETTUS. Those are the people permanently assigned to that location. When we have an investigation underway, we frequently bring in people from other markets and from our Washington area and add to our staff.

"Senator WATKINS. If they do not have any bigger staff in other areas than in this, what would you have to enforce the law where you are moving them from?

"Mr. PETTUS. We leave a reduced staff.

"Senator WATKINS. For instance, in Billings, Mont., you have 1 marketing specialist and 1 half-time clerk, as I get it, to regulate 5 packers in Utah, 3 in Idaho, 2 in Wyoming, and 11 in Montana—21 altogether. How in the world can you take anybody from that area to help somewhere else such as the Ogden, Utah, area if the others are manned in the same way?" (transcript, p. 695–6). At this point Mr. Butz asked Acting Director Pettus to explain how a case 2 years ago in the Ogden, Utah, area was handled. In part Mr. Pettus replied:

"Mr. PETTUS. I cannot recall at the moment how many people we had looking into the particular transaction, but we try to operate it with as few people as possible because we are spread so thin, Senator" (transcript, p. 697).

To which I replied, with the colloquy continuing as follows:

"Senator WATKINS. I recognize you are spread thin, and that is our complaint—that you do not have enough force to do the job in title II.

"Mr. PETTUS. We agree with you, and I think that is pointed out.

"Senator WATKINS. You have not had for nearly 36 years.

"Mr. PETTUS. I agree with you, sir.

"Senator WATKINS. We think that is a long enough trial period. * * * With all the problems that have been handed to Agriculture, we thought we would certainly find someone who would be glad to get rid of this matter of law enforcement in the field in which the FTC has a special interest by reason of the act of Congress creating it as an independent regulatory agency—a special arm of the Congress.

"Mr. BUTZ. It is quite true for 26 years it has not been adequately enforced, but don't you think when the sinner confesses and resolves to do better he should be given a chance?" (Transcript, p. 697–8)

Under these circumstances, what reasonably prudent person would not conclude that responsibility for prevention of unfair trade practices involving meat packers should be returned to the Federal Trade Commission, where it was before passage of the Packers and Stockyard Act of 1921? Is not 25 or 30 years of inadequate enforcement a long enough trial period?

3. Challenged AMI-Davies statement: "Actually, one would think that if the situation is serious enough in the meat industry to call for legislation the supporters of the transfer bills would be able to come up with at least one authenticated case of unlawful trade practices which have been uncorrected by the Secretary of Agriculture."

I am most happy to oblige Mr. Davies. But let me say this: It is not the job of the Senate Judiciary Committee to decide whether a complaint is or is not valid. Our job was to determine whether the USDA has been in the habit of (1) investigating complaints, and (2) taking proper action.

Countless witnesses told the committee of taking complaints to the USDA, about which the USDA did nothing. Complaints which the USDA did not ever attempt to investigate. Consider the following statement of Mr. Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive vice president, United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, given in testimony to the subcommittee:

"Here are some practices currently engaged in by meatpackers, as reported to us by our members and apparently about which nothing effective can be done in the present state of the law and enforcement jurisdiction:

"1. Discriminating in price between competing buyers. We happen to have supporting invoices on that, although they are confidential.

"2. Giving kickbacks to supervisors of a retail distributing company.

"Incidentally, most of these have been applied apparently for the purpose of incurring favor, in order to sell more of the fresh meats of these packers.

"Senator KEFAUVER. You mean, the packers gave kickbacks?

"Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is right; either the packers or the salesman or the agent of the packer, to the supervisors, in order to get more fresh meat business, or so they have reported to us.

"3. Subsidizing certain customers to the disadvantage of their competitors.

"4. Selling evaporated milk in five-case lots to some outlets cheaper than the wholesaler can buy evaporated milk in carload lots.

"5. Favoring some retailers under the guise of advertising and promotional allowances and even selling to them at prices cheaper than to the wholesaler.

"6. Selling to some retail buyers from branch houses below wholesale prices temporarily, to make up monthly branch-house tonnage quota. Of course, that is fresh-meat tonnage quotas.

"7. Packers salesmen telling wholesale grocers' retail customers the prices they have charged the wholesaler for purchase of packer merchandise, and in some cases, telling the retailer to buy up the wholesaler's stock of an item on which the price has advanced before the wholesaler learns of that advance" (hearings, p. 168).

But more disturbing, Mr. President, is the refusal of the Department of Agriculture at the policy level to take action against a packer even when the Packers and Stockyards Branch's Trade Practice Section has developed adequate information to warrant full-scale investigation and perhaps formal charges. Such a recent case, as Mr. Davies full well knows, involved certain alleged unfair trade practices prohibited by title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act on the part of Safeway Stores, which, if sustained would be violations of that act. The following colloquy between the Senate Subcommittee Counsel, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Pettus, and Mr. Lee D. Sinclair, Chief, Packers and Stockyards Branch, clearly develops this fact. Mr. Sinclair stated that he had recommended to his superiors "that the case be fully investigated and that we attempt to get sufficient funds to carry out that investigation." The colloquy then continued as follows:

"Mr. McHUGH. You were overruled in this recommendation?

"Mr. SINCLAIR. In effect there was an overruling, yes.

"Mr. McHUGH. Was the matter considered again after it was returned to you with this notation for conducting a study?

"Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I brought it up again about January of this year with Mr. Reed, the director of the Livestock Branch, Mr. Reed told me later that he had taken it up again and that we should not investigate it.

"Mr. McHUGH. Well, what did that mean to you? With whom?

"Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, I understand it to mean his superiors, who would be Mr. Lennartson, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Butz.

"Mr. McHUGH. After that, did you concur in the decision that was made not to go forward with this investigation, but to conduct this research study?

"Mr. SINCLAIR. Well, we weren't asked about that.

"Mr. McHUGH. Did your opinion as to the best manner of handling this problem change any?

"Mr. SINCLAIR. No."

I am not critical of the decision to undertake a broad economic study of the practice involved in the Safeway case. However, I am critical of the lack of action to stop such a practice when preliminary investigation by the Trade Practice Section seemed to verify a violation of title II. Both actions could and should have been undertaken.

Many witnesses who appeared before the Senate subcommittee listed dozens of similar instances involving practices carried on by packers which the USDA has not even bothered to investigate. The USDA witnesses did not refute them.

4. Challenged AMI-Davies statement: "Since the Packers and Stockyards Act was passed in 1921, there has not been a single conviction we know about in the industry for antitrust law violation, despite numerous sweeping investigations by the Department of Justice, which over the last 15 years actually brought 11 major criminal and civil cases involving packers of all sizes, all of which were dropped, dismissed or lost on trial."

It is true that the Department of Justice has authority to enforce the antitrust laws, involving conspiracy to monopolize, such as the Sherman Act of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1914. But this is beside the point at issue, since the Department of Justice does not have authority to prevent unfair trade practices under title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act, which falls short of Sherman Act violations. In addition, section 404 of the Packers and Stockyards Act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture "may report any violation of this act to the Attorney General of the United States, who shall cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States without delay." The only difficulty, however, is that Secretaries of Agriculture have not used this authority apparently, for title II has never been litigated in the courts, either by the USDA or the Department of Justice.

Although the Justice Department, under the Sherman Act now has authority to proceed against meat packers for conspiracies in restraint of trade, the big packers who dominate the meat industry know, in light of the 1948 case against Armour and Col, et al., that it is very unlikely, at least in the near future, that they will ever be effectively proceeded against under the Sherman Act. Why? Mr. Victor R. Hansen, head of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, in a letter to me dated July 11, 1957, put it this way: "In the Department's 1948 proceeding against the four major meat packers the Government had charged a continuing conspiracy commencing in 1893. After the case was filed the Court ordered that no evidence offered by the Government that related to the defendants' activities before 1930 would be received in evidence. This order of the Court eliminated from the Government's case its best evidence of conspiratorial acts. Thus the Court's "1930 cut-off date" drastically affected the ability of the Government to prove its case. For these reasons, this Department dismissed in 1954 its 1948 proceedings."

Thus, the only way to prevent continued concentration in the meat packing industry it seems at present, is to prevent that type of trade practice which falls short of a Sherman Act violation by returning to the FTC jurisdiction over packers' trade practices. This is provided by S. 1356.

5. Challenged AMI-Davis statement: The fact that meat packers submit reports to the Department of Agriculture has no bearing on enforcement activities, as the editorial implies."

Mr. President, it most certainly has a bearing. As I pointed out in my testimony to the House Antitrust and Commerce and Finance Subcommittees in support of H. R. 5282, a companion bill to S. 1356:

"USDA DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN DATA ESSENTIAL TO DETERMINATION OF TITLE II VIOLATIONS

"During the course of the Senate subcommittee's hearings on S. 1356, Mr. Butz, the major spokesman for the USDA, indicated that the Department, while willing to give the FTC jurisdiction over the wholesaling and retailing of meat, nonmeat food, and nonfood products of a firm not principally engaged in meat packaging and processing, nevertheless would not voluntarily give up jurisdiction over such activities by a firm principally engaged in meat packing because '* * * in that case it is necessary to have general supervision over that because sometimes, as has been alleged, they may use profits in their nonmeat activities, you see, to engage in discriminatory pricing practices on meat' (transcript, p. 751).

"But in fact, does the USDA obtain such data from meat packers? No, Mr. President, on a regular basis they do not, nor does the USDA even require packers to report their losses or profits on their meat operations or any nonmeat food product or nonfood product operation. As one witness summarized this administrative shortcoming to the Senate subcommittee last summer:

" 'Under the Packers and Stockyards Act every company doing an interstate meat business has to report a financial statement as of the end of each year but never have the packers and stockyards administration required the national packers to submit a statement of their meat operations separately from their total operations. That has been one of the failures of properly administering that Packers and Stockyards Act, in that you cannot get the definite information' (transcript, June 21, 1956, p. 21).

"The statement of this witness is substantiated by the USDA's Packers and Stockyards Administration self-appraisal report of April 4, 1957, to which I have already made reference, as I shall point out shortly.

"When asked during the Senate hearings on S. 1356 a few days ago whether the USDA was continuing to investigate charges of market sharing by packers, since the Department of Justice dropped its major suit in 1953 against several national packers based on this practice, Mr. Pettus, Acting Director, Livestock Branch, Agricultural Marketing Service replied:

" 'Not as a specific followup of that overall case, but in our various types of records that we get on packers, the reports that we get each year, and our observations, we have continued to look over the entire question of sharing' (transcript, p. 664).

"Great stress was placed by Mr. Pettus upon information contained in packer reports, or as he put it information 'that we get ourselves directly from the packers, under the act' (transcript, p. 665).

"Now, what does the self-appraisal report say about the content and use made of reports submitted annually by packers to the Packers & Stockyards Branch? Namely this:

" 'The annual reports of meatpackers are received by the 20 district offices that are maintained by the packers and stockyards branch. * * * Information contained in these reports is primarily concerned with ownership, organization, and financial conditions. * * * The annual reports of the top four packers are forwarded to the Washington office of the branch where they are retained in a permanent file.

" 'Although the annual reports of packers are received, there is no tabulation or statistical analysis made of the information contained in them for the purpose of determining industry trends, problems, or conditions' (p. 14).

"Might one not logically ask, as a result: Why, in fact, are these reports not reviewed for the purpose of determining industry trends, problems, or conditions? Why even require reports in the first place unless they are reviewed in order to further the carrying out of specific objectives of the Packers and Stockyards Act?

"Insofar as title II is concerned, the Department is charged with the responsibility of preventing unfair trade practices by meatpackers, yet these reports do not even require packers to show losses on their meat, nonmeat food products, and non-food-product operations. Such information, however, is essential to determine whether a firm is absorbing losses in one area or line of operation in order to eliminate competitors, but making up the loss in other areas and lines of operation where its position is better established in the market. If none but the reports of the 'top four packers' are sent to Washington, how could the Department ever

detect various market-sharing arrangements which limit competition for livestock and mean lower prices to producers? The odds are that it could not make such a detection, let alone produce evidence sustainable in a court of law.

"The self-appraisal report confirms these observations by correctly suggesting that 'effective administration and prompt enforcement of any regulatory measure such as the Packers and Stockyards Act are highly dependent upon the availability of adequate information and the use made of this information in the job that must be done. Packers and others subject to the act are now required to file annual reports. In the past, the Department of Agriculture has consistently adhered to a policy of requesting from those subject to this act a minimum of information in their reports.

" 'This raises the question as to whether both the timeliness and the content of these reports from packers might be improved and whether the information supplied should be in more pertinent detail for analysis and interpretation. Such reports would help pinpoint industry or individual problems and assist in bringing about more effective and economical administration of the act. This is so, particularly in view of the information such reports can reveal relating to trends, shifts, emphasis, degree of concentration in the industry, etc.' " (pp. 20–21).

6. Challenged AMI-Davies statement: "* * * we felt the logical solution is to adopt the approach suggested by the Dirksen amendment to the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill."

I am sure the AMI feels this way. I am equally sure the American people do not.

Proposals made to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly by (1) the American Meat Institute, lobbyist for the big national packers who oppose S. 1356, and (2) the United States Department of Agriculture, as embodied in the Dirksen amendments, would give to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction only over the wholesaling and retailing activities of a firm not principally engaged in meat packing or processing.

On the other hand, the great majority of the groups which testified before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee or filed statements with the subcommittee, or who have otherwise indicated approval of S. 1356, urged the Senate to give the FTC such authority over the wholesaling and retailing activities of all firms.

The group includes:

National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.
National Retail Dry Goods Association.
National Association of Retail Grocers.
National Fisheries Institute.
United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.
National Farmers Union.
National Food Brokers Association.
Cooperative League of the United States.
National Wool Growers Association.
National Milk Producers Federation.
American National Livestock Auction Association.
Idaho Wool Growers Association.
Utah Wool Growers Association.
Wyoming Wool Growers Association.
Utah Cattlemen's Association.
Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc.
National Renderers Association.
National American Wholesale Grocers Association.
National Institutional Wholesale Grocers Association.
National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.
Wyoming Stock Growers Association.
National Preservers Association.
Montana Cattlemen's Association.
Iowa Swine Producers Association.
Georgia Dairy Association.
Pure Milk Association.
Kansas Ice Cream and Milk Institute.

Why? Because the firms these spokesmen represent must compete with the packers in the wholesaling and retailing of meat, of nonmeat food products, and of nonfood products. Yet, as they pointed out to the subcommittee while they are subject to the effective enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as were the big 5 packers before 1921, these packers and others as well are subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act under title II of which they enjoy comparative freedom due to nonenforcement by the USDA.

The AMI and the USDA proposals, as embodied in the proposed Dirksen amendments to S. 1356, thus would continue the present system of two sets of trade practice rules: One for the big packers which is not effectively enforced by the USDA, and one set for their competitors which is effectively enforced by the FTC. As the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. O'MAHONEY) remarked during the testimony of the Department of Agriculture officials: "* * * you are proposing to throw the food chains to the wolves in the Federal Trade Commission while shielding the packers behind the Department of Agriculture" (hearings, S. 1356, p. 394).

These witnesses and the firms they represent are concerned in the light of this situation, because 3 of the biggest packers, represented by the AMI, were 1920 consent decree signers who recently have petitioned the courts to set aside those portions of that order which would permit these packers to process and sell 140 food and nonfood products, own and operate retail meat markets, sell fresh milk and cream, and operate distribution facilities for handling these products in direct competition with wholesale and retail food stores.

Should this petition be granted, these firms fear, and rightly so, the ramifications continued USDA noninterest in the enforcement of the unfair trade practices of title II would have upon their businesses, since to all intent and purpose these 3 of the biggest 10 packers would be free, as other packers now are, to expand into every segment of the food industry, and nonfood industries as well.

But whether the consent decree modification is granted or not, the activities of these packers outside the area prohibited by the consent decree are so extensive that their competitors—food firms, nonfood firms, and small packers—are likely to be hurt unless the big national packers are required to operate under the same set of trade practice rules under which they must operate. In this respect, it should be noted that in 1950 one or more of the four largest packers shipped 21 classes of food products in interstate commerce and 58 classes of nonfood products. Nonmeat food products comprised 6.6 percent of their total shipments. Nonfood products, exclusive of the byproducts of their meat operations, constituted 6.7 percent of their total shipments in interstate commerce, and nonfood byproducts shipped accounted for an additional 4.9 percent. Thus, 18.2 percent of their total shipments comprised nonmeat food and nonfood products.

Yet, these packer-owned operations now are not subject to the FTC, but their competitors are subject to the jurisdiction of that more effective agency. Nor under the proposed Dirksen amendments to S. 1356 would these big packers be subject to the FTC. The present situation without doubt gives, and these proposals would continue to give in the future, an unfair competitive advantage to packer-owned enterprises. Under these circumstances who, as a competitor of Swift & Co., wouldn't be concerned about this situation when in 1955 that firm, for example, produced 4 percent of the Nation's butter; 8 percent of the cheese; 9 percent of the margarine; 19 percent of the salad and cooking oil; and 15 percent of the shortening?

Why, these witnesses ask, and rightly so in my opinion, should the trade practices of a firm like Wilson Sporting Goods, selling nonfood products, be under USDA while its competitors like Spaulding, as it would under the USDA and AMI proposal, continue to be subject to the FTC? Why they ask, should Swift and Armour in the wholesaling of nonmeat food products such as cheese, canned milk, eggs, soups, etc., be under the USDA and their competitors like Campbell Soup Co. and Safeway Stores continue to be under the FTC, as the USDA and the AMI propose?

[From the Washington Post of August 22, 1957]

PACKERS AND THE FTC

The editorial in your August 19 edition entitled "Packers and the FTC" repeats in substance the contentions which have been made by proponents of S. 1356 and the companion bills in the House to transfer jurisdiction over the meatpacking industry from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission.

The first sentence of the editorial implies what a bit later is stated to be a fact—that there has not been effective policing of monopolistic or unfair trade practices in the meatpacking industry. To prove this contention, the supporters of the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill say that not many cases alleging such practices have been brought by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture does not have sufficient personnel to police the industry.

Actually, one would think that if the situation is serious enough in the meat industry to call for legislation, the supporters of the transfer bills would be able to come up with at least one authenticated case of unlawful trade practices which have been uncorrected by the Secretary of Agriculture.

So far this has not been done. Chairman COOLEY of the House Committee on Agriculture called attention to this glaring deficiency, after hearing many witnesses testify before his committee and after having asked for concrete examples of complaints.

The fact is that the meatpacking industry is a clean industry and the small number of cases proves it. Since the Packers and Stockyards Act was passed in 1921, there has not been a single conviction we know about in the industry for antitrust law violation, despite numerous sweeping investigations by the Department of Justice, which, over the last 15 years actually brought 11 major criminal and civil cases involving packers of all sizes, all of which were dropped, dismissed or lost on trial. Several of these cases involved various trade practices and in all of them the industry's activities were under the most detailed scrutiny and study.

Those who advocate the passage of this legislation claim that only three persons are available for enforcement. The Department of Agriculture, however, points out that it has 78 full-time employees who may be utilized in investigations whenever necessary.

The editorial states that the Department has neither the specialists nor the experience for effective enforcement of the law against unfair trade practices. Actually, the Agricultural personnel which have the responsibility in this field are much more expert than anyone available to the FTC, which this week may be investigating some phase of the food business and next week may be looking into automobile batteries.

The fact that meatpackers submit reports to the Department of Agriculture has no bearing on enforcement activities, as the editorial implies. The reports are required by law. Other businesses submit reports to the FTC. We fail to see how this fact can

be taken as a persuasive argument for legislation.

However, if legislation is needed to regulate more effectively someone who is claiming to be a backer when his principal business is in other fields, then we feel the logical solution is to adopt the approach suggested by the Dirksen amendment to the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill.

This amendment would keep those whose principal business is meatpacking under the Secretary of Agriculture and give the FTC jurisdiction over all activities of others except such meatpacking operations as they may choose to operate.

ALED P. DAVIES,
Director, Department of Livestock, American Meat Institute.

CHICAGO.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, Calendar No. 814, Senate bill 2672, be placed back on the calendar, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9379) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 23, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22, 1957:

UNITED NATIONS

To be representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.

A. S. J. Carnahan, United States Representative from the State of Missouri.

Walter H. Judd, United States Representative from the State of Minnesota.

George Meany, of Maryland.

Herman B. Wells, of Indiana.

To be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1957

James J. Wadsworth, of New York.

Miss Irene Dunne, of California.

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois.

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.

Genoa S. Washington, of Illinois.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The following-named persons to be examiners in chief in the Patent Office of the Department of Commerce:

Harry Sure, of Maryland.

Peter T. Dracopoulos, of Maryland.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Harvey G. Straub, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Robert W. Dill, of New York, to be collector of customs for the customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

W. Rae Dempsey, Jr., of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

James P. Winne, of Hawaii, to be collector of customs for the customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry Edwards, of New York, to be surveyor of customs, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

John S. Hastings, of Indiana, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

W. Lynn Parkinson, of Indiana, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Robert A. Grant, of Indiana, to be United States district Judge, northern district of Indiana.

Edward T. Gignoux, of Maine, to be United States district judge, for the district of Maine.

Thomas C. Egan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge, for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James A. Borland, of New Mexico, to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico, for a term of 4 years.

T. Fitzhugh Wilson, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, for a term of 4 years.

William M. Steger, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Texas, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Thomas H. Trent, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Ira Kenneth Evans O16215.

Maj. Gen. William Preston Corderman O16387.

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke O16468.

Maj. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell O16684.

Maj. Gen. Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., O16434.

Maj. Gen. James Francis Collins O16819.

Maj. Gen. Conrad Stanton Babcock O16104.

Maj. Gen. Henry Randolph Westphalinger O16130.

Maj. Gen. William Clyde Baker, Jr., O16371.

Maj. Gen. Keith Richard Barney O16377.

Maj. Gen. Clerin Rodney Smith O16388.

Maj. Gen. Ralph Morris Osborne O16399.

Maj. Gen. Lewis Sherrill Griffing O16413.

Maj. Gen. Holger Nelson Toftoy O16422.

Maj. Gen. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436.

Maj. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451.

Maj. Gen. Edward Harold McDaniel O16497.

Maj. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten O16669.

Maj. Gen. Max Sherred Johnson O16745.

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown O16761.

Maj. Gen. Willis Small Matthews O16932.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Lloyd Roosevelt Moses O29362.

Brig. Gen. Archibald William Stuart O18130.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Thomas James Hartford O18330, Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Austin Wortham Betts O19373.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, Public Law 773, 83d Congress:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert Ernest Frankland O277098.

To be brigadier general

Col. Clarence Birnie Johnson, Jr., O268791.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

The following-named captains of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admirals

James M. Farrin, Jr.	Robert J. Stroh
George H. Wales	James W. Davis
Edward J. O'Donnell	Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
James H. Flatley, Jr.	Joseph C. Clifton
Andrew M. Jackson, Jr.	Allan L. Reed
Kleber S. Masterson	Ernest C. Holtzworth
Marshall E. Dornin	Ray C. Needham
Robert L. Moore, Jr.	Robert M. Reynolds
Frank L. Johnson	Lloyd M. Mustin
Lot Ensey	Francis D. Foley
Denys W. Knoll	Ignatius J. Galantin
John W. Ailes III	Thomas H. Moorer
Jefferson R. Dennis	

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of John P. Darby, Jr., and 7 other officers, and the nominations of Richard T. Durkee, and 778 other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on August 5, 1957, and may be found in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John P. Darby, Jr., which appears on page 14086, and ending with the name of Richard A. Zuegel, which is shown on page 14089.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 22, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who art the source of every good and perfect gift, inspire us in our moments of prayer with lofty ideals and aspirations and with the wisdom and the will to fulfill them.

May we be grateful for the hallowed memories of the past and mindful of our eternal destiny as the children of Thy love and care.

Grant that we may be humble in our estimate of ourselves, never relying upon our own human ingenuity and seeking our own glory.

Make us faithful and diligent in performing the duties of our high vocation, discharging all our appointed tasks without thought of praise or reward.

Constrain us to be honorable in all our dealings with our fellow men and may our honesty never be only a matter of policy but of principle.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 491. An act for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger;

S. 864. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota;

S. 2460. An act to authorize the transfer of certain housing projects to the city of Decatur, Ill., or to the Decatur Housing Authority; and

S. 2792. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1937) entitled "An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. FREAR, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9131) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 3, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14, 32, 38, 40, and 61.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments Nos. 6 and 54 to the above-entitled bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and has appointed the following conferees: Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine.

CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF WARNER ROBINS, GA., OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7972) to provide for the conveyance to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., of certain lands located in such city.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the total area involved in this bill is 5.78 acres. It formerly constituted a portion of Robins Air Force Base. It has now been determined by the Air Force that there is no further requirement for this land, and they have declared it excess to their needs.

I want to draw particular attention to the fact that the city of Warner Robins will pay the fair market value for this property, whatever that may turn out to be. It is my understanding that the value will approximate $35,000.

Warner Robins is a growing community and has established a requirement for these two small parcels of land for use for municipal purposes.

I cannot visualize any objection to this measure in view of the obvious need of the city for the land and their willingness to pay the fair market value for the property.

The Department of the Air Force and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to this measure.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand this has been unanimously approved by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct and it has been approved by the Budget and the Air Force.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to convey to the city of Warner Robins, at the fair market value, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to 2 parcels of land aggregating 5.78 acres, within the city of Warner Robins, Ga., and more particularly described as follows:

Parcel 1: Commencing at a point being the common corner of land lots numbered 199, 200, 217, and 218 in the fifth district of Houston County, Warner Robins, Georgia, at the intersection of Watson Boulevard and Davis Drive, run south 89 degrees 30 minutes east for 40.01 feet; thence north 2 degrees east along the eastern right-of-way of North Davis Drive for 1,129.69 feet, thence south 88 degrees 41 minutes and 16 seconds east for 349.79 feet to the point of beginning, thence continue south 88 degrees 41 minutes 16 seconds east for 1,480.89 feet to a point on the western right-of-way on Myrtle Street; thence north 1 degree 26 minutes west for 141.10 feet, thence north 88 degrees 41 minutes 16 seconds west for 1,474.13 feet to the eastern right-of-way of a proposed drive; thence south 1 degree 18 minutes and 44 seconds west for 141.00 feet to the point of beginning. Said above described parcel contains 4.781 acres more or less situated entirely in land lot numbered 217 of the fifth district, Houston County, Warner Robins, Georgia.

Parcel 2: Commencing at a point being the common corner of land lots numbered 199, 200, 217, and 218 in the fifth district of Houston County, Warner Robins, Georgia, at the intersection of Watson Boulevard and Davis drive, run south 89 degrees 30 minutes east for 40.01 feet; thence north 2 degrees east along the eastern right-of-way of North Davis Drive for 1,129.69 feet to the point of beginning; thence south 88 degrees 41 minutes and 16 seconds east for a distance of 309.79 feet to a proposed drive, thence north 1 degree 18 minutes and 44 seconds east along the western right-of-way of said drive for 141.00 feet to a point on the proposed extension of Young Avenue; thence north 88 degrees 41 minutes and 16 seconds west for 308.10 feet more or less to a point at the eastern right-of-way of North Davis Drive; thence south 2 degrees west along said right-of-way for 141.01 feet to the point of beginning. Said described parcel contains 1 acre more or less situated in land lot numbered 217 at the fifth district of Houston County and Warner Robins, Georgia.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "acres," insert: "and any improvements located thereon."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Warner Robins, Ga., of certain lands and any improvements located thereon in such city."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, ROONEY, and TABER.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY LUTHER GANDY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to advise the House of the funeral services today of one of my predecessors in the Congress from the Second District of South Dakota, the Honorable Harry Luther Gandy.

The Honorable Harry L. Gandy, who served in the House of Representatives from March 4, 1915, to March 3, 1921, died last week at his home in Los Gatos, Calif., at the age of 76. His body was returned to Rapid City, S. Dak., for burial in his home State.

Mr. Gandy was born August 13, 1881, in Churubusco, Ind. He was graduated from Tri-State College, Angolo, Ind., in 1901, and moved to Rapid City, S. Dak., in 1907 where he engaged in newspaper work. He operated the Wasta, S. Dak., Gazette from 1910 to 1918.

He began a career of public service as United States Commissioner at Wasta

from 1910 to 1913. He was elected to the South Dakota State Senate in 1911. In 1914, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives where he served 3 terms. He was the first Democratic candidate ever to be elected from that district.

Since serving in Congress, he continued operating a ranch near Wasta until 1945, and from 1923 to 1930 was executive secretary of the National Coal Association of Washington, D. C. During this time, he assisted in the negotiations during a series of bitter and controversial mine strikes. He was connected with the Pittston Co. from 1930 to 1937, and from 1937 to 1940 was chairman, Bituminous Coal Producers Board, Cincinnati, Ohio. From 1944 until his retirement, he was assistant to the president, Elk River Coal & Lumber Co., and Buffalo Creek & Gauley Railroad Co., Widen, W. Va. It was my privilege to visit with him on several occasions when he was a Washington visitor, and at all times he was an ardent booster of western South Dakota.

Harry Gandy lived a long and successful life, marked with outstanding service to his State and country. I know my colleagues in the House join me in extending our sincere sympathy to his family.

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

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota in paying tribute to the memory of Mr. Gandy. Some 10 or 12 years ago, Mr. Gandy came to West Virginia and located in my Congressional District. He was elected vice president and manager of the Elk River Coal and Lumber Co. He became widely known in West Virginia. He was among the prominent coal operators of the State, operating one of the largest coal enterprises within the State. I join the gentleman in adding my word of praise of Mr. Gandy and extend my sincere sympathy to the family of this distinguished South Dakotan.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of the Honorable Harry Luther Gandy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] in paying tribute to our respected former Member, the Honorable Harry L. Gandy, who has recently passed away at his home in California.

Mr. Gandy was a most effective and conscientious Member of the Congress from 1915 to 1921. He has the distinction of being the first Democratic Congressional candidate elected from the western district of South Dakota. As such he has perpetuated the worthy cause of two-party government in a State that has traditionally leaned heavily on the side of the opposition party.

I want to salute our departed colleague for his political courage, his concept of public service and his dedication to the common good. My deepest sympathies are extended to his family and friends.

NARCOTICS MANUFACTURING ACT OF 1957

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9028) to discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes, which was reported unanimously favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1957."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. The enactment of this act is necessary for the following reasons:

(1) The Congress has long recognized that the manufacture, distribution, and use of narcotic drugs for nonmedical and nonscientific purposes endangers the health of the American people and threatens the general welfare. The Congress has enacted laws and the Senate has approved international conventions designed to establish effective control over domestic and international traffic in narcotic drugs.

(2) Until recently, most narcotic drugs were made from natural raw materials such as the opium poppy and the coca leaf, produced in limited areas of the world. In practice, control over the production of narcotic drugs could therefore be achieved by national and international restrictions over the production and shipment of these raw materials and their use to manufacture narcotic drugs.

(3) In recent years, however, technological advances have resulted in the development of new types of narcotic drugs, produced synthetically from a variety of generally available raw materials. As a result, controls over the production of narcotic drugs can no longer be maintained solely by controls relating to the opium poppy and the coca leaf.

(4) The United States has joined with other nations in executing international conventions intended to establish suitable controls over production, shipment, and use of all narcotic drugs. These conventions are not self-executing, and the obligations of the United States thereunder must be performed pursuant to appropriate legislation.

(5) In order (a) to discharge more effectively the international obligations of the United States, (b) to promote the public health, safety, and welfare, (c) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in narcotic drugs, and (d) to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of narcotic drugs, the Congress finds it necessary to enact a statute for the licensing and control of the manufacture of all narcotic drugs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "1931 convention" means the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, concluded at Geneva, July 13, 1931, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America July 9, 1933, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946.

(b) The term "1948 protocol" means the protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention of July 13, 1931, for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs (as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946), signed at Paris, November 19, 1948, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America, September 11, 1950.

(c) The term "Secretary or his delegate" means the Secretary of the Treasury, or any officer, employee, or agency of the Treasury Department duly authorized by the Secretary (directly or indirectly by one or more redelegations of authority) to perform the function mentioned or described in the context.

(d) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, association, trust, or other institution or entity.

(e) The term "narcotic drug" means narcotic drug as defined in section 4731 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act.

(f) The term "manufacture" means the production of a narcotic drug, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis.

(g) The term "basic class of narcotic drug" means any one of the following classes of narcotic drugs and any additional class or classes of narcotic drugs (other than crude opium or coca leaves), by whatever trade name designated, as may be defined from time to time by the Secretary or his delegate in accordance with section 6 of this act:

1. Opium, powdered, granulated, or deodorized, or tinctures or extracts of opium.
2. Mixed alkaloids of opium and their salts.
3. Morphine and its salts.
4. Codeine and its salts.
5. Thebaine and its salts.
6. Marcotine and its salts.
7. Papaverine and its salts.
8. Cotarnine and its salts.
9. Marceine and its salts.
10. Ethylmorphine and its salts.
11. Apomorphine and its salts.
12. Nalorphine (N-allylnormorphine) and its salts.
13. Hydromorphone (dihydromorphinone) and its salts.
14. Metopon (methyldihydromorphinone) and its salts.
15. Dihydrocodeine and its salts.
16. Hydrocodone (dihydrocodeinone) and its salts.
17. Oxycodone (dihydrohydroxycodeinone) and its salts.
18. Cocaine and its salts.
19. Ecgonine and its salts.
20. Pethidine (meperidine, Isonipecaine) (1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester) and its salts.
21. Alphaprodine (alpha-1, 3-dimethyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine) and its salts.
22. Methadone (amidone) (6-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenyl-3-heptanone) and its salts.
23. Isomethadone (isoamidone) (6-dimethylamino-5-methyl-4, 4-diphenyl-3-hexanone) and its salts.
24. Levorphan and racemorphan (3-hydroxy-N-methlymorphinan) and their salts.
25. Levomethorphan and racemethorphan, (3-methoxy-N-methylmorphinan) and their salts.
26. Anileridine (ethyl 1-[2-(p-amino phenyl)-ethyl]-4-phenyl piperidine-4-carboxylate) and its salts.

(h) The term "net disposal" means the quantity of a basic class of narcotic drug, sold, exchanged, given away, used in the production of another basic class of nar-

cotic drug for which the manufacturer is licensed, or otherwise disposed of (as such or contained in or combined with other drugs compounded by the manufacturer of such basic class) by the manufacturer during a stated period, less the quantity of any such basic class of narcotic drug returned to the manufacturer by a customer and any quantity sold or transferred to another licensed manufacturer of the same basic class of narcotic drug.

(i) The term "narcotic precursor" means a substance other than a narcotic drug which the Secretary or his delegate has found, after due notice and opportunity for public hearing—

(1) is an immediate chemical precursor of a narcotic drug;

(2) is produced primarily for use in the manufacture of a narcotic drug; and

(3) is used, or is likely to be used, in the manufacture of a narcotic drug by persons other than persons licensed to manufacture such narcotic drug.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Narcotic drugs: The words 'narcotic drugs' as used in this part shall mean any of the following, whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis:

"(1) Opium, isonipecaine, coca leaves, and opiate;

"(2) Any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, isonipecaine, coca leaves, or opiate;

"(3) Any substance (and any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation thereof) which is chemically identical with any of the substances referred to in clauses (1) and (2);

except that the words 'narcotic drugs' as used in this part shall not include decocainized coca leaves or extracts of coca leaves, which extracts do not contain cocaine or ecgonine."

(b) Subsection (g) of section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(g) Opiate: The word 'opiate' as used in this part shall mean any drug (as defined in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (52 Stat. 1041, sec. 201 (g); 21 U. S. C. 321)) or other substance found by the Secretary or his delegate and proclaimed by the Secretary or his delegate to have been so found in the Federal Register, after due notice and opportunity for public hearing, to have an addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability similar to morphine or cocaine or to be capable of conversion into a drug having such addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability, where in the judgment of the Secretary or his delegate, the relative technical simplicity and degree of yield of such conversion create a risk of improper use of the drug. The Secretary or his delegate is authorized to issue necessary rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this subsection, and to confer or impose upon any officer or employee of the Treasury Department whom he shall designate or appoint, the duty of conducting any hearing authorized hereunder. The Secretary or his delegate is authorized to withdraw any previous finding that a drug or other substance is an 'opiate' whenever he determines that such previous finding was erroneous, and upon publication of such determination in the Federal Register, the particular drug or other substance shall cease to be an opiate. For purposes of the foregoing provision the Secretary or his delegate may consider any action taken pursuant to article 3 of the 1948 protocol.

NOTIFICATIONS, FINDINGS, AND DECISIONS UNDER THE 1948 PROTOCOL

SEC. 5. (a) Before a notification may be sent on behalf of the United States to the Secretary General of the United Nations, under article 1 of the 1948 protocol, that a drug is considered liable to the same kind of abuse and productive of the same kind of harmful effects as the drugs specified in article 1, paragraph 2, of the 1931 convention, such drug shall have been found by the Secretary or his delegate to be an "opiate", as defined in section 4731 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 (b) of this act, and so proclaimed in accordance with the procedure prescribed by section 4731 (g) as amended.

(b) Upon receipt by the United States of a finding or decision made pursuant to article 1 or article 2 of the 1948 protocol that a certain drug is capable of producing addiction or conversion into a drug capable of producing addiction and that the appropriate provisions of the 1931 convention shall apply to such drug, such finding or decision shall be transmitted to the Secretary or his delegate. The Secretary or his delegate shall cause such finding or decision to be published in the Federal Register unless such drug has already been determined to be an opiate under the procedure prescribed by section 4731 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act. From the time of such publication, such drug shall be an opiate to the same extent as if the procedure prescribed by section 4731 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act, had been followed with respect to such drug.

(c) If the finding or decision so received and published in the Federal Register relates to a drug which has not previously been determined to be an opiate under the procedure prescribed by section 4731 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act, any person in the United States interested in the domestic manufacture and distribution of such drug for medical and scientific purposes may submit to the Secretary or his delegate written data, views, and argument opposed to such finding or decision. Such written data, views, and argument shall be transmitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations for consideration by the World Health Organization or the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations, as the case may be, under article 3 of the 1948 protocol. If thereafter the United States receives a revised finding or decision, under article 3 of the 1948 protocol, that such a drug is not capable of producing addiction or conversion into a drug capable of producing addiction and that the provisions of the 1931 convention shall not apply to such drug, such revised finding or decision shall be transmitted to the Secretary or his delegate, who shall cause such revised finding or decision to be published in the Federal Register within 90 days of receipt thereof by the Secretary or his delegate. From the time of such publication, such drug shall cease to be an opiate, unless the Secretary or his delegate has theretofore initiated an opiate procedure under section 4731 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act.

(d) Upon receipt by the United States of a revised finding or decision under article 3 of the 1948 protocol (except a revised finding or decision to which subsection (c) applies) that a drug (theretofore subject to the Federal narcotic laws as an opiate) is not capable of producing addiction or conversion into a drug capable of producing addiction and that the provisions of the 1931 convention shall not apply to such drug, the revised finding or decision shall be transmitted to the Secretary or his delegate. The Secretary or his delegate may, in his discretion, publish the revised finding or decision in the Federal Register and, from the time of such publication, such drug shall cease to be an opiate. If the revised finding or decision is not so published in the Federal Register, the said drug shall continue to be an opiate.

MODIFICATION OF LIST OF BASIC NARCOTIC DRUGS

SEC. 6. The Secretary or his delegate, upon his initiative or upon the petition of any interested person shall have the power by rule made on the record after opportunity for hearing, to alter classifications set forth in section 3 (g) by adding to, subtracting from, or further defining such classifications or any one or more of them, on the basis of their chemical structure and content and addiction liability or convertibility into an addicting drug. No new basic class shall be added unless with respect to any drug or drugs falling within such class the Secretary or his delegate shall have determined that such drug is a narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act, or has caused a finding or decision to be published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 5 of this act. For purposes of this subsection, the Secretary or his delegate may consider changes in classification established by the World Health Organization or its successor in function.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE MANUFACTURE OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

SEC. 7. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, it shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture any narcotic drug unless—

(1) such narcotic drug falls within a basic class of narcotic drugs established by or pursuant to this act, and

(2) such person holds a currently effective license and manufacturing quota with respect to such basic class of narcotic drug issued pursuant to section 8 of this act.

The omission of a narcotic drug from the classification established pursuant to section 3 (g) shall not be construed to permit the manufacture of such narcotic drug, the intent of this act being to limit the manufacture of narcotic drugs in the United States to those narcotic drugs established under this act as a basic class of narcotic drugs or as a member of a basic class of narcotic drugs. The fact that the Secretary or his delegate shall have—

(A) determined that a drug is a narcotic drug as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended by section 4 of this act, or

(B) caused a finding or decision with respect to any drug or other substance to be published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 5 of this act, shall not require the Secretary or his delegate to add such narcotic drug to the classifications set forth in paragraph (1) or to grant a manufacturing quota for such narcotic drug, if the Secretary or his delegate shall determine that it is contrary to the public health and safety to permit the manufacture of such drug within the United States.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to manufacture or attempt to manufacture any narcotic drug, or (2) to knowingly permit the manufacture of any narcotic drug, in or upon any place owned, leased, occupied, used or controlled by him unless he (or the lessee, tenant, or other occupant as the case may be) is the holder of a license and quota for the manufacture during the period in question of such narcotic drug in accordance with the provisions of sections 3 (g), 8, and 11 of this act; and it shall be unlawful for the holder of any such quota to manufacture during the period for which the quota is applicable any quantity of such narcotic drug in excess of the amount authorized by such quota.

LICENSES TO MANUFACTURE NARCOTIC DRUGS

SEC. 8. (a) Every person who manufactures a basic class or classes of narcotic drug shall, on or before January 1, 1958, if then already engaged in such manufacture, or otherwise before engaging in such manufacture, obtain from the Secretary or his delegate a license or licenses for the appropriate basic class or classes of narcotic drug. There shall be a separate license for the manufacture of each basic class of narcotic drug. In determining whether to issue a license for a particular basic class of narcotic drug to a particular applicant, the Secretary or his delegate shall be governed by the following factors—

(1) maintenance of effective controls against the diversion of the particular basic class of narcotic drug and of narcotic drugs compounded therefrom into other than legitimate medical and scientific channels through limitation of manufacture of the particular basic class of narcotic drug to the smallest number of establishments which will produce an adequate and uninterrupted supply of narcotic drugs of or derived from such basic class of narcotic drugs for medical and scientific purposes, consistent with the public interest; and

(2) compliance with the obligations undertaken by the United States pursuant to the 1931 convention and the 1948 protocol; and

(3) promotion of technical advances in the art of manufacturing narcotic drugs and the development of new narcotic drug products; and

(4) the applicant's education, moral character and reputation, the applicant's past drug manufacturing experience and the quality of his products, his technical competence, the existence in the applicant's establishment of adequate safeguards against diversion of narcotic drugs into other than legitimate medical and scientific channels; and

(5) such other factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public interest.

(b) Registration pursuant to section 4722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall be a prerequisite to the issuance of any license under this section. Licenses shall be in such form as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe and shall continue in effect subject only to annual renewal of registration unless revoked pursuant to section 9 of this act or voluntarily surrendered. Issuance of a license pursuant to this section shall not entitle the licensee to perform any act with respect to narcotic drugs as to which the consent or approval of the Secretary or his delegate is required by the provisions of this or any other act.

(c) Issuance of a license for the manufacture of any one basic class of narcotic drug shall not entitle the holder thereof to manufacture for sale, distribution, or other use any other basic class of narcotic drug.

(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary or his delegate shall authorize any person registered as a manufacturer or as a person engaged in research under section 4722 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, who meets the standards for licensing under subsection (a) (4) of this section 8, whether or not such person actually holds a license under subsection (a), to produce such limited quantities as the Secretary or his delegate may specify of any narcotic drug, except crude opium or coca leaves, whether or not a basic class for such drug has been established under section 3 (g) of this act, exclusively for research in the development of manufacturing processes for the drug, or for chemical, pharmacological or medical testing of such drugs, for fitness for medical or scientific use and for determination of its suitability for general manufacture and distribution for medical or scientific use. Such person shall make such reports as the Secretary or his delegate may require relating to the quantities of narcotic drug manufactured and to use and disposal of such quantities of such narcotic drug. Such quantities of such narcotic drug may be disposed of only in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary or his delegate. Any authorization made under this subsection (d) shall be subject to revocation or suspension in accordance with the procedure set forth in section 8 of this act.

(e) In issuing or refusing to issue manufacturing licenses pursuant to this section, the Secretary or his delegate shall act in conformity with the procedure prescribed by section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Secretary or his delegate shall be deemed to constitute "the agency" for purposes of compliance with sections 7 and 8 of such act. Each licensee of the basic class of narcotic drug with respect to which a license is sought to be obtained shall be deemed a person entitled to notice within the meaning of section 5 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSES

SEC. 9. (a) Any license issued pursuant to section 8 of this act may be revoked by the Secretary or his delegate if the licensee—

(1) has been convicted of violating or conspiring to violate any law of the United States or of any State where the offense involves any activity or transaction with respect to narcotic drugs; or

(2) has violated or failed to comply with any duly promulgated regulation of the Secretary or his delegate relating to narcotic drugs, and such violation or failure to comply reflected adversely on the licensee's reliability and integrity with respect to narcotic drugs.

In the case of a licensee holding more than one license issued pursuant to section 8 of this act, revocation may be in the discretion of the Secretary or his delegate extended to all licenses held by such licensee.

(b) Before revoking any license pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary or his delegate shall serve upon the licensee an order to show cause why an order of revocation should not be issued. Any such order to show cause shall contain a statement of the basis thereof, and shall call upon such licensee to appear before the Secretary or his delegate at a time and place stated in the order, but in no event less than 30 days after the date of receipt of such order, and give evidence upon the matter specified therein. The Secretary or his delegate may in his discretion suspend any license simultaneously with the issuance of an order to show cause, in cases where he finds that the public health, safety, or interest require such suspension. Such suspension shall continue in effect until the conclusion of any revocation proceeding, including judicial review thereof, unless sooner withdrawn by the Secretary or his delegate, or dissolved by a court of competent jurisdiction. Every hearing held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Secretary or his delegate shall be deemed to constitute "the agency" for purposes of compliance with sections 7 and 8 of such act. If after hearing, default, or waiver thereof by the licensee, the Secretary or his delegate determines that an order of revocation should issue, he shall issue such order, which shall include a statement of his findings and the grounds and reasons therefor and shall specify the effective date of the order, and he shall cause such order to be served on the licensee. In any case where a hearing is conducted pursuant to the provisions of this section both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the Secretary or his delegate. Proceedings under this section shall be independent of, and not in lieu of, criminal prosecution or other proceedings under this act or any other law of the United States.

AUTHORITY TO SEIZE NARCOTIC DRUGS, ORDER FORMS, AND TAX STAMPS

SEC. 10. In the event of the suspension or revocation of a license obtained under section 8, all narcotic drugs owned or possessed by such person at the time of suspension or at the effective date of the revocation order, as the case may be, whether or not taxes have been paid on such narcotic drugs, together with all unused order forms or narcotic tax stamps owned or possessed by such person, may at the discretion of the Secretary or his delegate be placed under seal and no disposition made until the time for taking an appeal has elapsed or until all appeals have been concluded. Upon a suspension or revocation order becoming final all narcotic drugs, tax stamps, and order forms shall be forfeited to the Government.

MANUFACTURING QUOTAS FOR BASIC CLASSES OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

SEC. 11. (a) For the purpose of fixing manufacturing quotas under this section and in order to carry out the treaty obligations of the United States, the Secretary or his delegate shall make determinations of the total quantity of each basic class of narcotic drug necessary to be manufactured during each calendar year to provide for the estimated medical and scientific needs of the United States, for lawful export requirements, and for establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks.

(b) In fixing individual manufacturing quotas for any basic class of narcotic drug for a calendar year pursuant to this section, or at any time after fixing such individual quotas, the Secretary or his delegate shall limit or reduce such individual quotas to the extent necessary to prevent the aggregate of such individual quotas from exceeding the amount of the determination of the Secretary or his delegate under subsection (a). In any such limitation or reduction pursuant to this subsection the quota of each licensed manufacturer of such basic class of drug shall be limited or reduced in the same proportion as the limitation or reduction of the aggregate of such quotas. However, if any licensee, before the issuance of a limitation or reduction in quota, has manufactured in excess of his quota so limited or reduced, the amount of such excess shall be subtracted from such licensee's manufacturing quota for the following year.

(c) On or before June 1 of each year, upon application therefor by a person having a license to manufacture a basic class of narcotic drug, the Secretary or his delegate shall fix a manufacturing quota for such calendar year for such basic class of narcotic drug for such person. Subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), such quota shall be sufficient to cover the applicant's estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements for the calendar year as determined by the Secretary or his delegate, who shall take into account the applicant's current disposal rate, the trend of such disposal rate during the preceding calendar year, the applicant's production cycle and inventory position, the economic availability of raw materials, yield and stability problems, emergencies such as strikes and fires, and other factors. Subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), such quota shall not be less than the sum of—

(1) such licensed manufacturer's net disposal of such basic class of narcotic drug during the immediately preceding calendar year or the average of the three immediately preceding calendar years in which such manufacturer produced such basic class of narcotic drug, whichever is greater; and

(2) one-half of such manufacturer's net disposal of such basic class of narcotic drug

during the immediately preceding calendar year;

less such manufacturer's inventory of such basic class of narcotic drug on December 31 of the preceding calendar year.

(d) During the period from January 1 until a manufacturing quota for such calendar year is fixed pursuant to subsection (c), any licensed manufacturer entitled to receive a quota for any basic class of narcotic drug under subsection (c) may manufacture a provisional quota of not more than 75 percent of whichever of the following is greater—

(1) such manufacturer's net disposal of such basic class of narcotic drug during the 12 months immediately preceding September 30 of the preceding calendar year; or

(2) twelve times such manufacturer's average monthly net disposal of such basic class of narcotic drug for the 33 months immediately preceding September 30 of the preceding calendar year;

or such higher or lower percentage as the Secretary or his delegate may from time to time for good cause direct. Any higher or lower percentage so directed shall apply to the provisional quotas of all licensed manufacturers for such basic class of narcotic drug.

(e) The Secretary or his delegate shall, on application therefor, and subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b), fix a quota for any licensed manufacturer of a basic class of narcotic drug who has not manufactured such basic class of narcotic drug during one or more of the three immediately preceding calendar years, in an amount adequate to cover such manufacturer's reasonably anticipated requirements for the current calendar year.

(f) At any time during the calendar year any licensed manufacturer who has applied for or received a manufacturing quota for a basic class of narcotic drug may apply for an increase in such quota, to meet his estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements during the remainder of such calendar year. In passing upon such application the Secretary or his delegate shall take into consideration any occurrences since the filing of such manufacturer's initial quota application that may require an increased manufacturing rate by such manufacturer during the balance of such calendar year. In passing upon such application the Secretary or his delegate may also take into consideration the amount, if any, by which the determination of the Secretary or his delegate under subsection (a) exceeds the aggregate of the quotas of all manufacturers under this section, and the equitable distribution of such excess among other manufacturers.

EXCEPTION FROM APPLICABILITY OF LICENSE AND QUOTA PROVISIONS

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act—

(1) no license or quota shall be required for the manufacture of such quantities of narcotic drugs as incidentally but necessarily result from the manufacturing process used for the manufacture of a basic class of narcotic drug duly licensed under this act; and

(2) no license or quota shall be required for the manufacture of such quantities of narcotic drugs as incidentally but necessarily result from the manufacture of any substance which is not a narcotic drug.

Unless such incidentally but necessarily resulting narcotic drug shall have been determined to be nonaddicting by the Secretary or his delegate, it may (apart from being used in the process of producing a narcotic drug for which license and quota are held) be retained or disposed of only in such manner as may be prescribed or authorized by the Secretary or his delegate.

REGULATION WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO MANUFACTURE NARCOTIC PRECURSORS

SEC. 13. Persons who manufacture, compound, package, sell, deal in, or give away any narcotic precursor shall keep such records and make such reports with respect to such narcotic precursor as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulation prescribe. The Secretary or his delegate may advise the Congress whether in his opinion the manufacture and distribution of narcotic precursors threaten to result in the diversion of narcotic drugs into other than legitimate medical and scientific channels and whether in his judgment further legislation with respect to narcotic precursors is necessary or desirable.

CERTAIN PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. Every final decision of the Secretary or his delegate under sections 3 (i), 6, 8, 9, 11 (c), 11 (e), or 11 (f) of this act shall be subject to judicial review as provided by and in the manner prescribed in Public Law 901, 81st Congress, approved December 29, 1950.

AMENDMENT TO LAW WITH RESPECT TO EXPORTATION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS

SEC. 15. Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909, as amended (21 U. S. C. 182), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Government shall export or cause to be exported from the United States, or from territory under its control or jurisdiction, any narcotic drug to any other country except—

"(1) to a country which has ratified and become a party to the International Opium Convention of 1912 for the Suppression of the Abuses of Opium, Morphine, Cocaine, and Derivative Drugs, or to the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925, any narcotic drugs derived directly or indirectly from crude opium or coca leaves; or

"(2) to a country which has ratified and become a party to the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs concluded at Geneva July 13, 1931, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America July 9, 1933, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946, and the protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention of July 13, 1931, for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs (as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946) signed at Paris November 19, 1948, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America September 11, 1950, any narcotic drugs not derived directly or indirectly from crude opium or coca leaves; and in the instance of (1) and (2) then only if—

"(1) such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with the respective conventions, a system which the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate deems adequate, for the control of imports of narcotic drugs;

"(2) the narcotic drug is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of the country of import; and

"(3) there is furnished to the Secretary or his delegate proof deemed adequate by him that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and scientific uses within the country to which exported, that it will not be reexported from such country, and that there is an actual need for the narcotic drug for medical and scientific uses within such country.

"(b) The exceptions contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, the exportation of which is absolutely prohibited.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the Secretary or his delegate may authorize the exportation of any narcotic drug (including crude opium and coca leaves) to a country which has ratified and become a party either to the 1912 convention, the 1925 convention, or the 1931 convention and supplementing protocols of 1946 and 1948, if the particular drug is to be applied to a special scientific purpose in the country of destination and the authorities of such country will permit the importation of the particular drug for such purpose.

"(d) The Secretary of State shall request all foreign governments to communicate through the diplomatic channels copies of the laws and regulations promulgated in their respective countries which prohibit or regulate the importation and shipment in transit of any narcotic drug and, when received, shall advise the Secretary or his delegate thereof."

AUTHORIZING IMPORTATION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS AS TO CERTAIN PERSONS

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or any other law, the Secretary or his delegate may in his discretion authorize the importation of any narcotic drug or drugs (including crude opium or coca leaves) for delivery to officials of the United Nations, of the Government of the United States, or of any of the several States, or to any person licensed or qualified to be licensed under section 7 of this act, for scientific purposes only.

ENFORCEMENT AND AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 17. It shall be the duty of the Secretary or his delegate to enforce the provisions of this act, and he is hereby authorized to make, prescribe, and publish all necessary rules and regulations for carrying out its provisions, including but not limited to rules and regulations for the prevention of unlawful diversion of narcotic drugs, and to confer or impose any of the rights, privileges, powers, and duties conferred or imposed upon him by this act upon such officers or employees of the Treasury Department as he shall designate or appoint.

PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 18. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) Any person who willfully makes, aids, or assists in the making of, or procures, counsels, or advises in the preparation or presentation of, a false or fraudulent statement in any application made pursuant to this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

PROCEDURE AND PRESUMPTIONS

SEC. 19. It shall not be necessary to negative any exemptions set forth in this act in any complaint, information, indictment, or other writ or proceeding laid or brought under this act and the burden of proof of any such exemption shall be upon the person claiming its benefit. In the absence of proof by such person that he is the duly authorized holder of an appropriate license or quota issued under this act, he shall be presumed not to be the holder of such license or quota and the burden of proof shall be upon him to rebut such presumption.

APPLICABILITY OF ACT

SEC. 20. The provisions of this act shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the Canal Zone, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the other insular territories and possessions of the United States.

SEPARABILITY OF INVALID PROVISIONS

SEC. 21. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any circumstances, shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 14, lines 2 and 3, strike out "paragraph (1)" and insert "section 3 (g)."

Page 17, line 21, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Page 29, line 17, strike out "7" and insert "8."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed, and that following my remarks the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may extend his remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 9028, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] is to implement and give full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that such manufacture be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for the purpose. As is pointed out in the committee report, the bill is also designed to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulation of exports into conformity with current treaty obligations, and to permit the importation and exportation of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research purposes.

The bill provides a system of licenses and manufacturing quotas for all manufacturers, with appropriate safeguards, with respect to the manufacture of the basic classes of narcotic drugs, both natural and synthetic, for medical and scientific purposes. This will enable the United States Government to discharge its treaty obligations and to provide for and promote the general health and welfare of our citizens.

This bill is strongly supported by the Bureau of Narcotics and has been carefully considered over a period of time by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has as its meritorious purpose the amendment of our Federal laws relating to narcotic drugs so as to give full effect to the treaty obligations of the United States to limit the manufacture of such drugs to purposes that are exclusively for medical and scientific uses and also provide that such manufacture would be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for that purpose. In addition the legislation would restrict exports and imports of narcotics to purposes that are limited by and specified in applicable treaties. This legislation was unanimously approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and should receive the favorable consideration of the Congress so as to strengthen our narcotic laws and the enforcement thereof.

U. S. S. "ARIZONA" MEMORIAL AT PEARL HARBOR

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, since the passage by the House of H. R. 5809, authorizing the construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor, I have received many letters commending our action. This reflects an interest that is nationwide. I wish to commend the able and distinguished gentleman from Hawaii, the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS, on the masterful manner in which he has handled a legislative proposal that appeals so strongly to the sentiment of the American people.

On the morning of the day H. R. 5809 was on the calendar for a vote I received a letter from Delegate BURNS. It read, in part:

> The U. S. S. *Arizona* is the tomb of 1,102 of the Navy's finest. Enclosed herewith is a list of those from your area or district shown by Navy records to have been aboard and to have died on December 7, 1941, on the U. S. S. *Arizona*. The *Arizona* is their tomb. I know that we can count on your support that this memorial to your constitutents will be as fine as it can be made.

I judge from conversations with my colleagues that a similar letter was received by each and every Member of the House, each letter transmitting a list of the men from the recipient's district or area whose tomb is the U. S. S. *Arizona*. It must have required a tremendous lot of work to furnish more than 400 Members of this body the *Arizona's* honor roll broken down by Congressional districts.

The memory of all the men who died at Pearl Harbor that black day of December 7, 1941, is sacred to all Americans. There is no distinction on the lines of local geography, of race, religion or station. But in reminding us that among the heroes of the Nation whose memory we were perpetuating were some who had been our own constituents, the gentleman from Hawaii gave us the added personal sense that in supporting H. R. 5809 we were aiding in building a memorial tomb not only for our countrymen personally unknown to us but also for the members of our own community families.

I wish to join my colleagues in an expression of thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii. He has brought home to us a new realization of how closely knit together are all of us in our great United States of America. I feel that I am expressing the sentiment of all my colleagues in congratulating the people of Hawaii on the fine representation they have in the Congress of the United States.

MARTIN'S MOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while the important work of this session of Congress was all but completed, and while the membership strained to wind it up this weekend, we were stalled by the Republican leadership of the House which fails to recognize, apparently, that all legislation is the result of compromise.

Rumors were heard that the Republican leadership was coming up with a brand new plan for civil rights, a genuine inspiration, something the President could sign, something nobody, apparently, had thought of before. There was a great air of expectancy yesterday as the time for the revelation neared. At length the moment arrived. The heavens darkened, the mountain quivered, and finally a ray of light broke through the clouds, and there, in all its majesty, stood the plan—a mouse, the usual timid and confused creature.

We have a new concept in the law, a bargain-basement contempt of court.

Mr. MARTIN proposes a Saks Fifth Avenue and Macy's basement contempt and, believe it or not, he is serious about it. Take your choice, Mr. MARTIN says, be $300 worth of contemptuous without a jury—the Macy rate, or go all out at the Saks Fifth Avenue rate—over $300 and a trial by jury.

CENSORSHIP BY THE MAJOR NETWORKS OF THE SONGS OF STEPHEN C. FOSTER

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting resentment throughout America against the shocking censorship by the major networks of the songs of Stephen C. Foster. Our people will be further shocked and alarmed when they learn that many music books taught in the public schools have already been censored, one in the Washington, D. C., area having left out entirely one of Stephen Foster's best and most familiar songs—Old Black Joe. When the news of this unwarranted action of publishing houses and broadcasters gets through to the American people in every one of our States, they will be resentful.

Our people gave their sons to fight for freedom against the Fascists, Nazis, and Communists. They gave their sons to fight this very type of censorship and re-

writing of history. I never dreamed when in the Armed Forces that I would live to see the day when censorship of this type would be practiced in America. It strikes at the very fundamentals of our American philosophy—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

I am today joining some of my colleagues in introducing a bill which would prohibit unwarranted censorship by broadcasting, television, telephone, telegraph, and similar companies without the permission of the author. In case the author is deceased before his songs or publications can be censored, a hearing must be held before the Federal Communications Commission, and the names of those requesting such censorship be exposed to the sunlight of public opinion.

This bill will provide for punishment of such censorship and it shall be a misdemeanor for any person or company to practice such un-American censorship. The bill provides for fines and imprisonment.

I do hope the House will pass this bill and protect our basic American freedoms.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have requested of the distinguished chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to have his great committee investigate the reasons behind such censorship here in free America.

GRADUATES OF UNITED STATES SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would require graduates of United States service academies to serve at least 10 years on active duty.

This 10-year requirement would apply to cadets and midshipmen accepted for admission to the academies after the date of enactment of the bill.

Under present law, graduates of the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies are required to serve only 3 years on active duty. Coast Guard Academy graduates must serve only 4 years.

Only this week the Air Force announced extension of the obligated service of pilot trainee reservists from 3 to 5 years. Here we have the almost incredible situation of a young man who has graduated from a college or university at his own expense being required to give 5 years of obligated service to the Military Establishment while another young man, after obtaining his education at Government expense, can throw up his contract at the end of 3 years.

It seems to me that after the Government invests some $40,000 in the education of a young man in one of the service academies the individual should be required to serve a longer period on active duty than is now the case. After all, the purpose of the academies is to prepare young men for lifetime careers as professional military leaders.

While it is of course too late for action to be taken on the bill during the present session, I hope it will receive favorable consideration early next year.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GUBSER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to take a partisan approach to any matter, but day in and day out I have listened to the hatchetmen from the Democratic side use printer's ink and space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to ridicule the Republican Party. Today I feel constrained to get out my own hatchet and be a little partisan. Perhaps it will not be quite as shiny and sharp as Democratic hatchets but I hope it will cut just as deeply.

There is a great deal of talk about civil rights legislation. Today on this floor we have heard ridicule of the Republican attempt at honest compromise. The truth of the matter is that the Democratic Party is bitterly divided on the civil rights issue, yet it has always posed as the champion of civil rights. They are so divided that they want to get rid of it this year so that they will not face it next year in an election year.

There is no Federal election that will be held before next year. No Negro will be deprived of his right to vote between now and January. We have plenty of time to work this out in January and pass a real bill instead of a sham. We Republicans are not afraid of it being an issue in an election year. Our skirts are clean. So let us go home, and settle it in January.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have for today may be vacated and transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day set for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ROCHESTER IRON & METAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7115) for the relief of the Rochester Iron & Metal Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Rochester Iron & Metal Co., 335 St. Paul Street, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $117,913.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Rochester Iron & Metal Co. against the United States arising from the failure of the Government to deliver 1,940 net tons of steel as a part of a purchase of 3 lots of steel billets by the Rochester Iron & Metal Co. from the Philadelphia Ordnance District in accordance with an invitation to bid issued April 27, 1953.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

Page 2, at the end of line 3, strike out the period and add the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 429) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sarah Reiko Tochman, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Stella M. Tochman, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Margherita Alongi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Dominic and Josephine Alongi, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Mary Derzay and Anton Derzay, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Anton Derzay, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Quijano, Lilia Quijano, and Aurora Quijano, shall be held and considered to be the minor alien children of Teodolfo Quijano, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 5. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (a) (5) and (b) of such act shall not apply in the case of Mrs. Yio Gik Him (nee Guadalupe Reyes Chip).

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kenichi Sugahara, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of M. Sgt. and Mrs. Fred W. Baars, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Teresa Pecchia and Mauro Pecchia shall be held and considered to be the minor alien children of Mrs. Giuseppina

Pecchia, a lawful resident of the United States.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Myra Joyce Carroll and Sheila Jeanne Carroll, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Carroll, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 15, after the words "Nationality Act," insert the following: "section 201 (a) and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF ADM. ARTHUR W. RADFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8763) to authorize the appointment of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of admiral in the Navy.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, because of the many distinguished services that Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, has rendered to his country during more than 45 years of service, including World War II, later service as Commander in Chief Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet during the Korean hostilities, and most recent service as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for 2 terms during a most critical period, the President is authorized to appoint Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of admiral in the Navy, with the active duty pay and allowances provided by law for an officer in such grade serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Upon retirement Adm. Arthur W. Radford shall be entitled to have his name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list and shall be entitled to the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as authorized by law for an officer on the active list serving in the grade of admiral and holding the office of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SEC. 2. In the event Admiral Radford is transferred to the retired list before the approval of this Act, the President is authorized to appoint him to the permanent grade of admiral on the retired list with the pay and allowances provided in section 1 of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike "in such grade serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." and insert "in the grade of rear admiral (upper half)."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike "admiral and holding the office of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." and insert "rear admiral (upper half)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the appointment of Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, to the permanent grade of admiral in the Navy and to provide for increased retired pay."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN HICKORY LOCK AND DAM PROJECT TO MIDDLE TENNESSEE COUNCIL, INC., BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8576) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to section 2 and without monetary consideration, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following lands within the Old Hickory lock and dam project:

Two certain parcels of land situate on the waters of Spencer Creek and the Cumberland River, in the Fourth Civil District of Wilson County, Tennessee, containing in aggregate 525.80 acres, more or less, and more particularly described as follows:

PARCEL 1

Beginning at a corner common to lands now or formerly owned by Zac Burford and others and the lands of the United States, said corner being in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Henry Louis Bloodworth and Frank W. Bloodworth; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Burford as follows: south, 03 degrees 00 minutes west 635 feet, south 8 degrees 30 minutes west 680 feet, north 76 degrees 00 minutes west 690 feet, south 01 degrees 00 minutes east 390 feet, south 80 degrees 00 minutes east 1,300 feet, and south 04 degrees 00 minutes west, 1,690 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Will Walker and others; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Walker south 04 degrees 00 minutes west 985 feet to a point in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Hughlette Katherine Purnell; thence, with the division line between the United States and said Purnell north 87 degrees 00 minutes west 960 feet; thence, leaving Purnell's line, through the lands of the United States north 87 degrees 00 minutes west 120 feet to a point in the 451 foot contour line above mean sea level; thence continuing through the lands of the United States; following the 451 foot contour line as it meanders in a general westerly, northerly, and easterly direction along the northeasterly shore line of the Spencer Creek Embayment, upstream along the easterly shore line of Cumberland River, a distance of 20,200 feet, more or less, to a point in the north line of the lands of said Bloodworth; thence with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States south 58 degrees 00 minutes west 1,425 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 367.6 acres, more or less.

PARCEL 2

Beginning at a corner common to lands now or formerly owned by C. E. and Louise Tubbs Northern and the lands of the United States, said corner being in a line of lands now or formerly owned by Hughlette Katherine Purnell; thence, with the division line between said Purnell and the United States north 03 degrees 00 minutes east 1,240 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Will Walker and others; thence, with the division line between said Walker and the United States as follows: North 03 degrees 00 minutes east 500 feet, south 79 degrees 30 minutes east 1,085 feet, north 190 feet and north 78 degrees 00 minutes west 170 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Zac Burford and others; thence, with the division line between said Burford and the United States as follows: North 26 degrees 00 minutes west 670 feet and south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 110 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by D. E. and Janie Greer Bloodworth, said corner being in the center of a road; thence, with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States along the center of said road south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 640 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by F. W. Bloodworth and wife; thence, with the division line between said F. W. Bloodworth and wife and the United States and continuing along the center of said road south 88 degrees 00 minutes east at 585 feet passing a corner of said Bloodworth, continuing in all 640 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Henry and Susie Tyree; thence, leaving said road along the division line between said Tyree and the subject owner as follows: South 05 degrees 00 minutes west 280 feet, north 64 degrees 00 minutes east 125 feet, south 04 degrees 00 minutes east 160 feet, south 57 degrees 00 minutes west 210 feet, south 18 degrees 00 minutes west 410 feet, north 89 degrees 00 minutes east 340 feet, and south 42 degrees 30 minutes east 335 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Lula Mae Davis; thence, with the division line between said Davis and the United States as follows: North 70 degrees 00 minutes east 315 feet and south 01 degree 00 minutes east 155 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Talmadge and Novella Collier; thence, with the division line between said Collier and the United States as follows: South 01 degree 00 minutes east 50 feet, south 73 degrees 00 minutes west 350 feet, north 85 degrees 00 minutes west 215 feet, south 12 degrees 00 minutes west 310 feet, south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, north 50 degrees 00 minutes east 260 feet, south 41 degrees 30 minutes east 235 feet, south 88 degrees 00 minutes east 90 feet, and south 05 degrees 00 minutes east 90 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by Dwight Manners; thence, with the division line between said Manners and the United States south 45 degrees 00 minutes west 350 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by D. E. and Janie Greer Bloodworth; thence, with the division line between said Bloodworth and the United States as follows: South 10 degrees 30 minutes west 150 feet, north 72 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, south 50 degrees 00 minutes east 250 feet, and south 15 degrees 30 minutes west 285 feet to a point in a line of lands now or formerly owned by O. A. Purnell; thence, with the division line between said Purnell and the United States as follows: North 84 degrees 00 minutes west 100 feet, south 1,280 feet, north 86 degrees 00 minutes east 345 feet, and south 05 degrees 00 minutes east 215 feet to a corner of lands now or formerly owned by H. B. Manners, in the center of a road; thence, leaving said road with the division line between said Manners and the United States as follows: South 86 degrees 25 minutes west 450.4 feet, south 36 degrees 06 minutes west 318 feet, north 73 degrees 21 minutes west 151.4 feet, south 35 degrees 57 minutes west 249.7 feet, north 09 degrees 07 minutes west 504 feet, and north 84 degrees 48 minutes west 80 feet to a corner of said Northern in the center of a road; thence, leaving said road with the division line between said Northern and the United States as follows: North 05 degrees 00 minutes east 350 feet, south 51 degrees 00 minutes west 290 feet, north 38 degrees 30 minutes west 265 feet,

north 03 degrees 00 minutes east 215 feet, south 35 degrees 30 minutes east 240 feet, north 45 degrees 30 minutes east 225 feet, north 08 degrees 30 minutes west 540 feet, south 25 degrees 00 minutes west 460 feet, north 30 degrees 00 minutes west 630 feet, north 72 degrees 00 minutes west 645 feet, north 08 degrees 00 minutes east 81.6 feet, and west 933 feet, to the point of beginning, containing 158.2 acres, more or less.

The above-described parcels of land are a part of the same lands, the fee title to which was vested in the United States by reason of the following deeds of record in the Office of the Register of Wilson County, Tennessee, and/or by the filing of Declaration of Takings in Civil Actions pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division, namely:

Tract No.	Vendor	Date of deed and/or declarations of takings	Deed book	Page	Declarations of takings No.	Civil action No.
	PARCEL 1					
G-703	E. L. Gaston, trustee, and others	Oct. 28, 1953	------	------	1	1723
G-707	Mildred Armstrong and others	------do------	------	------	1	1723
G-708	Jim Bailey and wife	June 17, 1953	137	580	--------	--------
G-709	William O. Barry	Jan. 15, 1954	138	680	--------	--------
G-723-1 (part)	Katherine H. Purnell	June 1, 1953	137	482	--------	--------
Lock and dam No. 4 (part):						
(a)	James Harvey Davis and others	Jan. 3, 1894	52	163	--------	(1)
(b)	Samuel Howerth and others	------do------	52	159	--------	(2)
	PARCEL 2					
G-713	Zac Burford and others	Mar. 24, 1954	------	------	1	1837
G-716	Hargrove Jenkins and wife	Sept. 4, 1953	138	197	--------	--------
G-717	Willie Thompson and others	Oct. 28, 1953	------	------	1	1723
G-718	Henry Tyree and wife	June 30, 1953	137	640	--------	--------
G-719	Lula Mae Davis and others	May 12, 1954	------	------	1	1862
G-720-1-2	Talmadge Collier and wife	May 21, 1953	137	428	--------	--------
G-721	Dwight Manners and wife	July 11, 1953	137	680	--------	--------
G-722	D. E. Bloodworth and wife	July 7, 1953	137	696	--------	--------
G-725	C. E. Northern and wife	May 20, 1953	137	419	--------	--------
G-726	O. A. Purnell and wife	July 24, 1953	138	36	--------	--------
G-731-2	Dwight Manners and others	July 6, 1954	------	------	2	1723

[1] Judgment No. 851.
[2] Judgment No. 850.

SEC. 2. Title to property authorized to be conveyed by this Act shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America—

(1) has not commenced the development of such property for recreation and camping purposes within the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to grant to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, such rights-of-way for public access and utility lines across any property of the United States as may be necessary to facilitate the development and use of the property conveyed under authority of this Act for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property herein authorized shall be subject to the right to flood due to the fluctuation of the water level of the Old Hickory lock and dam project and to such other conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Secretary of the Army may determine to be necessary for the management and operation of said Old Hickory lock and dam project.

SEC. 5. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the conditions of this Act, the area or areas he determines to be available for conveyance within the 609.2 acres of land leased to the said Boy Scouts Council at the Old Hickory lock and dam, Cumberland River, Tenn., under lease granted July 12, 1955, No. DA-40-058-CIVENG-56-8."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8576, to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Old Hickory Reservoir area on the Cumberland River in Tennessee to the Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, is a worthy measure which will serve a valued and useful purpose in aiding in the building of citizenship for our country.

This bill by our esteemed colleague, Congressman LOSER, is similar to a bill which I was pleased to introduce for this purpose. Also our other colleague from middle Tennessee, Congressman BASS, has likewise introduced a companion bill to the one which the House has considered and has just passed.

The Corps of Engineers has recommended the conveyance of this land to the Middle Tennessee Boy Scout Council in order that a camp may be developed and used by the Boy Scouts of middle Tennessee. The land is situated in Wilson County, in the district which I have the honor to represent. The full development of this Boy Scout camp will mean much to the youth of this area by providing a permanent encampment for recreation, sports, and training in leadership. The passage of this act will mean a great contribution to the building of character and good citizenship.

The Boy Scout Council has already expended more than $25,000 in developments in this area and it is anticipated that the organization will expend another $750,000 for permanent shelters, utilities, road development, and equipment to make the camp suitable for Boy Scouts and one of the most outstanding such developments.

There have been many leaders in this movement to bring about this accomplishment. Among the foremost of our outstanding civic-minded citizens spearheading this drive has been Mr. E. B. Stahlman, publisher of the Nashville Banner. The Governor of Tennessee, Hon. Frank G. Clement, has also expressed his interest in this legislation, as well as have many other officials and public spirited citizens. These include county judges, mayors of municipalities in middle Tennessee, chamber of commerce officials, business and industrial leaders, Boy Scout officials, and others.

I cite these facts to point out for the record that there is certainly a great public interest in this legislation. I am pleased that the Corps of Engineers has recommended this action and that the House Public Works Committee has favorably reported the bills introduced for this purpose.

I want to commend my colleagues, Congressmen LOSER and BASS, and also our colleagues, Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee and Congressman JONES of Alabama, members of the Public Works Committee, as well as Chairman BUCKLEY of the House Public Works Committee, for their diligence and assistance in securing favorable action on this legislation.

This project, when fully developed, will contribute immeasurably to the training of our youth, building character, good citizens, and leaders for our country. The passage of this legislation is in the public interest and will mean a significant contribution in this direction.

IRENE MONTOYA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 493) for the relief of Irene Montoya.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Irene Montoya, Belen, N. Mex., in addition to the sum paid to such legal guardian under the provisions of Private Law 699, 79th Congress, the further sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for expenses incident to the provision of artificial limbs and other expenses arising as a result of the loss of a leg in the explosion of a bomb which had been dropped and left unprotected in a field by the United States Army near Belen, N. Mex., on August 12, 1945: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$3,500", and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$7,500."

Page 2, lines 4 and 5, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ROBERT F. GROSS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 524) for the relief of Robert F. Gross.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert F. Gross of Harrisburg, Pa., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $1,047.42, representing the amount of the overpayment received by him at the time of his final separation from employment with the Department of Labor as compensation for unused annual leave.

SEC. 2. All disbursing officers, or other responsible officers, who made or authorized the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act, are relieved of all liability for such overpayment and their accounts shall be credited with the amount of such overpayment.

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

KARL L. LARSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of Karl L. Larson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Karl L. Larson, Mount Shasta, Calif., the sum of $503.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such person against the United States for compensation for personal property destroyed by fire on July 20, 1955, while employed by the Forest Service on the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ALFRED HANZAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Alfred Hanzal.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred Hanzal, San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $322.67. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alfred Hanzal against the United States for refund of taxes which he erroneously paid under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to his remuneration (as owner of the Milam Building Barber Shop, San Antonio) during the period beginning January 1, 1947, and ending March 31, 1947, and which cannot now be refunded to him by the Internal Revenue Service because of the expiration of the applicable period of limitation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6: Strike the words 'in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LT. PERCY HAMILTON HEBERT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1638) for the relief of Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That 1st Lt. Percy Hamilton Hebert, Air Force of the United States, retired, serial No. AO-888402, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $2,238. Such sum represents certain amounts erroneously paid to the said Percy Hamilton Hebert during the period between November 19, 1944, and June 30, 1950, inclusive, as a result of errors made in the computation of his retired pay.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Percy Hamilton Hebert an amount equal to the aggregate of amounts paid by him, or which have been withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of such claim of the United States.

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

MRS. MARGOT M. DRAUGHON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1692) for the relief of Mrs. Margot M. Draughon.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Margot M. Draughon is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $2,625. Such sum represents the amount of class E allotment payments which were erroneously made to Mrs. Margot M. Draughon, the wife of Charles R. Draughon, Army serial No. 6971596, during the period October 1, 1942, through August 31, 1945, after the said Charles R. Draughon had discontinued such allotment. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Margot M. Draughon any amount refunded by her to the United States on account of these erroneous payments of class E allotment. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to relieve Charles R. Draughon, Army serial No. 6971596, of any liability to refund to the United States any amounts which have been determined to be erroneous payments as the result of his authorizing a class E allotment to Mrs. Margot M. Draughon during the period August 1, 1942, through August 31, 1945.

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

ESTATE OF MRS. FRANK C. GREGG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1829) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Frank C. Gregg.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1951 of Mrs. Frank C. Gregg, the election of the said Mrs. Frank C. Gregg, a stockholder in the Scott & Gregg Real Estate Co., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on June 21, 1951, to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, such benefits having been denied Mrs. Frank C. Gregg because the filing of such election was delayed, due to the unavailability of the prescribed forms for filing such election and the serious illness of the said Mrs. Frank C. Gregg, until after the 30 days allowed for filing such election had expired.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "considered to have been filed within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan" and insert "held and considered fully effective."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN R. COOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3567) for the relief of John R. Cook.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John R. Cook, Alameda, Calif., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of John R. Cook against the United States on account of expenses incurred by him in successfully defending himself against a criminal prosecution brought by the United States, based on acts alleged to have been committed by him in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department. Such prosecution was dismissed on February 21, 1956, and the

Post Office Department has since determined that he should not have been removed from his position with the Department and has reinstated him with back pay for the period of his suspension: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out: "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ARTHUR J. DETTMERS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4543) for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries and all expenses incident thereto sustained as the result of an accident involving the crash of a United States Air Force airplane at Middletown Air Depot, Harrisburg, Pa., on August 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,776.03."

Page 1, line 10, strike out lines 10 and 11 and insert the following: "crash of a United States Army airplane at Olmsted Field, Middletown, Pa., on August 14, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FOREST H. BYROADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5163) for the relief of Forest H. Byroade.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,688.34 to Forest H. Byroade, of 13 Kinship Road, Dundalk, Baltimore County, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and other expenses incurred as the result of an accident on January 30, 1952, involving a United States Navy vehicle on U. S. Highway No. 1, Guilford, Howard County, Md., 250 feet north of the intersection of U. S. Highway No. 1 and Maryland State Route No. 32. Such claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

COL. JACK C. JEFFREY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6069) for the relief of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Col. Jack C. Jeffrey, of APO 343, care postmaster, San Francisco, Calif., in the sum of $435.64. Such credit is for excess shipping weight allowances for household goods shipped from Fort Monroe, Va., to San Antonio, Tex., and to other locations in the United States during November and December 1947.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Jack C. Jeffrey, of APO 343, care postmaster, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $435.63, as a refund of excess costs collected from Col. Jack C. Jeffrey on shipments of household effects to Madison, Wis., from overseas and from certain locations in the United States, during April, May, and August, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FAMILY OF JOSEPH A. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6824) for the relief of the family of Joseph A. Morgan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to determine the persons who would have been entitled upon the death of Joseph A. Morgan (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-1336540) to the United States series E and G bonds, the proceeds of which were donated to the United States by the said Joseph A. Morgan in 1951 while he was of unsound mind, if such bonds had not been redeemed by the said Joseph A. Morgan, and to pay to such persons, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts which they would have been entitled to receive if such bonds had been redeemed as of the day after the date of death of the said Joseph A. Morgan: *Provided*, That no part of any sum paid under this Act to any person in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to determine the persons who would have been entitled upon the death of Joseph A. Morgan (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-1336540) to the United States series E and G bonds, the proceeds of which were donated to the United States by the said Joseph A. Morgan in 1951, if such bonds had not been redeemed by the said Joseph A. Morgan, and to pay to such persons, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts which were deposited in the Treasury as the redemption value of the bonds to which they are found to be entitled: *Provided*, That no part of any sum paid under this act to any person shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE ESTATE OF ISA HAJIME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7200) for the relief of the estate of Isa Hajime.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Isa Hajime, deceased, formerly of Yontan, Okinawa, the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of Isa Hajime, sustained on September 4, 1949, as a result of a criminal assault by an enlisted man of the United States Air Force at Yontan, Okinawa: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating

any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

FOR THE RELIEF OF ANTON N. NYERGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7591) for the relief of Anton N. Nyerges.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anton N. Nyerges, the sum of $3,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of any and all claims against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as Foreign Service officer at the American Legation, Budapest, Hungary, on November 4, 1956, as a result of a revolution: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HENRY M. LEDNICKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8618) for the relief of Henry M. Lednicky.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry M. Lednicky, West, Tex., the sum of $317.25, which represents payment for janitor service performed by Mr. Lednicky while he was in charge of the local post office at the request of the Post Office Department.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after "Department" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GLADYS ARBUTUS JOEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of Gladys Arbutus Joel.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

VIRGINIA RAY POTTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8374) for the relief of Virginia Ray Potts.

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

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

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

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 437) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Concepcion Delgado Mendez, and Pedro Diaz (Ramirez) may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Filippo Vitale, Joseph Juda Teuchberg, Eleonore Maria Elizabeth Rambo, Rosario Pollina, Mirca Bruna Gesiotto Gordon, and Francesco DeMarco, may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Manuel Sanchez Miranda may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ciro (Jerry) Barile may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Fratoni Zimmerman may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Domenica D'Angelo Padovani may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Domingo Quintanar may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 8. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the name "Mendez," strike out the word "and."

On page 1, line 6, after the name "(Ramirez)" insert the following: "and Adolphe C. Verheyn."

On page 3, after line 8, insert new sections 7 and 8 to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Vova Rubin may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) and (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bruno Lagomarsino may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

On page 3, line 9, strike out "SEC. 7." and substitute "SEC. 9."

On page 3, after line 16, insert new sections 10 and 11 to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaret Weydmann, the fiance of Sgt. William R. Casey, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Billi, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Margaret Weydmann is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. William R. Casey and that they are found otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, except that section 212 (a) (9) of that act shall not be applicable in the case of the said Margaret Weydmann. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Margaret Weydmann and her minor child, Billi, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with

the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Margaret Weydmann and her minor son, Billi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Margaret Weydmann and her minor son, Billi, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

"SEC. 11. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Colin Noyes Clinch-Jones may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

On page 3, line 17, renumber "SEC. 8." to read "SEC. 12."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ANGELA FERRINI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 336) for the relief of Angela Ferrini.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angela Ferrini shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101 (a) (27) (A) of the said act.

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

WILLEM WOERAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 397) for the relief of Willem Woeras.

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

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

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

BENJAMIN WACHTFOGEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 398) for the relief of Benjamin Wachtfogel.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Benjamin Wachtfogel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

JOSE RAMIREZ-MORENO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 441) for the relief of Jose Ramirez-Moreno.

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

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

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

PEDRO AMPO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 463) for the relief of Pedro Ampo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Pedro Ampo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Diosdado D. Aba, a citizen of the United States.

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

MARIA CONCETTA DI TURI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 465) for the relief of Maria Concetta Di Turi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Concetta Di Turi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Leonardo Di Turi, a citizen of the United States.

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

LUIGI LINO TUREL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 485) for the relief of Luigi Lino Turel.

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

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

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

DANIELA RENATA PATRICIA ZEI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 499) for the relief of Daniela Renata Patricia Zei.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Daniela Renata Patricia Zei, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Patrick N. Dinon, citizens of the United States.

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

HIDEKO TAKIGUCHI PULASKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 562) for the relief of Hideko Takiguchi Pulaski.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Hideko Takiguchi Pulaski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sfc. John Pulaski, a citizen of the United States.

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

VIDA DJENICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 567) for the relief of Vida Djenich.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vida Djenich shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Cvetko Djenich, a citizen of the United States.

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

URSULA ROSA PAZDRO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 660) for the relief of Ursula Rosa Pazdro.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Rosa Pazdro may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided,* That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

HOWARD I. BUCHBINDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 662) for the relief of Howard I. Buchbinder.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Howard I. Buchbinder shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

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

ZACHAROULA PAPOULIA MATSA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 796) for the relief of Zacharoula Papoulia Matsa.

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

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

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

CHARLES A. SIDAWI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 976) for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi.

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

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

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

ALICE EIRL SCHAER (MI ON LEE)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1035) for the relief of Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Paul Schaer, citizens of the United States, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the said act, the said Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee) may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That if the said Alice Eirl Schaer (Mi On Lee) is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That the exemption provided herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

MRS. AHSAPET GAMITYAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1049) for the relief of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Ahsapet Gamityan shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HRYGORY (HARRY) MYDLAK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1050) for the relief of Hrygory (Harry) Mydlak.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hrygory (Harry) Mydlak shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

ZDENKA SNELER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1153) for the relief of Zdenka Sneler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zdenka Sneler shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Grisnik, citizens of the United States.

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

JOHN NICHOLAS CHRISTODOULIAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1167) for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias.

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

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

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

HELENE CORDERY HALL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1175) for the relief of Helene Cordery Hall.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helene Cordery Hall shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to this alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

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

EDWARD MARTIN HINSBERGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1241) for the relief of Edward Martin Hinsberger.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Edward Martin Hinsberger, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this

act, the said Edward Martin Hinsberger shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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

DANIEL ALCIDE CHARLEBOIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1271) for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Daniel Alcide Charlebois. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Daniel Alcide Charlebois shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LEE-ANA ROBERTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1290) for the relief of Lee-Ana Roberts.

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

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

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

EITHANIAHU (ETON) YELLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1293) for the relief of Eithaniahu (Eton) Yellin.

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

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

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

PAO-WEI YUNG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1306) for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung.

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

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

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

TORIBIA BASTERRECHEA (ARROLA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1307) for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola).

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

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

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

CARMEN JEANNE LAUNOIS JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1308) for the relief of Carmen Jeanne Launois Johnson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carmen Jeanne Launois Johnson may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

SANDRA ANN SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1335) for the relief of Sandra Ann Scott.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sandra Ann Scott, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of David W. Scott, a citizen of the United States.

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

WANDA WAWRZYCZEK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1370) for the relief of Wanda Wawrzyczek.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wanda Wawrzyczek shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

REBECCA JEAN LUNDY (HELEN CHOY)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1387) for the relief of Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy) may, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, deems necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy) in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such act: *Provided further*, That this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusions under paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of such act known to the Secretary of State or to the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eli Lundy, citizens of the United States.

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

WOLFGANG JOCHIM HERMAN SCHMIEDCHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1414) for the relief of Wolfgang Jochim Herman Schmiedchen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANSIS LUIZ DARZINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1421) for the relief of Ansis Luiz Darzins.

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

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

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

NICOLETA P. PANTELAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Nicoleta P. Pantelakis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nicoleta P. Pantelakis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. S. L. Lamprose, citizens of the United States.

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

SIC GUN CHAU (TSE) AND HING MAN CHAU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1685) for the relief of Sic Gun Chau (Tse) and Hing Man Chau.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sic Gun Chau (Tse) and Hing Man Chau may, if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, be issued visas and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, deems necessary to impose. A suitable or proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, shall be given by or on behalf of the said Sic Gun Chau (Tse) and Hing Man Chau in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as bonds or undertakings given under section 213 of such act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of such act known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

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

ROSA SIGL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1736) for the relief of Rosa Sigl.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Sigl may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That the marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Sgt. Dewey Kocherhans, shall occur not later than six months following the date of the enactment of this act.

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

EILEEN SHEILA DHANDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1767) for the relief of Eileen Sheila Dhanda.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eileen Sheila Dhanda shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That, if applicable, the conditions required by section 247 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act are complied with. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

RANDOLPH STEPHAN WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1783) for the relief of Randolph Stephan Walker.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Randolph Stephan Walker, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert and Charlotte Ann Walker, citizens of the United States.

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

MARJETA WINKLE BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1804) for the relief of Marjeta Winkle Brown.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marjeta Winkle Brown, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Harold Darrel Brown, a citizen of the United States.

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

NICHOLAS DILLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1815) for the relief of Nicholas Dilles.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholas Dilles shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Dilles, citizens of the United States.

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

JOHN PANAGIOTOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1817) for the relief of John Panagiotou.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander John Panagiotou shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Nick J. Dennery, a citizen of the United States.

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

CHARLES DOUGLAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Charles Douglas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Charles Douglas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Comdr. Lloyd Benson, a citizen of the United States.

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

MICHELLE PATRICIA HILL (PATRICIA ADACHI)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michelle Patricia Hill (Patricia Adachi), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant Carl Leroy Hill and Loretta Hill, citizens of the United States.

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

MARIA WEST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1896) for the relief of Maria West.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria West, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Victor L. West, Jr., and Callie S. West, citizens of the United States.

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

BELIA RODRIGUEZ TERNOIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1902) for the relief of Belia Rodriguez Ternoir.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Belia Rodriguez Ternoir, wife of an American citizen, may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That the exemption provided for in this act shall apply only to the grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

SALVATORE SALERNO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1910) for the relief of Salvatore Salerno.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvatore Salerno may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act: *And provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

LETIZIA MARIA ARINI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1972) for the relief of Letizia Maria Arini.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Letizia Maria Arini may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

One page 1, line 3, strike out the word "paragraph" and substitute in lieu thereof "paragraphs (9) and."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "paragraph" and substitute in lieu thereof "paragraphs."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JOZICE MATANA KOULIS AND DAVORKO MATANA KOULIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2003) for the relief of Jozice Matana Koulis and Davorko Matana Koulis.

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

Be it enacted, That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Jozice Matana Koulis and Davorko Matana Koulis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Pauline Roduj Koulis, a citizen of the United States.

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

VACLAV UHLIK ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2095) for the relief of Vaclav Uhlik, Marta Uhlik, Vaclav Uhlik, Jr., and Eva Uhlik.

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

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

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

GERTRUD MEZGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2165) for the relief of Gertrud Mezger.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Mezger, the fiancée of Albert Lee Klingelhofer, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of the Armed Forces, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gertrud Mezger is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Albert Lee Klingelhofer and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Mezger, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Mezger, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gertrud Mezger as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

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

CERTAIN CASES IN WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS SUSPENDED DEPORTATION

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 40.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-1750750, Ali, Mohamid.
A-6678456, Alvear, Leonica Garcia De.
A-9764546, Balzer, Herbert Paul.
A-5554927, Bliznakoff, Vasil.
A-3124105, Cassimis, John.
A-5886946, Cho, Tse.
A-8057140, Chu, Lek.
A-10255258, Chu, Li Yih Ai.
A-5993801, Li, Sue Ling.
A-10255250, Li, Sue Loo.
A-10255047, Li, Ruth Wu.
A-5531810, Dartmanin, John.
A-6921218, Epstein, Zofia.
A-6958010, Escobar-Gonzales, Victor Manuel.
A-9527785, Fong, Wong.
A-3049549, Gama-Reyes, Manuel.
A-4590908, Glick, Adolf.
A-1432407, Hahn, Soon Kyo.
0900-57150, Hahn, Tai Chin.
A-4359142, Herrara-Jiminez, Samuel.
A-9726671, Hidick, Massoad Abdul.
A-7356652, Hroncich, Leonardo.
A-2678095, Hsu, Rose Fung.
A-3667758, Kepraios, Stavros Stelianos.
A-1551550, Khan, Ali.
A-10255537, Kwan, Kwang Pei.
A-3209149, Lee, Poo.
A-8259493, Liadis, Panagiotis Dimitriou.
A-8189299, Liu, Tsong Won.
A-5449221, Lottrup, Jorgen S.
A-9770877, Mahmoud, Mohamed.
A-4043565, Maillet, Andre Pierre.
A-5148487, Mann, Mina.
A-1121179, Messina, Stellario G.
A-9709248, Nam, Tsu Hau.
A-4421186, Napoli, Michael.
A-9511407, On, Lee.
A-6242520, Ortiz-Zamorano, Rosendo.
A-4067578, Papagiarnis, John.
A-10139255, Rodriguez, Camelia Dreyfous.
A-10255544, Rodriguez, Manuel Joaquim.
A-4543718, Aurin, Dietrich.
A-7544210, Chu, Chen-Fu.
A-5970130, Contreras, Pablo.
A-7301220, Epstein, Zalman.
A-7866953, Herrera-Melquiades, Adalberto.

A-4962216, Gonzales, Eluteria.
A-9647371, Jung, Kai.
A-9654171, Lefas, Zacharias.
A-1961443, Roknich, Daniel.
A-9777001, Ryan, Michael.
A-6062026, Salazar-Gallegos, Roberto.
A-3429897, Sanchez-Poveda, Candido.
A-1177218, Secondo, Michele.
A-5877615, Sztulman, Berek.
A-9777191, Trillo, Manuel.
A-6933837, Tsai, Juin-Ping.
A-10139010, Tsai, Shuenn, Jeou.
A-8890267, Vasquez, Carlos.
A-10060080, Way, Tow.
A-10236971, Wing, Chin.
A-6708345, Wood, Jim Varley.
A-7388556, Yong, Sun Chin.
A-6817533, Greenhalgh, Richard James.
A-1239918, Kouyios Nikitas.
A-6733979, Gerber, Golda.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, strike out all of line 8.

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

JANE FROMAN AND GYPSY MARKOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1633) for the relief of Jane Froman and Gypsy Markoff.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jane Froman the sum of $398,000 and to Gypsy Markoff the sum of $118,000.

The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Jane Froman and the said Gypsy Markoff against the United States for compensation for injuries incurred by them on or about the 22d day of February 1943 in the performance of a military assignment for the United States while said persons were passengers in the Pan American Airways seaplane *Yankee Clipper* which crashed in the Tagus River in the Port of Lisbon, Portugal: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by, any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claims referred to herein, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$398,000" and insert "$138,205."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$118,000" and insert "$33,236."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "in the performance of a military assignment for the United States" and insert "while en route to entertain members of the United States Armed Forces."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 435 for the relief of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lisa El Aneed, Alfred El Aneed, and Maria Gounaris Stephenson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act in the case of Alfred El Aneed.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Joseph (Josip) Torbar, Ludmilla Jungbauer, and Albert Charles Jolly. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said persons shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenia Dlugopolska and May Ping Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Alfred El Aneed," strike out the word "and", as it appears before the words "and Maria."

On page 2, line 9, after the word "issued", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That, unless Ludmilla Jungbauer is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, to be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provisions of this section of this act shall be applicable in her case upon compliance with such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

On page 2, line 11, after the word "act," insert the following name: "Nicola Parente."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SGT. AND MRS. DONALD D. COLEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1007) for the relief of Sgt. Donald D. Coleman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Donald D. Coleman (SN-NG 25259543) and Martha S. Coleman, his wife, the sum of $15,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of their 6-month-old daughter, DeLayne Duke Coleman, who died in Munich, Germany, on March 31, 1955, after failure by military medical personnel, because of inadequate medical treatment facilities and/or error in judgment, to admit the said child to a hospital, to provide her with ambulance service, or to otherwise provide her with proper medical services or attention, although the said child's mother made every effort to secure medical attention for her, the father of the said child, the said Sgt. Donald D. Coleman, being away on field maneuvers at the time of the said child's death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of $500 shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$8,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ACME BAG & BURLAP CO. AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1805) for the relief of persons and firms for the direct expenses incurred by them for fumigation of premises in the control and eradication of the khapra beetle.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GUY H. DAVANT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2063) for the relief of Guy H. Davant.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $156.55, to Guy H. Davant, of 1014 East Fortification Street, Jackson, Miss., in full settlement of all claims of said Guy H. Davant against the United States, such sum being the amount of his return transportation ticket from the Panama Canal Zone for which he paid prior to the cancellation of his employment there by the Bureau of Public Roads: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HAROLD WILLIAM ABBOTT AND OTHERS

The Clerk called House Resolution 323.

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

Resolved, That the bill, H. R. 8758, entitled "A bill for the relief of Harold William Abbott and others," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably owing by the United States to the claimants, the statute of limitations to the contrary notwithstanding.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAWICK CORP.

The Clerk called House Resolution 385.

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

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 8500) entitled, "A bill for the relief of the Fawick Corp.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, giving findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably owing by the United States to the claimant.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BOYD DINEHART AND RICHARD REAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1803) for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart for the death of her minor son, James Reams, and of Richard Reams for injuries sustained by him, on April 1, 1943, when the said James Reams was killed and Richard Reams injured by the explosion of a shell at Fort Ord, Calif.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1346 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code. Nothing in this act shall be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States.

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

JOHN C. MATLON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of John C. Matlon.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Matlon, of Forest Lake, Minn., the sum of $731.99. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John C. Matlon against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in the travel of his wife and two sons and the transportation of his household and personal effects from Augusta, Ga., to St. Paul, Minn., in September 1955. Payment of this claim has been denied by the Department of the Army on the ground that such expenses were incurred for personal reasons although the said John C. Matlon would have been entitled to such travel and transportation allowances at the time of his separation from active duty on January 31, 1956: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike the words "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EDWARD J. BOLGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7177) for the relief of Edward J. Bolger.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward J. Bolger, Neptune, N. J., the sum of $250. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment for which the said Edward J. Bolger was held liable in the courts of the State of New Jersey, as the result of an accident which occurred on July 26, 1954, and which involved a Government vehicle being driven by the said Edward J. Bolger in the course of his duties as an employee of the United States Post Office Department, Asbury Park, N. J. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Edward J. Bolger shall use such sum to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

WILLIAM F. KEMPE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2705) for the relief of William F. Kempe.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of William F. Kempe, La Porte, Ind., and his claim for compensation for disability sustained by him as a result of disease alleged to have been contracted prior to May 14, 1951, while he was employed at the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, La Porte, Ind., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in the case of medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

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

RALPH H. WEEKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2901) for the relief of Ralph H. Weeks.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph H. Weeks, the sum of $1,998.70. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such person against the United States for payment for damages to his personal effects, alleged to have been sustained while being shipped on the steamship *Alaska* at Government expense, as an employee of the Department of the Interior, on February 2, 1947, on which date said ship was wrecked: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

CONTINENTAL HOSIERY MILLS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4229) for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N. C., successor

to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N. C.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $18,319.20 with interest thereon from the 19th day of April 1947 to Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N. C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, representing a refund of income tax erroneously collected from said corporation on April 19, 1947, by the Bureau of Internal Revenue: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

A. W. YOUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4469) for the relief of A. W. Young.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $541.92 to A. W. Young, of Butler, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents the amount paid by the said A. W. Young to the Post Office Department for registered jacket No. 137, March 7, 1919, as the result of losses from a railroad accident of certain money orders, bonds, and cash, for which he was held accountable: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ABRAHAM A. RUBIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of Abraham A. Rubin.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Abraham A. Rubin of Forest Hills, N. Y., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Abraham A. Rubin against the United States for refund of the amount which he posted as a student bond in the case of Israel Rubin, an alien admitted to the United States on November 6, 1957, as a student under section 4 (e) of the Immigration Act of 1924: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any amount not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11: Strike "1957" and insert "1947" in lieu thereof.

Page 2, line 2: Strike the words "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. MATTIE JANE LAWSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5851) for the relief of Mrs. Mattie Jane Lawson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, to Mrs. Mattie Jane Lawson, of Jasper, Ala., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States post-office vehicle on March 20, 1943, at the intersection of Fourth Avenue and Third Street, Jasper, Ala.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, strike the period and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "to" insert "the legal guardian of."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mrs. Mattie Jane Lawson."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY J. MADENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7508) for the relief of Harry J. Madenberg.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Harry J. Madenberg of Chicago, Ill., a city letter carrier, is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States any unpaid portion of the $686.91, for which he has been held liable on account of the theft from his custody on December 22, 1955, of nine registered letters.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry J. Madenberg an amount equal to all amounts which he has paid to the United States on account of the theft of registered letters referred to in the first section of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 13, strike the period and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARGIE C. STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8033), for the relief of Margie C. Stewart.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margie C. Stewart, of Cedarville, Ohio, the sum of $5,616, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for salary for the period of May 4, 1955, to May 28, 1957, during which time she was erroneously separated from her position with the General Services Administration in the Knott Building at Dayton, Ohio.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures and insert in lieu thereof "$3,417."

Page 1, line 7, strike the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "for payment of compensation during the period of erroneous removal from General Services Administration dating from June 8, 1955, to April 15, 1957, such compensation to be paid at the rate received on the date of removal less any amounts earned by her through other employment during such period or paid to her as unemployment compensation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

WILLIAM V. DOBBINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9015) for the relief of William V. Dobbins.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William V. Dobbins, Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $217.30. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said William V. Dobbins was held liable on September 30, 1953, in a civil action in the Hudson County District Court, part V, of Kearney, N. J., as the result of an accident which occurred on December 18, 1951, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said William V. Dobbins, a letter carrier in the United States Post Office, Jersey City, N. J. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said William V. Dobbins shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 436) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

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

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Florentina Laurente shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Anselmo Laurente, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joon Wong Choi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Chaplain (Captain) Albert L. Gamble, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provision of section 202 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carolyn Foster shall be held to be chargeable to the quota of Great Britain.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elio Rotondo shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Giovanni and Elisa Rotondo, lawfully resident aliens in the United States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Toy Shee Moy (Choy Sen Yuet) shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lee Tai Chon, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Donald Nichols, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Javier Rojo Barcena, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William Bruce Sutherland, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "Britain", strike out the period and add the following: "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

At the end of the joint resolution add new sections 8, 9, and 10 to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosario Nunez Basante, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Francisco Basante dos Santos, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Slobodan Galeb, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. B. T. Galeb, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 10. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lilian Magdalena Morris, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert W. Morris, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

G. H. LITTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4351) for the relief of G. H. Litts.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $19,000 to G. H. Litts, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., in full settlement of all claims again the United States for losses sustained under contract No. DA-36-109-CIV-ENG-56-100, with the Corps of Engineers, for removal of debris in East Stroudsburg, Pa., following the Eastern States flood of August 18, 19, 1955: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$19,000" and insert "$13,766.21."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

REMOVAL OF CLOUD ON TITLE TO PROPERTY IN ILLINOIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7081) to provide for the removal of a cloud on the title to certain real property located in the State of Illinois.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services shall convey, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following tracts of real property lying within the east half of section 24, township 1 north, range 3 west of the third principal meridian, Clinton County, Ill., as provided in the following paragraphs:

(1) To Daniel H. Meyer, the west 16½ feet and the south 16½ feet of the southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 24.

(2) To Richard Brinkman and Florence Brinkman, the southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 24, except 16½ feet off of the south side and except 16½ feet off of the west side.

(3) To Lee A. Friend, southeast quarter southeast quarter of section 24.

(4) To William F. Weihe, north half southeast quarter of section 24.

(5) To Lawrence M. Dame and Villa Dame, as joint tenants, beginning at the northwest corner of the northwest quarter northeast quarter of section 24, thence east 59 rods, thence south 44 rods, thence west 59 rods, thence north 44 rods to the place of beginning.

(6) To Gene W. Spears, commencing 59 rods east of the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 24, thence east to the northeast corner of the said northeast quarter, thence south 24 rods, thence west 101 rods to a point due south of the point of beginning, thence north 24 rods to the place of beginning.

(7) To william F. Weihe, northeast quarter of section 24, except a tract described as beginning at the northwest corner thereof, thence east 59 rods, thence south 44 rods, thence west 59 rods, thence north 44 rods, to the place of beginning; and also except a tract described as beginning 59 rods east of the northwest corner of said northeast quarter, thence east to the northeast corner thereof, thence south 24 rods, thence west 101 rods, thence north to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the United States hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims all right, title, and interest in and to '200 acres, part of east one-half section 24, township 1 north, range 3 north,' Clinton County, Ill., which the United States may have by virtue of a deed made to the United States on August 24, 1868, by the United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, recorded in book 3 of deeds at page 116, records of Clinton County, Ill.,

to the person or persons who would, except for any claim of right, title, and interest in and to such land on the part of the United States by virtue of said deed, be entitled to said land under the laws of the State of Illinois."

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Texas: Page 3, line 8, strike the last word and insert in lieu thereof "west."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LAND CONVEYANCE AT BOWIE, MD.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1962) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain tract of land owned by the United States to the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, Bowie, Md.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, Bowie, Md., any right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain tract of land situated in Bowie, Md., Prince Georges County, described as follows:

Beginning at an iron pipe set on the south side of Fairland-Springfield Road, formerly known as the Springfield Hill Road, being at the northeast corner of the land now owned by the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church, running south 36 degrees 30 minutes west 328.75 feet; thence south 53 degrees 30 minutes east to the north boundary of Telegraph Road; thence northeasterly to the intersection of the north side of Telegraph Road and the south side of Fairland-Springfield Road; thence continuing in a northwesterly direction following the south side of Fairland-Springfield Road to the point of beginning, containing 5.5 acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be subject to the condition that the Perkins Chapel Methodist Church pay to the Secretary of Agriculture as consideration for the land conveyed the fair market value of such land as determined by the Secretary after appraisal of such land.

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

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-4158392, Adeikis, Stanley Michael.
A-2385127, Aksomaitis, Vincas.
A-5396880, Asano, Katsu.
A-5026507, Beltran, Adolfo.
A-2830514, Beltran, David.
A-5342432, Berezovsky, Philip.
A-10249801, Berger, Hyman.
A-3996498, Cardozo, Manuel Soares.
A-5126546, Castaneda-Cardozo, Alfonso.
A-5453601, Collazos-Gomez, Ernesto.
A-4322851, Cuilla, Serafano.
A-2375195, Ding-Gomez, Loreto.
A-2368529, Fiori, Francesco.
A-3279005, Freiman, John.
A-4621249, Genco, Salvatore.
A-5740870, Gergieff, Mogomet.
A-3607094, Giardina, John.
A-10519582, Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Jose Guadalupe.
A-3234931, Hagig, Jurius Bahounes.
A-3092077, Hanna, Asef.
A-2753717, Hernandez, Raymond.
A-5457310, Holm, Henning.
A-5817785, Imbelli, Joseph.
A-8890652, Johnson, John Christian.
A-2369307, Kapian, Anna.
A-4493473, Kessler, Max.
A-501488, Kymczak, Wojciech.
A-5405700, Kotchkowsky, Anthony.
A-3569890, Kozlowski, Edward.
A-2836648, Kubiejewski, John.
A-5974494, Mannert, Anna.
A-8979815, Martinez-Torres, Juan.
A-3299593, Mellin, Otto Hammes.
A-10116646, Milwood, Orville.
A-5140141, Mirarchi, Rosario Joseph.
A-3245080, Nevarrez-Garcia, Manuel Angelo.
A-8938342, Palacio, Manuel.
A-3584143, Aldana, Sara Barbosa De.
A-4195208, Cariozzi, James.
A-3692261, D'Elena, Celeste.
A-5156681, Dicroff, Robert Ernst.
A-1899752, Elashik, Sava.
A-5622659, Favorito, Thomas Vincent.
A-4619627, Kagan, Irving.
A-5949135, Kaminski, Leon.
A-5547409, Kognoski, Peter.
A-5158358, Latina, Salvatore.
A-3166512, Lewandowski, Felix.
A-3331252, Parillo, Pasquale.
A-10421865, Pawlak, Stanley.
A-5231537, Pecoraro, Girolamo.
A-5768942, Peltz, Max.
A-4893229, Perez, Regina Escobar.
A-8862238, Pidalo, Barbara.
A-2772408, Pilaia, Sam.
A-8582019, Radke, Victor John.
A-3810815, Romanovich, John.
A-2397876, Sabolovich, Mike.
A-3524451, Salazar-Ruiz, Andres.
A-5643343, Saledonis, Joseph John.
A-4146663, Schwartz, Isadore.
A-4571662, Siuba, Antonette.
A-3212351, Spear, Max.
A-5655850, Storz, Siegfried Herman.
A-4492568, Takeda, Shiro.
A-3490481, Tepper, Joseph Bernard.
A-2777783, Vallone, Felice.
A-2231701, Varela, Guadalupe Alvarez De.
A-5733817, Vargo, John.
A-3838689, Vega, Ramon.
A-5437973, Videll, Carl Ragnar Frederick.
A-2582384, Villagomez-Anguiano, Jose.
A-2675965, Woo, Nye Yen.
A-4566433, Zalaski, Myron Stanley.
A-2720389, Bielick, Lukian.
A-3290571, Do Souto, Jose.
A-7089013, Limon Acosta, Felix.
A-1582711, Lutsky, Isadore.
A-4446802, Ptasienski, Joseph.
A-2705430, De Hernandez, Manuela Triana.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, strike out all of line 4.

On page 4, strike out all of lines 5, 12, 15, and 22.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL BERNSTEIN

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Paul Bernstein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Bernstein, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $797.78. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Bernstein against the United States arising out of services rendered by him to the United States between June 30, 1936, and November 1, 1939, as an employee of the Federal Works Agency, Works Projects Administration, New York City. Such sum is the amount due the said Paul Bernstein for sick leave and annual leave, earned but not taken by him before a retroactive transfer to an agency under a different leave system. Similar payments may now be made under the subsequently enacted provisions of the Act approved December 21, 1944 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, supp. V, title 5, sec. 61d): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9131) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

STADIUM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1937) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

DECEDENT ESTATES LAW

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6508) to modify the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "SEC. 3." insert (a).

Page 3, after line 6, insert:

"(b) The intestate share as provided by section 940 of the act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,' approved March 3, 1901, shall attach to all real property owned by husband or wife during coverture: *Provided,* That neither husband nor wife hereafter shall have the right to convey, transfer, or encumber his or her real property free of the surviving spouse's interest in case of intestacy, as provided in this act, without joinder of the other spouse."

Page 6, line 17, strike out "Married" and insert "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 3 of this act, married."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. THOMAS' LITERARY SOCIETY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend the charter of St. Thomas' Literary Society and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from South Carolina cleared this bill with the ranking Member on this side?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, it has been cleared.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to incorporate St. Thomas' Literary Society in the District of Columbia," approved June 2, 1856 (11 Stat. 448), is amended by striking out "purposes of charity and education" and inserting in lieu thereof "purposes of religion, charity, and education"; and by striking out "not exceeding in value the sum of $500,000 at any one time,".

SEC. 2. Such act is further amended by striking out section 4 thereof, and redesignating section 5 as section 4.

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

RESERVISTS' PENSIONS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1140) to amend Public Law 314, 78th Congress, to provide that retired reservists may waive receipt of a portion of their retired pay.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from Virginia has cleared this matter with the ranking Member on this side?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct. It has been cleared with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the ranking member on the committee, and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill was on the Consent Calendar and it was requested to be passed over by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who has withdrawn his objection. The bill simply permits the reservists to waive a portion of their retirement in order to receive the equivalent in compensation when they have been retired for disability. That provision now is available to the regulars in the military, but not to the reservists and equalizes the conditions between the regulars and the reservists.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay," approved May 27, 1944 (38 U. S. C. 26c), is amended to read as follows: "That any person who is receiving retired or retirement pay pursuant to any provision of law relating to the granting of retired or retirement pay to persons in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service (including the Reserve components thereof), and who would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration if he were not receiving such retired or retirement pay, shall be entitled to receive such pension or compensation upon the filing by such person with the department by which such retired or retirement pay is paid of a waiver of so much of his retired or retirement pay as is equal in amount to such pension or compensation. To prevent duplication of payments, the department with which any such waiver is filed shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver, the amount waived, and the effective date of the reduction in retired or retirement pay."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the discharge of retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Philippine Scouts in certain cases," approved June 30, 1941 (38 U. S. C. 26b), is repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1005 of Public Law 85–56, approved June 17, 1957 (71 Stat. 123), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 1005. Any person who is receiving retired or retirement pay under any provision of law providing retired or retirement pay to persons in any of the components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, or Public Health Service, and who would be eligible to receive pension or compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration if he were not receiving such retired or retirement pay, shall be entitled to receive such pension or compensation upon the filing by such person with the department by which such retired or retirement pay is paid of a waiver of so much of this retired or retirement pay as is equal in amount to such pension or compensation. To prevent duplication of payments, the department with which any such waiver is filed shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver, the amount waived, and the effective date of the reduction in retired or retirement pay.'

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1958, or the first day of the month following enactment, whichever is later."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend Public Law 85–56 to permit persons receiving retired pay for nonregular service to waive receipt of a portion of that pay to receive pensions or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 399) to increase the postage allowances of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (a), in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by law, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to procure and furnish—

(1) to each Representative and Delegate and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, upon request by such person, United States airmail and special delivery postage stamps in an amount not exceeding $100, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and each succeeding fiscal year, for the mailing of postal matters arising in connection with his official business; and

(2) to each standing committee of the House of Representatives, upon request of the chairman thereof United States airmail and special delivery postage stamps in an amount not exceeding $100, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and each succeeding fiscal year, for official business of each such committee.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution.

Mr. FRIEDEL. At the present time the Members of Congress receive an allotment for the purchase of stamps. Special delivery stamps have gone up from 20 cents to 30 cents and this allowance is increased in proportion.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does it also provide for an increase in airmail stamps?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This increases your overall stamp allowance from $200 to $300. The subject came up because of the increase in special delivery stamps by the Postmaster General.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this an authorizing resolution or is it a resolution which provides that these funds come out of the contingent fund of the House or what is it?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It provides that the money comes out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. What is the necessity or need for this at this time, other than the fact that it has been increased? We are in the process of adjourning almost. In my opinion, most Members will be returning to their districts, so what necessitates that increase in postage at this time?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Well, there have been quite a few requests from Members. This is in line with the increase in the cost of special delivery stamps.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman think at all in terms of bringing in a resolution increasing the secretarial allowance?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, I have not.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Why have you not brought in such a bill?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Because we do not have many requests from Members for such an increase.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. How do you get a bill for this?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Because of requests from many Members.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. But you have not had a request from Members for an increase in secretarial allowance?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Only a few. I have a list of Members who have paid out of their own pockets for telephone and telegraph and stationery allowances every month. Many Members have to pay these expenses out of their own pockets in order to answer their constituents' mail. The resolution was passed by our committee by unanimous vote.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I understand that. But further reserving the right to object, it has been customary in the past when we have an extended session which necessitates additional office work and office equipment and materials to keep the office going, to have an additional fund allocated for stationery and also for secretarial allowance. We have gone beyond the normal adjournment date by about 2 months. Many of us have used up our allowance, and some of us have to go on our own. I just wondered why that has not been given some consideration by the committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I agree with the gentleman. That will be one of the bills considered the first of January next year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The first of January you will be asking for an appropriation for next year, but that will not answer the purpose now.

Mr. FRIEDEL. It is too late to have another committee meeting on that now before adjournment.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. If I may say to the gentleman from Indiana, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, that committee in the past, when they thought the circumstances justified it, did appropriate to Members of the House additional stationery allowances. If the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, should see fit to do that in these closing days, there will be many of us who would be willing to accept it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. There have been appropriations made directly by the Appropriations Committee, and there have been resolutions authorizing transfer from the contingent fund of the House to that fund.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BOGGS]. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL OFFICE SPACE IN HOME DISTRICTS OF CONGRESSMEN, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9282) to provide additional office space in home districts of Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL]?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman will explain the bill?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I will explain it.

Under the law today, Members who do not have office space available in a Federal Building in their home district, and are forced to rent private office space, are allowed $75 a month for this purpose. This bill provides for an increase from $75 a month to $100 a month for private office space. In many areas it is difficult to find office space for $75 a month.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is in conformity with the Senate practice.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does not the bill also provide that Members may have an office in two different cities, the total rent not to exceed $100 a month?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes. It provides that they may have two offices in their district, but they cannot spend more than $100 a month rent overall for both offices.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This, of course, is on a year-round basis.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is on a year-round basis. This rent is not paid by the Members. The landlord is paid by the Clerk of the House.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the 18th paragraph under the subheading "Contingent Expenses of the House" under the heading "House of Representatives" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (2 U. S. C. 122; 68 Stat. 396), is amended to read as follows:

"Each Member shall be entitled to office space suitable for his use in the district he represents, at not more than two places designated by him in such district. The Sergeant at Arms shall secure office space satisfactory to the Member in the post offices or other Federal buildings if such space is available. Office space to which a Member is entitled under this paragraph which is not secured by the Sergeant at Arms, may be secured by the Member, and the Clerk shall approve for payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives vouchers covering bona fide statements of amounts due for such office space not exceeding $1,200 per annum. As used in this paragraph the term 'Member' means each Member of the House of Representatives, the Delegate from Alaska, the Delegate from Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; the term 'district' means each Congressional district, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and, in the case of a Representative at Large, a State; and the term 'Clerk' means the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of August 1, 1957.

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

CHANGE OF TITLE OF CERTAIN POSITIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 405, authorizing the titles of the "Chief Janitor" and "Assistant Chief Janitor (Minority)," office of the Doorkeeper, be changed to "Custodian" and "Assistant Custodian (Minority)," respectively.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective September 1, 1957, until otherwise provided by law, the title of the positions "Chief Janitor," and "Assistant Chief Janitor (Minority)," office of the Doorkeeper, be changed to "Custodian" and "Assistant Custodian (Minority)," respectively.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is a very simple resolution. There is no money involved. It just changes the title from Chief Janitor to Custodian and from Assistant Chief Janitor to Assistant Custodian.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it recommended by the leadership?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I cleared this with both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MARTIN. Will this change the duties of the individuals at all?

Mr. FRIEDEL. They have a lot of work other than that of being janitor and we thought it fitting that they have more appropriate titles.

Mr. MARTIN. It is probably paving the way for a salary increase, is it not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, no salary increase.

Mr. MARTIN. Not this year, but next.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I do not know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

BIENNIAL BASIS FOR COMPUTING CERTAIN ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 9406 to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in explaining this bill may I say that it provides that instead of the Member receiving his telephone and telegraph allotment on a yearly basis, he will receive it for the entire term. If the Member overdraws in the first session it will go over to the second; and if there is a surplus in the first sesson it may be used in the second. It does not increase the amount in any way.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There have been a good many requests for this legislation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; and quite a number of Members have overdrawn already.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, section 2 of the act entited "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives," approved June 23, 1949, as amended (2 U. S. C. 46g), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. In the case of any Member of the House of Representatives other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip, there shall be paid under the first section of this act—

"(1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of the Member, aggregating not more than 6,000 minutes during a term, except that if a Member is elected for a portion of a term, the aggregate number of minutes with respect to which toll charges may be paid under the first section for such portion of a term shall be reduced to a number which is the same percentage of 6,000 as the number of days of his service in such portion of a term is of the total number of days in a term; and

"(2) charges on strictly official telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms sent by or on behalf of the Member aggregating during a term not more than 40,000 words of which not more than 4,000 may be in telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms sent to or from a point outside the United States, or its Territories or possessions, except that if a Member is elected for a portion of a term the aggregate number of words with respect to which charges may be paid under the first section for such portion of a term shall be reduced to a number which is the same percentage of 40,000 as the number of days of his service in such portion of a term is of the total number of days in a term.

For the purposes of this section, the word 'term' means the period beginning at noon on January 3 of an odd-numbered calendar year and ending at noon on January 3 of the next succeeding odd-numbered calendar years."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of noon, January 3, 1957.

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

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution, House Resolution 279, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 64 of the 85th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, and the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 65 of the 85th Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, for the purposes of both investigations, additional to that authorized by House Resolution 143 of the 85th Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman explain just what is expected to be accomplished through this $25,000 expenditure?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This authorizes the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation of appeals for charitable contributions made in the name of veterans. Our subcommittee received testimony that a lot of promoters used the names of veterans' groups for their own benefit, while the veterans' organizations received little or nothing. In one instance the promoters raised $1 million but all the veterans received was $100,000. The Veterans' Affairs Committee intends to go into the State laws and see if the State laws can be amended to correct the situation. The Committee will review State laws and they will review Federal laws. There is a lot of detailed work involved. That is one of the abuses we ought to correct.

Mr. MARTIN. That may well be, but would not the gentleman think that the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veterans' organizations would be aware of this abuse? They are not exactly powerless and they might bring pressure upon the legislatures to have the situation corrected.

Mr. FRIEDEL. These major organizations are the ones who are supporting this legislation. They are powerless because they cannot revoke the charters of the small local chapters.

Mr. MARTIN. Who granted them the charter?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Federal Government. The veterans' organizations are chartered by the United States Government.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; but the gentleman is not accusing them.

Mr. FRIEDEL. They have these local chapters.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is not accusing them, is he?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, but they do not have supervision of a lot of the local chapters who, in turn, are misled by these promoters. If we can get proper legislation through this investigation, it will save the taxpayers of our country millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. MARTIN. If there is anything that is going to save the taxpayers some money I do not know but what I could agree with the gentleman, but I am not convinced that you will save very much money here.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have a very able chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. If he does not spend all of this money it will go back to the Treasury. He will not waste it. He has been conservative.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not criticizing him. This is the Veterans' Affairs Committee?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not criticizing the committee at all, but it does look to me as if $25,000 is a lot of money. The way to find out information is to send a few letters around to the Legion posts and they will tell you quickly enough what the trouble is.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The committee will have to study the State laws and Federal laws. These local chapters get their charters from the national group.

Mr. MARTIN. How many people will be on the payroll?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This provides a salary for one full-time counsel, travel for the committee, reporters' services, and miscellaneous expenses, total $25,000.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not going to object.

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

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

Mr. WIER. Is it not true that 2 years ago the Congress had a committee set up that called in all of the veterans' organizations and they put their finger on these units or other organizations that were receiving funds on the basis it affected veterans? I think there is a tremendous volume of information on it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The information we received is that the veterans' organizations are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. WIER. I know, but it has been done once.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Not that I know of.

Mr. WIER. I am pointing it out to the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, I was not a member of the gentleman's subcommittee, but I understood that members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs came before the gentleman's committee for hearing and justified this resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, they came and justified it and it was passed unanimously by our subcommittee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. By vote of Members on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up for immediate consideration House Resolution 406.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction including the following:

(1) The operation and enforcement of the Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities, approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147), as amended, to determine what changes therein are necessary in order to grant the greatest possible freedom of political activity to the greatest possible number of persons whose political activities are now restricted under that act and amendments thereto, consistent with the preservation of governmental efficiency and impartiality.

(2) The operation and enforcement of any act of Congress, rule, regulation, order, understanding or precedent now obtaining in the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the Government of the United States restricting the rights of officers or employees of the United States or of any State or local subdivision thereof to take an active part in the political life of the Nation.

(3) The operation and effect of any act of Congress, including the Federal Corrupt Practices Act (43 Stat. 1070), as amended, restricting the right of any Senator, or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to or candidate for Congress, or individual elected as Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, to take an active part in the political life of the Nation.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, may hold such hearings, and may require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations at it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SEC. 2. The expenses incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $50,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized and approved by the Committee on House Administration, and signed by the chairman of such committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina kindly explain this resolution?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for an investigation of what is commonly known as the Hatch Act and other acts, statutes and Executive orders that are related to matters covered by the Hatch Act. There has been a great deal of confusion and there is still much confusion in the enforcement of the so-called Hatch Act. Various administrative officers of the Government do not agree on what the act means and do not agree on its enforcement.

The enforcement officer for the Civil Service Commission has recommended that some amendments be made. Various Members of the Congress have introduced bills requesting that a study be made and amendments made to the law. Particularly the Members of Congress who are in the Washington area introduced bills and testified—several of them did—before our committee when we had two hearings on these bills. The further we go into the matter the more complex we find it and the greater need we find for a thorough investigation and some relief by means of amendments to the law. We believe that it cannot be done in the proper manner unless a thorough investigation and study is made. That is the reason why we are asking for this investigation at this time. It is thought best that we begin this work during the recess of Congress to have more time to put on it. That is the reason it is being requested now.

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is it contemplated that the gentleman's commitee might to some extent take over part of the functions of the Special Elections Subcommittee which we usually have each year about the time the campaign opens?

Mr. ASHMORE. I do not know that that has been considered by the committee, but the investigation, I presume, will be made by the Elections Committee and we will, of course, study all matters pertaining to all questions of enforcement of the Hatch Act.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman from Texas recalls that we undertook to do something about that on one occasion. Is that not right?

Mr. BURLESON. That would be the inference, that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration would conduct this inquiry.

If the gentleman will yield further, I am not definite myself, but as far as I know there has never been an investigation into the entire so-called Hatch Act.

Mr. ASHMORE. There has not.

Mr. BURLESON. There has developed over the years the question of the applicability of the law. Now any Federal employee receiving any portion of his salary from the Federal Government is subject to the law. As we are all aware, the number of Federal employees has increased tremendously. I think it is denying the right of many people who are paid in part—I use the word "part" for lack of a better one—by Federal funds to take part in many matters locally which are not strictly political as we ordinarily think of them.

As many Members will recall, last year the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] introduced a bill which would exempt State employees from the Hatch Act, so-called, that is, those who receive a small part of their pay from the Federal Government but who are actually State employees. That passed this body and went over to the other body, where it did not pass. As a result that provision is still in force. I just mention that as an example of the fact that many Members have asked the committee to look into this matter to reappraise its applicability. I think that would sum up the purpose of it, as I understand it.

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

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

Mr. MARTIN. May I ask the chairman of the committee if there was not a similar investigation over in the Senate, and they have proposed legislation? It seems to me I read of that in the newspapers.

Mr. BURLESON. I think the Rules Committee of the Senate looked into various facets of the Hatch Act, but, as far as I know, there has never been a complete or whole investigation of the applicability of the law.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know how completely the other body looked up the legislation, but another question I also should like to inquire about: The gentleman made the statement that this would probably take the place of the regular Elections Committee. Has this been taken up with the Democratic leadership of the House?

Mr. BURLESON. I think the minority leader perhaps misunderstood that. It does not take the place of the so-called Elections Committee which is appointed in an election year, but the work, if the House approves the bill, will be conducted by the standing Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MARTIN. I have no objection to the membership of the committee, but I do not think anybody in the House on the gentleman's side or my side would want two committees trying to supervise an election.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe the minority leader still may misunderstand me. That is just the point. We are not

creating a new committee. This is not a select committee. We propose that the regular Subcommittee on Elections, the same members of the Committee on House Administration, serving on the Subcommittee on Elections, would conduct the investigation. There are bills pending, I think from both sides of the aisle, which suggest that a committee be appointed to look into this matter. The committee considered those bills. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] and I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] and others suggested that this special commission be set up to look into this matter. Personally, I am a little allergic to commissions. The committee felt likewise, that if there is a need for this work the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration was able and willing, and if given the authority and the money, we could do an adequate job of it.

Mr. ASHMORE. I would like to say to the minority leader that there will be no confusion or misunderstanding between the work of the regularly established Subcommittee on Elections and this committee. The Subcommittee on Elections considers only contested election cases. This resolution does not go into that.

Mr. MARTIN. The special committee has to do with campaigns. It supervises elections. We do not want to have two campaign committees directing us as to how our campaigns are to be conducted. They might be in conflict.

Mr. ASHMORE. That will not happen because the regular Committee on Elections does not go into those matters unless there is a contested election which is brought to our attention.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Could the gentleman tell us whether it is the plan of the committee to hold hearings or just to conduct a staff investigation?

Mr. ASHMORE. It is the plan of the committee to hold hearings.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is on specific bills, for instance, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] and others as well.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is correct, and to go into the matter thoroughly. That is the reason we asked for the money so that we will be able to go to these places where we have been requested to go.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the Members of Congress be given the opportunity to come back after the recess because, obviously, it will be rather difficult for some Members to come before the committee during the interim period?

Mr. ASHMORE. Yes; they will, either during the recess or after.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I wish to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, Why do we need the provision in the resolution for holding hearings within or outside of the United States? It seems to me that election matters would be held in the United States.

Mr. ASHMORE. I think the reason for that language, I will say to the gentleman, is that there may be a need to go to Panama or Alaska or someplace like that. It makes no particular difference to the committee whether it is included or not, but that is generally the language used.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, whatever the House desires to do with this resolution is, of course, their business, but I want to disabuse the minds of the gentleman from South Carolina, the gentleman from Texas and the other Members of any impression that the special committee that is appointed for 2 years does not go into such matters as this. I have served on this committee for several Congresses, and always the resolution setting up the special committee is very broad in its language and authorizes them to go into general matters relating to elections and would be broad enough, in my judgment, to encompass the suggestion here. We have on many occasions filed reports where general investigations have taken place. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] was the chairman last year and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has also served as chairman. We went into a great many things other than specific Members' seats. I think, perhaps, the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from South Carolina were not aware of that.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. Yes, I am aware of that. It is just a matter of misunderstanding of the nature of the subcommittee which proposes to do this work. I think the gentleman will agree that the principal mission of the special elections committee is to determine what violations have occurred during an election. In other words, violations of the Hatch Act as they might have affected the results of an election. But, aside from that, the gentleman, I am sure, is aware that the report made by the special elections committee ends up with the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, yes, that is true.

Mr. BURLESON. I think we understand each other.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Is there anything in this resolution which covers the rest of the field the gentleman has been referring to? We mentioned the Hatch Act. Does this authorize investigation into the Corrupt Practices Act as well?

Mr. ASHMORE. It does.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. May I inquire how the committee has jurisdiction, rather than the Committee on the Judiciary, of investigations of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act?

Mr. ASHMORE. By virtue of the Reorganization Act, I am informed. We looked into that.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. It is my understanding that when resolutions include the right of travel abroad, some reason is given. I know when they appear before the Committee on Rules it is customary to cite some reason for that. I am wondering whether the gentleman is authorized to go beyond the United States, Territories, and possessions. Why should you have to investigate elections in Japan, Panama, or Peru?

Mr. ASHMORE. We have no intention of going beyond the territory of the United States, but there was some confusion as to whether or not the language "within the United States" covers Territories and possessions.

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. I thought it might be well to bring that out. The committee has no such intention?

Mr. ASHMORE. That is true.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If the committee is going abroad, I wish it would look into the new currency that is floating around and subject to redemption with our dollars. I came into possession of some of it today.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is not Confederate money, is it?

Mr. GROSS. It might turn out to be. It is UNESCO money. You have heard the expression: "as phoney as a 3-dollar bill." I have one of them here. This is a UNESCO 3-dollar bill. This particular one is in payment for—if the gentleman's committee is going abroad, I would like to have it——

Mr. ASHMORE. We have no intention of going abroad, but I am glad to know about it.

Mr. GROSS. This $3 bill is supposed to be in payment for books for a Japanese. I have here a publication put out by UNESCO which lists the products foreigners can buy with this paper money. Here are some of the items: Optical equipment, books, periodicals, electrical measuring instruments, blowers, vacuum pumps and gages, radio parts, small workshop tools, film, and other photographic equipment. A foreigner sends his order and UNESCO money to the supplier in this country and the supplier ships the merchandise. Then the supplier apparently takes this UNESCO money to a bank in the United States and gets his dollars. The bank, in turn, apparently sends the UNESCO note over to Paris, to international headquarters of UNESCO and is reimbursed through one, Luther B. Evans, who is known as Directeur General of UNESCO. I just thought if the committee was going abroad it might want to look into this funny money that is in circulation.

Mr. ASHMORE. It will not be necessary, because the committee is not going abroad.

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

Mr. ASHMORE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it very important to caution the House in these investigations not to have too many? As ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I did not know of the

hearings before the gentleman's committee on the investigation to be conducted by them. I voted for the investigation, but I did it with the feeling that we must be very careful not to hurt any veterans' organizations or any committee of the House.

I believe the gentleman will agree with me as to the importance of these investigations. They can be used as punitive measures and cause great harm and great unhappiness unjustifiably to the Members of Congress and also Federal employees.

Mr. ASHMORE. I am glad to have the gentlewoman's contribution; however, that is a matter over which this committee does not have jurisdiction. I believe the gentlewoman has reference to another resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope committees conducting other investigations will bear this in mind too.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) favoring the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission for the publication of certain documents, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a Senate resolution and it is merely for the use of the Senate. There is no provision in this resolution for any material for the House, is there?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This resolution apparently is not going to cost the Government any money. It says that the Congress of the United States respectfully urges the governors and legislatures of the several States and the State historical commissions and achival agencies as well as appropriate libraries, historical societies, colleges, and universities, business corporations, foundations, civic and other nonprofit organizations, and individuals to cooperate with the National Historical Publications Commission in the fulfillment of the said program. It just urges them to support it. I think it is a harmless bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Without expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Without any expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the National Historical Publications Commission is charged by the Congress with responsibility for cooperating with and encouraging "Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, societies, and individuals" in collecting, preserving, and publishing documents that are important for understanding the history of the United States; and

Whereas the said Commission in the discharge of these responsibilities has recommended a national program to encourage the publication of the basic source materials of American history through the cooperative efforts of both public and private organizations; and

Whereas the President of the United States has approved the national program for the publication of historical documents, as set forth in the Commission's published report to him (and summarized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 7, p. 9310, for July 22, 1955); and

Whereas it is important that the people of the United States understand the history of their country and of its relationship to the rest of the world; and

Whereas the publication of such source materials as letters, diaries, journals, sermons, speeches, reports, and other documents—the firsthand evidence of the initiative, courage, and spiritual qualities of the men and women who have helped to shape our country's destiny—would contribute to a better understanding of the history of the United States in all of its manifold aspects, and would thereby strengthen the defense of our country against its enemies: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission in its report entitled "A National Program for the Publication of Historical Documents" would be of lasting benefit to the Government and citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States respectfully urges the governors and legislatures of the several States and the State historical commissions and archival agencies, as well as appropriate libraries, historical societies, colleges and universities, business corporations, foundations, civic and other nonprofit organizations, and individuals to cooperate with the National Historical Publications Commission in the fulfillment of the said program.

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

BOOKS FOR THE ADULT BLIND

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2434) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I shall be pleased to.

This is a bill pased by the other body which removes the limitation on the authorization of appropriations for books and records for the blind. In other words, as the law now stands the Committee on Appropriations each year determines the request which is limited by an authorization. With the passage of this bill there will be no limitation. At the present time I understand the limitation is $125,000 a year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That there is authorized to be appropriated annually to the Library of Congress, in addition to appropriations otherwise made to said Library, such sums for expenditure under the direction of the Librarian of Congress as may be necessary to provide books published either in raised characters, on sound-reproduction recordings, or in any other form, and for the purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for such sound-reproduction recordings, for the use of the blind residents of the United States, including the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, all of which books, recordings, and reproducers will remain the property of the Library of Congress but will be loaned to blind readers under regulations prescribed by the Librarian of Congress for this service. In the purchase of books in either raised characters or in sound-reproduction recordings the Librarian of Congress, without reference to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C. 5), as amended, shall give preference to non-profit-making institutions or agencies whose activities are primarily concerned with the blind, in all cases where the prices or bids submitted by such institutions or agencies are, by said Librarian, under all the circumstances and needs involved, determined to be fair and reasonable."

SEC. 2. This act shall be applicable with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for each fiscal year thereafter.

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

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 392) authorizing the printing of certain proceedings in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as a House document.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in explanation I may say that this is in conformity with a practice carried on in the House in other committees and relates to proceedings in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I believe there is no objection to the resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on Merchant

Marine and Fisheries of Thursday, May 16, 1957, incident to the presentation of a portrait of Chairman HERBERT C. BONNER to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be printed as a House document with suitable binding.

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

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 401 authorizing the printing as a House document of the historical data regarding the creation and jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and providing for additional copies.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is more or less a document showing the creation and the jurisdiction of this committee. It is a very small printing bill. The estimated cost of printing is $291.

I believe there is no objection to it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the historical data regarding the creation and jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives; and that 1,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 232, 84TH CONGRESS, WITH EMENDATIONS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I ask for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution No. 17.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the House of Representatives 500,000 additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress, with emendations.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman going to explain this resolution, inasmuch as it involves a sizable amount? It concerns every Member of the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will be glad to do that. This resolution has to do with the reprint of a House document known as The Capitol. I think most of the Members are familiar with it. There will be certain changes made. This resolution provides for the printing of 500,000 additional copies and I think I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not support this resolution in the committee. I am bringing it here at the direction of the committee. It is up to the Members of the House to decide what they want to do.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think it would be fair to say to the House that the gentleman from Missouri and myself more or less consented that the resolution come before the House but we did not support it in the committee.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. I would like to say with reference to the document that this is one, I am informed, of few that has ever shown a profit to the Government Printing Office. There have been some $7,400 made. I am informed that as of the 22d of this month there were some 1,500 orders unfilled because they are out of the document. I may say to the House, and I know that everyone here must understand I cannot make a definite statement, that I have been informed and advised by responsible Members of the other body it is their desire, if this resolution is adopted, that the publication they have be not reprinted and that a section of this document would be devoted to the Senate. Of course, certainly, I cannot say definitely that that will happen, but I understand and have been informed, as I say, by responsible people on the other side of the building that that is their intention and their plan. Of course, if that should come to pass it would mean a substantial saving as far as printing is concerned, in that there would be one document rather than the currently two.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. We have heard a great deal about economy this year. Here is a matter involving over $100,000 that we are going to spend on ourselves to see if we can popularize the Members at home. I think if we are going to have economy—and I have not seen too many signs of it this year, only in 1 or 2 spots—why not start with ourselves. I feel so strongly about this that I was surprised at the gentleman from Texas's statement the Government had made a profit. I would therefore suggest that he withdraw the resolution so that we can look into that statement. If this is going to cost $100,000 as a "give away" to Members of the Congress to popularize themselves, I am going to ask for a rollcall vote. This extravagance should not be undertaken in a year we have been obliged to reject worthier proposals. I have observed with alarm the constant increase of our legislative authority.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of our committee.

Mr. BURLESON. I cannot agree with the minority leader that this is a service to ourselves or a particular favor to ourselves. There is a great public demand for this publication.

Mr. MARTIN. Why the $100,000 then?

Mr. BURLESON. I am not too sure that the gentleman from Texas mentioned it, but we do know there are now on file with the Government Printing Office requests for more than 1,500 copies. Those are requests. We do not know how many books may be included in any one request. We know there are more than 1,500.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman not think we should have that information before we vote on it?

Mr. BURLESON. We have it, as near as we can get it. We did not ask the people in the Printing Office to go through and count the number which may be included in each order, but they tell us it is over 1,500.

Mr. IKARD. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that on the 22d of this month I talked to the Government Printing Office and received the following information:

By way of explanation, I hope I have made myself clear that I was not implying that the copies that went to Members did not cost anything. They certainly did. But I was saying that the copies that went to the Government Printing Office and were sold, were sold at a profit. I was informed on the 22d day of this month that the profit was $7,380. I was also informed at the same time by the Office of the Superintendent of Documents that they had received approximately 1,500 requests from individuals for copies of this publication. These were now on file. They were cash customers and represented orders that were unfilled.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman think he could stay in business by getting $7,000 of cash sales and giving $100,000 of these publications away to Members of Congress?

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, this publication has made a profit on those that were sold. We frequently print documents here for our own use. As has been pointed out by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration [Mr. BURLESON] this is an effort on the part of this body to impress upon the people who get these publications something of the responsibility, of the function and purpose of representative Government. We have been very careful in our efforts not to build up any one Member or to put out a document that promotes any individual. We have tried as best we could to present objectively to the public the purpose, the function and the responsibility of the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot agree with the gentleman. I think it is a violation of our economy drive and I am certainly going to ask for a rollcall on the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I might say for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader that this

committee has brought about some economies in printing. While I was not in support of this particular resolution in the committee, I do know that each copy that has been printed has been distributed and there are no more copies available. We do print each year millions of copies of documents, reports, and so forth, that are not ever sent out and which clutter up our storerooms. This committee has carried over several resolutions which were before it, which we did not present to the House. I should like to say that in defense of the committee. We have some others here today that I think will result in cluttering up our storerooms, but I do not think this one will ever lodge in our storerooms. It will be distributed.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman kindly explain why he voted against the resolution in the committee? He has always been a sound member of the committee and stood for economy.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have voted against many resolutions. I have been in the minority many times, voting for economy. I would forego this one as a matter of economy. However, I have been outvoted many times. I have presented other resolutions here that I think we could have done without and I did not support them in the committee; and I will say that I was successful in preventing others from coming out of the committee which saved more money than the one before us would cost.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Is the document in question the Life magazine type picture book of the Capitol?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This is it.

Mr. HOSMER. Of which Members of the House and of the other body received some 550 copies last year for free distribution?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is the one.

Mr. HOSMER. Does this resolution propose to give the Members another supply of that document for the same purpose?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It does.

Mr. HOSMER. It seems to me if there is anything to the argument that this is a means of informing and enthusing the people of the country about Congress as an institution we either have to print enough for everybody in the country or not print any at all, because if you limit them to some 550 per Member it is obviously then nothing more than a public relations gimmick for the Members themselves. I do not think that as responsible elected officials we have any right to devote $100,000 of the taxpayers' money to improving our relations with constituents.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. As to the cost of printing, the figure of $100,000 has been used. The estimated cost is between $90,000 and $95,000.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman as regards the fact that I believe the Subcommittee on Printing has probably turned down more requests for printing in the past year than it has in the previous 7 or 8 years. The resolutions that have been brought up here today are in most cases the survivors of a pretty thorough scrutiny. I commend the gentleman on his efforts in that regard.

With regard to this particular publication, certainly there can be some objections to it. On the other hand, I believe it is increasingly true that practically every library in the United States has or is about to receive copies of this. There are lots of publications, I may say to the gentleman who has just spoken, and we do not have to put one in every home in America. However, as folks come here in increasing tens of thousands to visit this Capitol, to have some publication of this kind available as an item augmenting their pleasure and information, I think is a good thing. Perhaps we have too elaborate a publication there for that purpose, but certainly I think it makes a fine memento for our visitors here to take back home. I tend to regard it, and I am not objecting to anybody else's remarks, as something we give to the people, not to the Members of Congress.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am a member of the Committee on Printing. I think that, if any of the members had been present at the last meeting, they would realize that we really do not just pass every bill because it is requested. We cut off a lot more than we approve. I believe this one document "The Capitol" we are discussing comes more nearly meeting the approval of everybody that knows about it. More people are asking for them. Although they are given to the Members of Congress themselves, they are distributed to the voters, the taxpayers, who want to know something about their Capitol and something about their Government. I have helped to cut off many a document that I felt would remain in the storeroom, but this one I know will not. I am sure the people who know about it will approve.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of legislation which puts us to the test of deciding between that which is desirable in Government and that which is absolutely necessary. Those of us who for reasons of economy hold sturdily to the latter theory believe that in this resolution the issue is clear-cut.

The publication in question is a handsome picture book printed at Government expense and used by Congressmen as gifts to visiting constituents. The document has merit. Its makeup is attractive, and the information concerning the workings of Government is a valuable reference. My own visitors are invariably pleased with this booklet as a memento of their trip to see their Congressman. I, of course, am not unmindful of the fact that my name is stamped on a prominent place on this addition to my constituent's library.

However, since this is my first opportunity to vote on whether this is a wise use of the taxpayers' money, I feel compelled to say that it is not. While we need to encourage interest in the affairs of Government, it is questionable whether this objective in all truth is not secondary to the book's value in the reelection of the constituents' current Congressman.

If the book is of general worth as a guide to civics, as has been said here on the floor, and if Congressmen are the best means of distribution, I believe we should urge this viewpoint on charitable foundations which make grants for educational purposes.

During the course of this session many of us have voted against programs with laudable motives because we believe the test of absolute "necessity" is better than the test of "desirability." We should apply the same standards to those proposals in which we as individuals are, if not the primary, then the secondary beneficiaries. On such a basis this appropriation for nearly $100,000 cannot be justified, and I hope the resolution will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN) there were—ayes 72, noes 45.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 129, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—183

Addonizio	Celler	Granahan
Albert	Christopher	Grant
Allen, Calif.	Chudoff	Green, Oreg.
Anderson, Mont.	Clark	Green, Pa.
Andrews	Colmer	Gregory
Ashley	Corbett	Griffiths
Ashmore	Cramer	Hagen
Aspinall	Cunningham, Iowa	Haley
Ayres	Davis, Tenn.	Hardy
Bailey	Delaney	Harris
Barden	Dempsey	Harrison, Va.
Baring	Denton	Hébert
Bass, Tenn.	Dingell	Hemphill
Beckworth	Dollinger	Herlong
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, S. C.	Hillings
Bennett, Mich.	Durham	Holland
Blatnik	Eberharter	Horan
Boggs	Edmondson	Huddleston
Boland	Elliott	Hull
Bolling	Engle	Hyde
Bonner	Evins	Ikard
Boykin	Fallon	Jarman
Boyle	Farbstein	Jennings
Breeding	Fascell	Johnson
Brooks, La.	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Brooks, Tex.	Fisher	Karsten
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	Kearns
Brown, Mo.	Forand	Kelley, Pa.
Broyhill	Forrester	Kelly, N. Y.
Burleson	Fountain	Keogh
Byrd	Friedel	Kirwan
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	Kitchin
Cannon	Gary	Kuczynski
		Knutson

Lanham	Perkins	Sheppard
Lankford	Pfost	Shuford
Lennon	Poage	Sisk
Lesinski	Polk	Smith, Miss.
Long	Porter	Smith, Va.
McFall	Price	Staggers
McGovern	Prouty	Steed
Machrowicz	Rabaut	Sullivan
Mack, Ill.	Rains	Teller
Marshall	Ray	Thompson, La.
Merrow	Reuss	Thompson, N. J.
Metcalf	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Mills	Riley	Thornberry
Montoya	Roberts	Trimble
Morgan	Robeson, Va.	Tuck
Morris	Rodino	Ullman
Moss	Rogers, Colo.	Vanik
Moulder	Rogers, Fla.	Vinson
Multer	Rogers, Tex.	Walter
Natcher	Rooney	Watts
Norrell	Roosevelt	Westland
O'Brien, Ill.	Rutherford	Whitener
O'Hara, Ill.	Santangelo	Wier
O'Hara, Minn.	Saund	Willis
O'Konski	Schenck	Withrow
Passman	Schwengel	Wright
Patman	Scott, N. C.	Young
Patterson	Selden	

NAYS—129

Abernethy	Frazier	Murray
Adair	Gathings	Neal
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	Griffin	Nimtz
	Gross	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	Gubser	Pelly
	Gwinn	Pillion
Auchincloss	Hale	Poff
Avery	Harden	Radwan
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin	Haskell	Reed
Bates	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Heselton	Rogers, Mass.
Berry	Hill	St. George
Betts	Holmes	Saylor
Bolton	Holt	Scott, Pa.
Bosch	Hosmer	Scudder
Bow	James	Siler
Broomfield	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Smith, Calif.
Byrne, Ill.	Johansen	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Cederberg	Judd	Stauffer
Chamberlain	Keating	Taber
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Talle
Chiperfield	Knox	Teague, Calif.
Church	Lane	Tewes
Coffin	LeCompte	Thomson, Wyo.
Collier	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Cooper	Loser	Utt
Cunningham, Nebr.	McConnell	Van Pelt
	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Curtin	McDonough	Vorys
Dague	McIntire	Weaver
Davis, Ga.	McIntosh	Wharton
Derounian	McVey	Whitten
Devereux	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Dixon	Martin	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	Matthews	Williams, N. Y.
Dwyer	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Fino	Moore	Winstead
Ford	Mumma	Younger

NOT VOTING—120

Abbitt	Dawson, Ill.	Kean
Alexander	Dawson, Utah	Kearney
Alger	Dellay	Kee
Anfuso	Dennison	Keeney
Arends	Dies	Kilburn
Barrett	Diggs	Kilday
Bass, N. H.	Donohue	King
Baumhart	Dooley	Krueger
Beamer	Dorn, N. Y.	Laird
Becker	Doyle	Landrum
Bentley	Flood	Latham
Blitch	Flynt	McCarthy
Bray	Frelinghuysen	McCormack
Brownson	Garmatz	McGregor
Buckley	George	McMillan
Budge	Gordon	Macdonald
Burdick	Gray	Madden
Bush	Halleck	Magnuson
Carnahan	Harvey	Mahon
Carrigg	Hays, Ark.	Mailliard
Chelf	Hays, Ohio	Mason
Clevenger	Healey	May
Coad	Hess	Meader
Cole	Hiestand	Michel
Cooley	Hoeven	Miller, Calif.
Coudert	Hoffman	Miller, N. Y.
Cretella	Holifield	Minshall
Curtis, Mass.	Holtzman	Morano
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson	Morrison
Norblad	Robsion, Ky.	Taylor
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sadlak	Teague, Tex.
O'Neill	Scherer	Thomas
Ostertag	Scrivner	Udall
Philbin	Seely-Brown	Vursell
Pilcher	Sheehan	Wainwright
Powell	Shelley	Widnall
Preston	Sieminski	Wolverton
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sikes	Yates
Riehlman	Simpson, Pa.	Zablocki
Rivers	Spence	Zelenko

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Alger against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Beamer against.
Mr. Udall for, with Mr. Baumhart against.
Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Wolverton against.
Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Hiestand against.
Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. May against.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Minshall against.
Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Mahon against.
Mr. Coad for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas for, with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire against.
Mr. Alexander for, with Mr. Clevenger against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Cretella against.
Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Dellay against.
Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sadlak against.
Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Harvey against.
Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Bray against.
Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Brownson against.
Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Becker against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Keeney against.
Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. May against.
Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Carrigg against.
Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Widnall against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Krueger against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. McGregor against.
Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hoffman against.
Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Dooley against.
Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. Hoeven against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Morano against.
Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Jackson against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Scherer against.
Mr. Abbitt for with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Sheehan against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Seely-Brown against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Preston with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Cole.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Dorn of New York.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. SCUDDER and Mr. JUDD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN MATERIAL RELATING TO THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as a House document part II of Central Valley project documents comprising project operating documents, and that there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 1,200 additional copies, 600 of which shall be bound in cloth and 600 bound in paper.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 188) authorizing the printing as a House document of the document entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem; Fifty-six Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1956".

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the document entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem: 56 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1956," which was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the instance and under the direction of the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, 84th Congress, shall be printed as a House document.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed for the use of the House of Representatives 4,500 copies of such House document, of which 3,500 copies shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House Document Room.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike out "four" and insert "one", and strike out "five hundred."

Page 1, line 12, strike out all of line 12 and the remainder of the concurrent resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following: "which shall be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives."

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is it not correct that House Concurrent Resolution 188 is one that the Select Committee on Small Business is seeking?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; it is a document that has already been printed, as I understand.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has been represented to us as a document in the interest of the small business of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The document is entitled, "Congress and the Monopoly Problem; 56 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1956." It would now be printed as a House document, and the committee amendment would change the concurrent resolution so that all of the copies, 1,000, would be for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would the gentleman say what the Committee on Small Business told his committee they wanted to use this document for? I had not heard of this until today. I should like to know why the document is being sought, for what purpose the committee seeks it.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. This document has been very popular with the libraries, judges, lawyers, and other people who are interested in antitrust legislation, including the different agencies of our Government. I do not recall that the committee asked that we have control of the distribution of them. It is all right, but we have requests now for 1,000 copies. This number was reduced from what the concurrent resolution stated. I am not going to ask that it be increased, but I assure the gentleman that there is a real need, and there are actual requests for these documents now. It was carefully prepared. It is the only document of its kind that is in existence. No private publisher has ever published a document like this. It is right up-to-date, and it serves a good purpose. The fact that they have been designated for distribution by our committee is all right, because we have requests for that number of copies now.

Mr. HOSMER. From what committee does this document originally come?

Mr. PATMAN. It came from the House Committee on Small Business.

Mr. HOSMER. Is there any question with respect to the jurisdiction of this matter as between the Committee on Small Business and a standing committee of the House?

Mr. PATMAN. No one has ever questioned it; in fact, we have been praised for having it prepared. It was prepared under the direction of the Committee on Small Business. We have had not one word of criticism but many words of praise.

Mr. HOSMER. I would hope that in the future the Small Business Committee at large be informed of these requests before they are made to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. PATMAN. This happens to be a reprint. Since there has never been any objection, it was presumed that there would be no objection to a reprint.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand that, but I think the amount, $3,557.72, would justify a discussion of this matter by the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. That was for the original request, which we think was justified, but the committee cut that down about one-third.

Mr. HOSMER. As I understand, the resolution provides for the sum that I just mentioned. Is that correct?

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. I think the original estimate was something over $6,000. Is that not right?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not have those figures before me; I could not say.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The committee did cut it more than in half, in total number of copies and approximately half in cost. Is this not correct?

Mr. PATMAN. We did not have an opportunity to present this to the committee because we were engaged in other activities of other committees and we could not be there at the time to present this to the committee. However, it is just a reprint, and the books are well worthwhile. They are highly regarded and very much needed. Whatever the cost is, it is a cost to the Government. I do not know what it is, but it is a cost to the Government.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if there has been any consideration in the committee of a procedure whereby documents such as this one and others, which the committee from time to time orders be printed, can be reprinted by the Government Printing Office for the purpose of sale rather than have free distribution through the channels of either the Members or the various standing and select committees of the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman is asking if the Government Printing Office should print these for sale?

Mr. HOSMER. I am asking if the committee has ever considered the adoption of any procedure whereby this could be done and thereby save the recurrent printing costs and enable the people to purchase these documents at least at cost.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The subcommittee on printing is now considering that. On that basis, we did not report several resolutions which were offered. I might say it has been the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri that many publications which have been printed for free distribution could be sold, and that there would be a ready market from the Government Printing Office. Our committee is working on that. I think by the early part of next session, we will bring in some recommendations to the House along that line.

Mr. HOSMER. I would hope that the committee would do that before too many more of these resolutions appropriating specific sums for this purpose come in again.

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

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Could the distinguished chairman of the committee explain why the resolution, which I sponsored, to provide for the publication of some additional copies of Job Outlook Opportunities, a publication by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, which was reported by your committee unanimously, was not reported out? The number of requests for reprints were, I believe, 6,000, and that was the suggestion of the committee at the time they acted on it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That was one of several resolutions which was carried over. It was not turned down by the committee, but it was carried over until the next session until we can look into the practice of having these books sold. There are some of them for sale at the Government Printing Office. The Department of Labor also has some of these books.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the publication is a worthwhile one in this period of juvenile delinquency when the high schools and colleges are trying all over the country to steer the youth of the country into satisfactory jobs. It was at their request that I introduced the resolution, at the request of high school libraries and college libraries who wanted some information that they could use in their instruction courses in this field. I think it is a very worthwhile publication.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that it is a very worthwhile publication. I also want to remind the gentleman that I am only one member of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 215) authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain public hearings, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be authorized to have printed for its use 20,000 copies of the public hearings on "The Nature of Radio-Active Fallout and Its Effects on Man," held by the Special Subcommittee on Radiation during the 85th Congress, 1st session; and be it further

Resolved, That the Joint Committee be authorized to have printed 20,000 copies of a brief analysis of the above hearings.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina who introduced this resolution. I do not think there is any controversy about it, however, I want to explain that it is for printing the hearings on the nature of radioactive fallout and its effect on man.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns the hearings held by the Joint Committee on the problem of fallout and radiation hazards. We based our hearings entirely on scientific data presented by the foremost scientists in

America. I doubt whether any hearings have ever been held here on Capitol Hill which are better evaluated on a purely scientific basis.

The hearings have created widespread interest not only in this country but in many other countries. Requests have been received from colleges and universities, scientific organizations, and from practically all of the civil defense installations in the country.

I wrote a letter to every Member of the House and of the Senate, asking them to indicate the number of copies of the hearings they would require. Many Members began receiving requests from constituents long before the hearings were completed, and at the present time the requests for copies from the Members of Congress filed with the Joint Committee total more than 12,000 copies.

I believe the document will be of great benefit to our schools and colleges throughout the country. There have been confusing statements and so much misinformation printed about this subject that the committee felt it could render a real service to the country in holding and printing these hearings, and I believe a good job has been done. I hope the House will go along with this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con Res. 39) providing for the printing as a Senate document and for additional copies of the report of the Commission on Government Security.

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

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document the report of the Commission on Government Security, submitted to the Congress June 21, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 304 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended; and that there shall be printed 5,000 additional copies, of which 2,500 shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,500 for the use of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

PHILLIS GUYADEEN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1558) for the relief of Phillis Guyadeen, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (b) (4) of that act shall not be applicable in connection with the application for an immigrant visa by Phillis Guyadeen."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IKUKO MOROOKA MAHONEY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1741) for the relief of Ikuko Morooka Mahoney, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ikuko Morooka Mahoney, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL ADAMSON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Daniel Adamson, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if these amendments have been cleared with the minority side?

Mr. WALTER. These amendments have been cleared. They in no way affect the legislation. They are technical, with the exception of two resolutions where the Senate struck the name from the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTORIA GALEA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4854) for the relief of Victoria Galea, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (c) (1) shall not be applicable in connection with the application for an immigrant visa by Victoria Galea."

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire of the gentleman, both with regard to this bill, and others which I understand he is about to present, if he could give us just a general statement on these amendments which have been adopted by the Senate and in which we are being asked to concur.

Mr. WALTER. For the most part, the amendments are technical. In one case the beneficiary has died, but in two resolutions the Senate struck the names from the resolutions as they left the House.

Mr. KEATING. There are some instances where the names were stricken out of the House bills?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me why the names of the persons who were in the bill when it went to the Senate have now been stricken?

Mr. WALTER. The name deleted from the first, House Joint Resolution 338, there was a preference that became available; in other words, this alien had applied for a quota number; there was none available. Subsequently the preference became available, so the alien could be admitted as a first-preference alien without the need of private legislation.

In the second case the beneficiary is a student of nursing. She has student status and cannot be deported. When she completes her education she will then become a skilled specialist within the meaning of the law and be entitled to a first preference in a quota which is wide open.

Mr. McCULLOCH. If I may interrupt further, I would like to ask a question which might save time. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania in accord with the action of the Senate in striking these various names which have been mentioned.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, I am quite certain that in each instance they followed the proper course.

Mr. McCULLOCH. And it was in accordance with the unanimous agreement in the Senate committee that these names were stricken, I presume.

Mr. WALTER. I doubt if the language employed in some of the changes improved the language carried in the measure as it passed the House; but their technicians did change the language, and rather than get into a prolonged discussion and conference the members of the subcommittee felt it was easier to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. McCULLOCH. One further question, and then I shall be through: This action of the Senate was in accord, then, with the unanimous agreement of the subcommittee of the House?

Mr. WALTER. In each case well-known policies were followed.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INNOCENZA GUARASCIO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8284) for the relief of Innocenza Guarascio, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Innocenza Guarascio may be issued a nonquota immigrant visa and may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act. Upon the issuance of such nonquota immigrant visa, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the total number of nonquota visas authorized and not issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 338) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "Sister Emmanuel (Miss Margarete Fu),".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Jael Mercades,".

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Mosche Davidovitz,".

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Frieda Davidovitz,".

Page 1, line 11, strike out "Lino Aguilon Reyes,".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "Vartuhi Parsejian de Carpenter (also known as Rosa Carpenter)".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 340) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 368) for the relief of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "Purificacion de Peralta,".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 392) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Kam Man Leung."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Ellen Yuin-Shang Chung Au."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Shao-Run" and insert "Shao-Ru."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 373 to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Clelia Cusano Puglia."

Page 1, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9.

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Clelia Cusano Puglia shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 203 (a) (2) of that act, and a petition in behalf of the said Clelia Cusano Puglia under section 205 of the said act may be filed by her minor daughter, Chiarina Puglia, a United States citizen."

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yotsu Yusawa Heim, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "4" and insert "5."

Page 2, line 24, strike out "5" and insert "6."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN SPOUSES AND MINOR CHILDREN OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 387 for the relief of certain spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "Maria A. Grammatica."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "Giovannina Del S. Kennedy."

Page 3, line 11, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 11, after "Riccardi" insert "Hiroko Bergano, Lina Nagel Cassady, Chan Han Fong, Satsuko Yoda Murphy, Maria Angelina Eugenia Bravo de Staniszewski, Mrs. Ichiko Shibata Crazy Bear, Mrs. Giuseppina de Duonni, Mr. Giovanni D'Emilia, Mrs. Maria Begonia Dymsza, Mrs. Kazue Tomo-

yama Elliot, Mr. Mendel Lindenfeld, Mrs. Rose Bagnato Marciano, Mrs. Shimako Maston, Mrs. Chun Mun, and Mrs. Chieko Rainboldt."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 212 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 409 to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Josephine Braun Rice."

Page 2, strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (17), and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maitland McKinley Joseph may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

Page 2, line 13, after "Fomenko" insert "Mrs. Valerie Horsakova and Moses Kuperschmidt."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "a visa" and insert "visas."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "he is" and insert "they are."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "beneficiary is" and insert "beneficiaries are."

Page 2, line 23, after "deposited" insert "in each case."

Page 3, line 2, strike out "Pietro Pipitone."

Page 5, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 11. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Pipitone, the widower of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant, and he may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the said act."

Page 5, line 5, strike out "11" and insert "12."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 411 for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Wickham Courtney Anderson."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Pilar A. Centeno."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Yang Sin Djen Dao."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Jen-Hung (Carlos Joseph) Chao."

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "visa" down to and including line 13 and insert "fees."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "case" and insert "cases."

Page 3, line 8, after "of" insert "Rosa Grunbaum and."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Concurrent Resolution 194 granting permanent residence to certain aliens with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, strike out line 6.

Page 13, after line 12, insert:

"A-6511104, Chun, Shu Gar.

"A-7767904, Chiu, Cheng Chia.

"A-6197692, Kuo, Hsiao-Lan.

"0200-86579, Kuo, Hsiao-Mei (nee Yen).

"A-5928235, Lum, Yip.

"A-10489388, Peiker, Konstantin.

"A-9729590, Wee, Wah Kei."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARCELONA LIGHTHOUSE SITE, PORTLAND, N. Y.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1678) to provide for the quitclaiming of the title of the United States to the real property known as the Barcelona Lighthouse site, Portland, N. Y., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "Administrator.", insert "Such conveyance shall be conditional upon payment being made for such real property in an amount equal to its fair market value (excluding the value of any improvements) as determined by the Administrator after appraisal."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great satisfaction to have H. R. 1678 pass the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, because this legislation will clear the title to six-tenths of an acre of land upon which stands a lighthouse that was abandoned by the Government in 1859. This abandoned and deserted lighthouse was sold in 1872 and later restored as a dwelling. It has been in the hands of a very prominent family, the Crandalls, for many years. Mr. G. Patterson Crandall and Mrs. Nellie B. Crandall, his wife, had every right to assume that they had full title not only to the lighthouse, which was purchased from the Government, but also the site of six-tenths of an acre on which it stood. It was only recently that the United States Government claimed any title to the land. There was little value in the property, both land and tower, because it sold for $102 in 1872. Whatever value has developed in the property is due to the improvements made in it by Mr. and Mrs. Crandall. I introduced a bill to clear this title, which bill has just passed the House of Representatives with a Senate amendment; the amendment having been placed upon the bill by Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon. This amendment requires, in order to clear the title to the six-tenths of 1 acre on which the lighthouse stands, according to the General Services Administration the payment of the market value without the value of improvements to the property. The good faith of the Crandalls in believing they had the title to the real estate is indicated by the fact that they have paid the taxes on this real estate since 1910.

The Government has never spent 1 cent on this property for the last 100 years. I cannot help but feel the irony of requiring these people to pay the present fair market value to the Federal Government to clear the title when billions of dollars are appropriated and sent to every imaginable boondoggling project abroad.

I am gratified, however, that the title can be cleared by the enactment of this bill and its ultimate signature by the President of the United States.

FISHING OPERATIONS IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9280) to facilitate the conduct of fishing operations in the Territory of Alaska, to promote the conservation of fishery resources thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate the conduct of fishing operations in the Territory of Alaska and to promote the conservation of fishery resources thereof section 2 of the act approved June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 464, 465; 48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, 225), relating to the escapement in certain instances of a portion of the salmon run in the waters of Alaska, is hereby repealed.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 9280 at the request of representatives of the Department of Interior, Department of State, the fishing industry, and of the North Pacific Fisheries Commission. The bill seeks to amend the White Act of 1924 so as to give the Secretary of Interior greater discretion with respect to fixing the percentage of salmon runs which should be permitted for spawning purposes. The White Act provides that not less than 50 percent of salmon run must be permitted to escape for spawning purposes. The remainder may be taken by fishermen. The experiences under this provision of law have proved to be unscientific. Better conservation results can be had under my bill in those cases where salmon runs are so large that a 50 percent escapement would permit more fish to go upstream for spawning purposes than the stream could handle. The results in such case are wasteful. Less than a 50 percent escapement would produce better results.

While it is true that at the present time more than 50 percent escapement is required by the Secretary of Interior in most streams in Alaska, he is powerless under present law to permit a smaller than 50 percent escapement in those cases where it would be beneficial and scientific to do so.

Furthermore, Japanese fishermen have abstained from taking Alaska salmon in waters adjacent to Alaska simply because of a treaty provision which requires the United States to make full utilization of Alaska salmon resources and to follow sound conservation practices. If we fail to fulfill the treaty requirement there is no assurance that Japanese fishermen will continue to abstain from taking our salmon. My bill provides for sound conservation practices and also makes possible a full utilization of our Alaska salmon resource.

A CHALLENGE TO SECRETARY MITCHELL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has seen a demand for leadership from the administration that has been unprecedently bipartisan. And just as unprecedented has been the administration's abdication of its responsibility for leadership.

Congress and the American people have suffered from an incredible display of equivocation, of hollow promises and lip service. The administration has been consistent only in its inconsistency. It has taken a stand, then retreated, made pronouncements, then renounced them, backed and filled until it has become clear that Republican policy could only be construed in the most charitable light as being no policy.

Notable among the examples of Republican issue-dodging is the stand of the administration and the Department of Labor on the Taft-Hartley Act and its application to right-to-work laws. Again, shifts in position, contradictory statements and an obvious intent to stay on the fence have denied to great segments of American labor the right that it asks and deserves to union security through union-shop agreements. Secretary Mitchell has spent the tenure of his office wooing the support of labor, but never offering a program that reflects a small part of his pious words. The time has come to demand that he make good on the principles that he purports to embrace.

Let us look at the record. In 1954, before the 16th Annual Convention of the CIO in Los Angeles, Secretary Mitchell said that laws that make it illegal for workers and employers to enter into union-shop agreements "do more harm than good."

In the first place—

He continued—

they do not create jobs at all. In the second place they result in undesirable and unnecessary limitations upon the freedom of working men and women and their employers to bargain collectively and agree upon conditions of work. Thirdly, they restrict union security and thereby undermine the basic strength of the labor organization.[1]

In recognizing the justice of freedom in collective bargaining, why did Secretary Mitchell thus condemn right-to-work laws? For very good reasons, well known to him in 1954, and every bit as valid in 1957. The so-called right-to-work law, contrary to its connotations of freedom for all, is actually a tightening vise around unions. It provides no rights—it only denies rights.

The Taft-Hartley Act now provides minimum union security. It is minimum security because under the act, States may put on the books "right to work" statutes that restrict union activity more severely than the act provides. Seventeen States now have such laws. The act itself, however, prohibits the States from relieving Taft-Hartley restrictions. And those more restrictive State laws, which can outlaw the union shop and maintenance of membership agreements, both acceptable under Taft-Hartley, have precedence over the act. In other words, in those 17 States, wage earners and employers are prohibited from sitting around the collective bargaining table. They are prohibited from coming to mutually acceptable agreements on wages, hours and working conditions. And they are prohibited from engaging in this union activity even if both the worker and the employer desire to do so.

Secretary Mitchell was well aware in 1954 of the patent unfairness of laws that make agreements between labor and management illegal. He was aware, I am sure, that in the national picture these laws tend to undermine the stability of the national economy. It is obviously impossible to maintain a strong economy and a healthy labor market as a whole, if within that whole are islands of economic weakness and labor insecurity. This is a national problem and can only be handled on the national level by invalidating the priority given to right-to-work laws.

Yet listen to Secretary Mitchell's comments in 1957 on a bill that would place statute priority in the Taft-Hartley Act. He writes:

On March 14, 1957, I transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives three administration proposals for amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, primarily as it relates to the building and construction industry. These were introduced in the House as H. R. 6857. At the present time, I am not prepared to recommend any proposals for amendment of this act other than those provided in H. R. 6857.

The bill to which he refers does indeed make some needed corrections in the act. It removes restrictions on the building trades industry that have been unnecessary and well nigh impossible to meet, it allows employers to contribute to funds that would be used to train skilled workers, and it allows employers to group together for collective bargaining. My approval of these worthy aims is wholehearted. But this bill, which is as far as Secretary Mitchell is willing to venture along the road that he has implied is the right road, will have no effect on unfair, restrictive right-to-work laws which he has said "do more harm than good."

Now Secretary Mitchell's position is conceded to be one of hope that no more States will enact right-to-work laws. He is evidently willing to work in the interests of American labor by crossing his fingers. Is this action? Is it policy? If he in truth hopes that no new right-to-work laws are enacted, we might reasonably assume that his position is still one of disapproval of those laws, and that his disapproval might well be based on the very reasons that he announced in 1954. Why then, when presented with a bill that would remedy the situation that he deplores, does he refuse to take a stand?

And this is the same man who has recently berated Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and a number of liberal organizations for compromising their position on the civil-rights bill. He says:

They give as a reason something is better than nothing. All I can say to them is that this is not the philosophy that made our country what it is today.[2]

[1] New York Times, December 8, 1954.

[2] Daily Labor Report, August 16, 1957.

Let Secretary Mitchell condemn others for what he might construe to be an abandonment of principles when he can show the American people that he is willing to back his principles up with action. We have seen, for instance his Department's opposition to a fair minimum wage. Let him fight for the rights that labor deserves just as the advocates of civil-rights legislation have fought for the protection of the rights of the people. Then we will appreciate his words when he talks about philosophies that made our country what it is today.

I, for one, intend to give him every opportunity to make good on his words. His support of fair labor legislation is the minimum requirement. If, however, his support of the kind of revisions of Taft-Hartley that he has deemed right in the past is not forthcoming, then it is up to Congress in the next session to give such legislation priority without the blessing of the Department of Labor.

Mr. Mitchell, we are waiting.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. KEATING. 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. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader if he can tell us about the program for tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] will present some privileged resolutions from the Committee on Un-American Activities having to do with contempt citations.

Mr. KEATING. I suppose it is to be expected that there might be some rollcalls on those resolutions?

Mr. ALBERT. It is a possibility.

Mr. KEATING. Are there any conference reports coming up that the gentleman can inform us about?

Mr. ALBERT. Not that I know of at this time, but under our general reservation conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. KEATING. There will not be any other business tomorrow in addition to the resolutions the gentleman has referred to or perhaps some conference reports?

Mr. ALBERT. Or action under unanimous consent.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the acting majority leader if he knows whether there will be a session on Saturday or whether we may have the weekend off.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not planned at this time to have a session on Saturday.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the acting majority leader this question? Personally I expect to be here, but there are some Members who have made some plans and I wondered if it has been discussed whether it would be possible to put over any rollcall votes until Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. That has not been determined, and at this time I am not able to give the gentleman that assurance.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that if a conference report on an appropriation bill were brought up tomorrow, in order to expedite it, we would have a rollcall.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to inquire if any plans have been made for introducing a resolution to adjourn sine die? It seems to be the opinion of many people that if we had such a resolution to adjourn by Saturday night, it might speed up a great many matters, and some things could happen this week that will happen next week.

Mr. ALBERT. There are no plans of that kind pending at this time, to my knowledge.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Cornelia S. Roberts; and

H. R. 7384. An act for the relief of the town of Medicine Lake, Mont.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1937) entitled "An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 939) entitled "An act to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9023) entitled "An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, to extend until June 30, 1960, the authority of the Surgeon General to make certain payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care to certain Indians," disagreed to by the House; requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. COOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6127, as passed by the House of Representatives, was a moderate civil-rights bill which would nonetheless have been effective in providing more adequate protection for individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. I believe that the enactment into law of the bill, as passed by the House, would unquestionably have been in the national interest.

The bill that has now been returned to the House by the other body still bears the same number, H. R. 6127. However, in what were its most important provisions, it is no longer the same bill. Those Members of the House who supported its passage in its original form may now well wonder whether its enactment would still be in the national interest.

Part III of the bill, which would have authorized the Attorney General to bring civil proceedings in Federal courts for injunctions and other preventive relief to secure for individuals the equal protection of the laws, has been deleted. Thus, the bill would now provide a civil remedy to the Attorney General only in cases involving violation of the right to vote.

If this were the only result of the amendments made in the other body, enactment of the bill would still represent a significant step forward, even though it fell far short of what the true friends of civil rights had hoped for. A provision for an effective remedy solely in voting cases would be preferable to no civil-rights legislation at all. But even in this limited field the bill returned by the other body is not the same as the bill which was passed by the House.

The bill which the House passed would have authorized the Attorney General to follow the usual procedure in equity cases to prevent interference with the right to vote. The bill did not introduce any novel proceedings nor depart from the usual and traditional procedures for the enforcement of court orders. The other body, while concurring in the determination of the House that the Attorney General should be authorized to seek equity relief for the protection of voting rights, took the occasion to change in a vital respect the rules of procedure traditionally followed in the enforcement of equity decrees.

A court order can be of no more effect than the means available for its enforcement. The power of a court to punish disobedience of its orders by means of speedy, summary procedure without using a jury has long been recognized. It is conceded that the constitutional guaranty of jury trial does not relate to such proceedings. Nonetheless the other body, in order to meet danger imagined to exist in voting right cases, adopted a sweeping, radical, and ill-considered amendment applicable to the whole field of equity jurisprudence and to the enforcement of every court order in every case. This amendment cannot but seriously weaken and impair

the authority of the Federal courts if enacted into law. The amendment provided that no Federal court could punish for contempt of its orders without first affording the contemnor a jury trial. Under this provision even a person who deliberately disobeyed a subpena to appear in court would be entitled to a jury trial before he could be punished for his flouting of the court's authority.

On the floor of the other body it was argued that this drastic weakening of the authority of Federal judges was not intended to discriminate against the enforcement of the right to vote but that it was a desirable change in equity procedure generally. That is why, it was said, a jury trial should be a matter of right in all criminal-contempt cases. Now, however, the disastrous effect of this proposal on the Federal courts is very generally perceived and acknowledged even by some of its sponsors in the other body. It is now conceded that the amendment providing jury trials in criminal-contempt cases should be limited to contempts arising in voting-right cases only. What is this if not discrimination against the right to vote? On what legitimate basis can it be claimed that the enforcement procedures available to the courts in cases involving the right to vote should be weaker, slower, and more cumbersome than for the enforcement of any other right guaranteed by Federal law?

Surely, it cannot be asserted that in voting-right cases as distinguished from any other type of litigation Federal judges will tend more to be arbitrary and unjust toward those alleged to have violated the court's orders. The Federal judges who would hear and decide these cases are not foreign to the people of their soil nor to the areas in which they sit. They are ordinarily natives of their communities and share the social traditions and customs of those communities. At the same time, experience has shown they will be fearless in their duty, will apply the law without favor, and will uphold it with utmost integrity.

If we must now accept this weakening and unfair amendment as applied to voting right cases, let us at least make its provisions consistent with the use of trial juries in criminal cases generally. The Constitution and the laws do not require juries in all criminal cases. It has long been recognized that with respect to less serious offenses where the permissible punishment is not great, the right to jury trial does not apply. The right to jury trial in criminal contempt cases, created by this ill-advised amendment, should certainly extend no further than it now exists in criminal cases. With this in mind, it has been proposed that the first paragraph of the amendment to part V advanced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee be itself amended to add the following proviso:

> *Provided, however,* That the court in which such criminal contempt proceeding is pending may, in its sole discretion, order that the accused shall not be entitled to trial by a jury, and if such an order is entered by the court the accused shall if convicted by the court without a jury be punished by fine which shall not exceed the sum of $300 or by imprisonment not exceeding the term of 90 days, or both.

The amendment proposed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee would restrict the novel introduction of jury trial in cases of criminal contempt to disobedience of orders made in voting right cases. The further amendment which I now propose would follow the policy of not requiring juries where the possible punishment is not great.

In this connection, it is interesting to note legislation previously enacted by the Congress relating to jury trial for offenses committed in the District of Columbia. Section 11–616 of the District of Columbia Code, enacted by Congress, contains the following provision:

> In all prosecutions within the jurisdiction of said court in which, according to the Constitution of the United States, the accused would be entitled to a jury trial, the trial shall be by jury * * *.
>
> In all cases where the accused would not by force of the Constitution of the United States be entitled to a trial by jury, the trial shall be by the court without a jury, unless * * * the fine or penalty may be more than $300, or imprisonment as punishment for the offense may be more than 90 days.

Pursuant to this provision, there is no jury trial in the District of Columbia for disorderly conduct or for unlawful assembly, each of which offenses involves a maximum punishment of $250 or 90 days imprisonment. Likewise, there is no provision for jury trial in connection with the offenses of indecent exposure not before a minor, of vagrancy, of sale of unwholesome food, of violating industrial safety regulations or of speeding, all of which involve maximum penalties of a $300 fine or 90 days in jail or both. There is, likewise, no provision for jury trial for the offense of hit-and-run driving involving damage to property, a first violation of which carries a maximum penalty of $100 or 30 days and the second violation a maximum penalty of $300 or 90 days. These examples illustrate a public policy even in criminal offenses of not requiring jury trial where the offense is of a less serious nature and the maximum penalty is relatively slight.

The amendment I have proposed would, if adopted, relieve the fears expressed in the other body of harsh and excessive punishment imposed without a jury trial. It would, however, preserve to the court its right to enforce its orders in the traditional speedy and effective manner without jury trial where the punishment is limited. While I consider it just as unwise to interpose a jury in the enforcement of court orders arising in voting right cases as it is in equity proceedings generally, the present proposal will at least permit the simple and speedy procedures of enforcement that are usual in equity cases to be followed in those instances where the court considers that the fine should not exceed $300 or the imprisonment 90 days.

This proposal is advanced with great reluctance since any jury trial amendment seriously weakens the protection of the right to vote. But it at least puts some baby teeth in the ineffective and unworkable provisions of the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The proper way to resolve all the differences between the two bodies is by the normal and accepted practice of a House-Senate conference. But, due to the adamant position taken by the leadership controling this Congress and the insistence that the Congress shall at most pass only a weak and diluted imitation of a civil-right bill, the adoption of the amendment I propose would at least salvage something from the wreck wrought by the other body.

THE FARM SITUATION

Mr. HILL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, to those Members of this House who have been constantly emphasizing serious difficulties in which the farm producers find themselves, it might be well to remind them that once in a while the sun does shine through the gloom. It is not all bad regardless of the weeping and wailing of the do-gooders and especially those who would brace farm income by extending the arm of support to the extent of placing the farmers in a straitjacket under a farm pension compensatory payment plan. To my way of thinking this policy is an extremely socialistic approach.

To illustrate that everything about the farm program is not as bad as our wailing colleagues indicate, I quote from the Washington Farm Reporter, dated August 17, 1957, written by what I consider an excellent, understanding, agricultural writer, Fred Bailey:

> Prices farmers receive have turned the corner—and have been above the year-earlier figure for more than 12 months. And this has been accomplished with lower—rather than higher—price supports.
>
> Farm income is headed up for the first time in a peacetime year since 1947. Figured on a per farm basis, the increase from 1955 to 1956 was 7 percent. Also regarding the economic position of farmers: Assets are at an all-time high and average 8 times debt. Only 1 of 3 farms has a mortgage, with farm ownership being a record high.
>
> Exports are larger than ever before measured in both quantity and value. Much of the credit is due 480 export program and competitive pricing of cotton and wheat.
>
> Surplus holdings of CCC are being drawn down by roughly one-sixth during the most recent 16 months. Stocks of wheat, cotton, rice, and dairy products all are on the decline. And USDA expects further reductions during the 1957–58 marketing area.
>
> Other programs: Rural development (underway in 24 States), Soil Conservation Service (a 37 percent increase in farmers participating), Farmers' Home Administration (a 50-percent increase in loans), and ACP (a gain in practices undertaken).

When we close the books on this session of Congress we will have to conclude that no major farm legislation will have been enacted by the 1st session of the 85th Congress. However the Committee on Agriculture, on which I have the honor to serve, has done a world of work in committee and many hearings have been held and much testimony has been heard on major agricultural problems, and certainly during the 2d

session of the 85th Congress this House will have an opportunity to consider fundamental changes in the approach toward the solution of our agricultural difficulties. It is not an easy task.

The rewriting of our basic agricultural legislation is long past due and nothing will be gained by delaying action.

REVOLUTION IN LATIN AMERICA?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a United Press dispatch of July 31 from San Juan, Puerto Rico, which reads as follows:

> Nicholas Silfa, representative of the Dominican Revolutionary Party in New York, left today for Habana after 3 days of conferences of unity with the Dominican exile leaders, especially Angel Morales, president of the United Front.
>
> Yesterday afternoon Silfa, accompanied by Morales, visited briefly Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín at his residence.
>
> Silfa is in the last phases of a trip of 1 month to Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other places not revealed in order to unite the anti-Trujillo forces for the final step of the struggle against the dictator.

I am informed that the Nicholas Silfa referred to in the above press dispatch is an American citizen, and in fact, the same individual who at one time, on the basis of information whose source he claimed to be unable to reveal, charged that Galindez had been thrown alive into the boiler of a Dominican ship. This story was checked by the New York City police, with the full cooperation of the Dominican Government, and disproved. Even Mr. Silfa admits his allegation was incorrect, although it received wide publicity at the time, on his authority.

What concerns me most, Mr. Speaker, is the spectacle of an American citizen traveling throughout Latin America, and conferring with the governor of an American territory, for the open and avowed purpose of overthrowing the government of a friendly Latin American country. I do not understand, in the first place, how an American citizen can be a member of a foreign political party. Neither do I understand how our State Department can permit and provide passports for American citizens to travel abroad for such purposes. Even less can I understand the propriety of the governor of an American territory participating in conference with such an individual. Surely nothing but evil and danger for the United States can result from it.

During the last 3 years, President Remon of Panama, President Somoza of Nicaragua, and President Castillo Armas of Guatemala, have all been assassinated. The one thing that all three of these leaders had in common was their unswerving opposition to the infiltration of their countries by Communist elements. That the assassinations of Presidents Somoza and Castillo Armas was the result of subversive activities, there is not the slightest doubt. President Somoza's death was greeted with ill-concealed pleasure by Romulo Betancourt, the Venezuelan exile who is a close friend and mentor of President Figueres of Costa Rica. Betancourt works closely with Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico. Figueres invited Representative PORTER to Costa Rica. All are outspoken enemies of Trujillo in the Dominican Republic and Perez Jimenez in Venezuela. All have conferred with Mr. Silfa.

This picture seems to me frighteningly clear. The former Red officials of Guatemala, now living in Uruguay and Chile, called Castillo Armas' assassin a hero. They were intimate friends of Figueres and Betancourt. Figueres and Betancourt are attempting to get Trujillo. It is inconceivable that their plans do not call for more assassinations and more "heroes." Should this happen, the United States must assume its share of the blame for permitting activities of this nature by Silfa, an American citizen; by Betancourt, a Venezuelan who spends much of his time on American soil, who organized the Bogotá riot which almost cost the life of Gen. George Marshall; by Muñoz-Marín, Governor of an American territory, and Representative PORTER, an American Congressman.

Indeed, it seems to me that the United States has gone further than merely permitting this activity. We have given the greatest publicity and sympathy to charges by men like Silfa, Representative Porter, Betancourt and Governor Muñoz-Marín, which so far have been either disproven or unproven, and condemned their opponents without further thought. We have undertaken and are now undertaking extensive investigations of their charges, and of the Dominican Republic, for example, without investigating the people who are making the charges and why they are making them. One thing is certain, however, the assassinations of the leaders of friendly anti-Communist countries must stop, and they will not be stopped by investigating Trujillo.

THE FUTURE OF THE LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk a little bit about some people down in the tristate area of Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma who have about lost all faith in their Govment.

They are miners—lead and zinc miners. They have some real problems. But their personal problems are small, indeed, compared to the Nation's problem and the national interest in the future of the lead and zinc industry.

And that is what I want to bring to your attention today—the story of how an intelligent country willfully or negligently is maneuvering itself into an unwise and precarious dependence on foreign sources for too much of its vital lead and zinc ores.

First, let us orient ourselves with the facts of life about the world we live in, August 22, 1957.

Two powerful forces in the world, the force for freedom and the force for communism, are locked in a life-and-death struggle for survival or supremacy.

The arsenal for freedom's forces is the United States of America. The arsenal for communism is the U. S. S. R. Whatever the perimeter forces might be and however they might shift around, the real last-ditch stronghold of freedom is the United States of America and the last-ditch stronghold of communism is the U. S. S. R.

Just how long this struggle will go on nobody knows. You can get opinions that the two philosophies can coexist for the next hundred years without open warfare. You can also get opinions that an incident in Syria or Taiwan could ignite the spark overnight. The truth is, nobody knows, and anybody's opinion is just as good as anybody else's.

But this much we do know. The potential for conflict is present. The forces are powerful and getting more powerful all the time. The commitments on both sides are firming up constantly; and the conflict is basic. We hope and pray that it will not erupt in war. We are trying to prevent it. But to say that war is not a very real possibility in an explosive situation of this kind is to turn one's back on every lesson of history. We must work for peace, but constantly be vigilant.

In such an abnormal era it is essential to pay special attention to the sources of vital raw materials required for the national security.

Mr. Gordon Gray, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, told the House Ways and Means Committee recently:

> A healthy mining industry is important not only in time of peace but also in time of national emergency.

He went on to say:

> Complete reliance on nearby foreign production—

Get that; even nearby foreign production—

> in time of emergency would subject us to contingencies which could endanger the security of the country.

He further said:

> Availability of foreign metals could be dependent to a large degree on willingness to pay inflated and even exhorbitant prices.

He wound up by saying:

> Domestic production provides a somewhat greater degree of national security.

But while Mr. Gray stated the truths very well, just plain commonsense tells us that lead and zinc production capacity is essential to the security of the United States—freedom's arsenal.

In these particularly explosive times, no thinking nation should under any circumstances maneuver itself into a position where it is needlessly dependent on a precarious source of supply for a large amount of vital raw material. It is unthinkable shortsightedness. But that is exactly what this Nation is doing. Lead and zinc imports have gradually become

so far out of balance with domestic production, so utterly disproportionate, that foreign metals are now almost our primary source of supply, and it is getting worse.

Why would a supposedly intelligent nation take a calculated risk like that? Oh, there are a thousand reasons and excuses. It is said that imports are essential in the fight against inflation. It is said that we have to do it to help our allies. Still others say it really is not a risk at all because many of the mines are owned by American companies, anyway, and the sources are nearby friendly governments.

These reasons scarcely take into account, of course, that governments change sometimes, that arbitrary confiscation of private property has occurred many times in many countries, that, while we are hoping for the day when trade will move freely among peoples of the world, that day is not yet here.

To depend upon even nearby foreign production for a vital ore involves a certain element of risk.

Why take the risk until you have to take it?

The truth is that somebody wants it that way so we are doing it that way. The Nation is willfully encouraging even more dependence on foreign sources of two vital metals by permitting and sanctioning more and more imports.

Here at home we are closing down our own mines, letting them fill up with water and letting the miners disperse to other occupations. We are literally knocking a big part of an entire industry in the head because somebody somewhere wants to do it that way. Now the mystery is—who is the somebody and where is this key thinking?

Certainly, it is not the Congress because the Congress is vitally interested in this problem. The congressionally established agency of the Congress, the Tariff Commission, which was created to adjust tariffs in detail in accordance with the Congressional policy told the executive to slow down on this import business a little bit and they told them that in 1954. They asked the President to raise the tariffs to the maximum limit under existing authority so that we could get a better balance of imports and domestic production. But, apparently, when the Tariff Commission was talking in one ear of the President, somebody else was talking in the other ear. The President did not do it; and again there were plenty of excuses for not doing it.

As a substitute, the Nation started stockpiling lead and zinc supplies on top of the ground. Understand that is the hard way, that is the expensive way to store any substantial quantities of ore or petroleum. The cheap way is to keep it in the ground in its natural state. But, there were good reasons for stockpiling some lead and zinc for quick, ready emergency stockpile purposes. We did it and that was fine, but still it did not solve the whole problem. What happens after the stockpile is exhausted?

Remember—the Office of Defense Mobilization says that a healthy mining industry is essential for national security. The only way to get a guaranty of adequate stores of lead and zinc for the Nation is a healthy domestic mining industry in the United States. The situation has gone from bad to worse as situations of this kind generally do.

We were about to pass the point of no turning back in our national lead and zinc policy, and just about everybody recognizes it as a mistake. That is the strange thing about this whole lead and zinc industry situation. Everybody seems to want to correct a bad situation; but nobody does anything.

Now, the President has the authority to do it. Let us not kid ourselves about that. Under section 7 (b) of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, the President can raise tariffs to any amount that he wants to. He can impose quotas or anything else that he wants to do to preserve an industry essential to the Nation's defense requirements. The process is a simple one. The President tells the Office of Defense Mobilization to conduct a study of the lead and zinc situation. The ODM reports its findings and the President then takes whatever action is justified with almost no limitation on what the President can do. In a press conference yesterday the President explained why he had not followed this procedure with lead and zinc. He said, "The condition was represented to me as being so critical as not to allow time for such an investigation, which usually involves many months."

In other words, from that statement the President wanted faster action than that study. So they figured out at the White House the thing to do to get fast action was to get a bill through the Congress. Now if there is any slower slow-boat-to-China way of getting tariff relief for a specific product, than by trying to pass a bill through the Congress. I do not know what it could be. Passing an act of Congress takes time. Everybody in Washington knows that. Certainly, the Department of Interior and the other agencies of the executive branch acting for the President knew it, because the very bill they sent to Capitol Hill carried an effective date of January 1958. No relief was even intended before 1958.

I submit that thinking people will all agree with this obvious passing of the "hot potato" from one branch of the Government to the other, the national interest in lead and zinc in an era of potential international explosions got bogged down in the Washington bureaucracy maze. Now what happened?

Lead and zinc are essential to the national security. Both the Executive and Congress will admit that. The Tariff Commission long ago recommended to the President that something must be done to get some relief for the lead and zinc miners of America so that our domestic industry can survive. But the recommendation received a Presidential veto. The Office of Defense Mobilization says lead and zinc are essential to national security. All the President has to do is call for a study and then adjust imports to proper balance. Why does something not happen?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Yes, I yield. I would like to get the gentleman's theory.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman knows there is pending in the Congress a bill to provide protection for the lead and zinc industry. Hearings have been held on that legislation by the Senate Finance Committee and hearings have been held in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on that legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means could have met at any time in the last several weeks and reported that bill out. I assure the gentleman that, at least on the Republican side, I am advised they were requested to report the bill out immediately.

Where is the responsibility for not reporting that bill out? It is on the Democratic-controlled Ways and Means Committee of the House, and there is no doubt about it.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Now, that is one of the basic problems right there. The gentleman brings politics into the Nation's security. The politicians keep trying to make some sort of an issue out of this nonpolitical matter.

Now I do not believe the President wants to play politics with it. I believe he genuinely wants to correct the situation. But someone keeps saying, make Congress take the responsibility, even though there is ample legislative authority now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN] if he wants to continue his colloquy.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. If I could continue briefly, I would appreciate it.

You do not pass legislation to do something that the Executive is already authorized to do in the first place unless you just reach a total impasse where the Executive just under no circumstances will carry out the will of Congress. Even then, you have no assurance that the President will sign it. The President refused to sign the Tariff Commission recommendation of 1954. The President has, up to now, refused to make adjustments under section 7 B. Merely passing a bill is no guaranty that the bill would become law.

What we have to do is find out who it is, and why, someone, somewhere, is so opposed to a better balance of lead and zinc imports with domestic production. Who is it that keeps bottling up Executive action?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Missouri in his remarks a few moments ago referred to the statement made by the President in his press conference yesterday. I wonder if the gentleman is also familiar with the last two sentences of the statement in his press conference, in which he said the following:

I actually believe the best way in the long run to handle these things is through the established method which is to put it into the Tariff Commission and allow the study

to be made, and then for the President to act on it in accordance with existing law.

I understand that the industry itself seems now to prefer that method.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I was just looking for my copy of the President's statement. That is the key point. Surely, the gentleman from Wisconsin recognizes that the President himself has the authority when the President himself says so, and feels now that Executive action is the proper course to take.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not going to argue the question as to whether or not there is authority down in the White House to take some action.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Excuse me, but the gentleman was arguing that a moment ago.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No; I was not. I am trying to make the point here, and I suggest that the gentleman study the matter a little further—I am suggesting to the gentleman that the Congress has the power to do something. The President may also have power but that does not excuse us, I say to the gentleman, from doing what we ourselves can do; and certainly we can do it quicker, having held the hearings, knowing the facts, and not having to wait until the Tariff Commission or some other commission makes a finding on the subject. We should face up to our own responsibility.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Well now, I am sure the gentleman recognizes realities. Congress is nearing the end of the session and will not be in session again until January. The President can, and should, and he admits he can, do something about it. I am sure that he wants to do the right thing.

I am just hoping that no one will get to his ear before he actually gets down to doing it and stop it again this time, because the Nation's security is involved.

Further, how disgusting it must be to people back in the mining areas to see this Alphonse-Gaston act or buckpassing argument. They do not care whether the Congress has the authority, the President has the authority, whether Joe Smith or Joe Jones has the authority; what they want is that something be done, and the people who look down the road and think about the national interest want something done, too.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to compliment my colleague from Missouri for the effort he has made and the statement he is making. My State of Kansas is affected by this problem. I hope we can work something out before long that will help not only my State but also the gentleman's State, and Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I certainly thank the gentleman from Kansas who has been vitally concerned about this problem from the beginning.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I compliment the gentleman. The gentleman has made a distinct contribution to the solution of this problem. We have no lead or zinc probem in South Carolina, but it is easy for me to realize that lead and zinc are essential to the national defense, not only of this country but also of the world; and it is essential that we have lead and zinc in the United States that we can tap.

Syria was our friend yesterday; she is our enemy today. We cannot depend on so-called friends all over the world to keep the heart and core of the Free World on a self-sustaining basis.

Again I compliment the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina. He has epitomized it well.

Every thinking person in the Congress wants to see this situation corrected, because it is vital to the very core of our national defense. Why take one single risk we do not have to take?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am going to continue the discussion of this very subject and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin a little later.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am concerned about lead and zinc. The State of Montana I represent, and the district I represent is first in the production of zinc in the United States. We are fifth in the production of lead in the United States.

In the last 90 days in Montana more than 1,500 miners have lost their jobs. Since the first of the year in the State of Montana as a result of this depression in lead and zinc 2,500 of the 5,000 miners are unemployed as the result of the closing of the lead and zinc mines and smelters in the State of Montana. You can hardly pick up a paper in the West without reading that such-and-such a mine is closing. Sometimes you read that they are pulling the pumps out of the mines, or they are knocking the pillars out. Sometimes you read there is going to be a skeleton crew put in there to keep the pumps going. When they pull the pumps out, and when the pillars are knocked out, that mine is finished, that resource is gone. Sometimes the ore bodies are still there, but it would take a prohibitive sum to bring such a mine back into production in the event we would need it in a national emergency such as we had in World War II or in the Korean war. So we have the admitted fact, as the gentleman from Missouri has pointed out, that lead and zinc are metals necessary and vital to the security of this Nation. It is an industry with thousands of men employed. Everyone admits that the industry is in a critical situation.

In 1953 when a similar crisis arose I felt that the leaders of the lead and zinc industry under existing legislation should go to the Tariff Commission, where hearings would be held, and relief secured under the escape clause. They did that. They went to the Commission, hearings were held, and, as was pointed out in the letter of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a recommendation to give them the fullest relief was made to the President. Instead of that the President chose to embark upon the stockpiling program. The stockpiling program, while lead and zinc are necessary for the national defense and national security, was only going to give temporary relief until we had a full stockpile. The President recognized there was going to be some difficulty about the control of imports because he sent a letter to the Secretary of State directing him to tell the foreign producers that this was for the relief of the domestic industry and not to increase foreign production.

On August 20, 1954, the President said:

In addition, I am directing the Secretary of State to seek recognition by the foreign countries which are principal suppliers of lead and zinc that this increased stockpile buying is designed to help domestic production and they will not themselves seek to take any unfair advantage of it.

Those foreign producers paid as much attention to that as the steel producers paid to the President's directive asking them to hold down the price of steel. They continued to ship lead and zinc into this country, so that the stockpile was just another subsidy for foreign producers.

I have voted for these reciprocal trade agreements, I have voted for all the extensions to the Tariff Acts, I believe in them. I believe in them if there is a way in which to control the safety valve and take care of a seriously and critically injured domestic industry. But such relief must be a part of any act. The President is doing a disservice to the Reciprocal Trade Act when he comes to the Congress to ask for legislation to cure a situation that he has the power to cure under existing law.

I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has pointed out to the President that there is ample power and authority under existing law to give the lead and zinc industry the relief it needs. I am glad that yesterday in the news conference that the gentleman from Missouri mentioned, the President said that he believes the best way to handle these things is through the established method, which is to put it into the hands of the Tariff Commission, allow a study to be made, and then have the President act in accordance with law.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has told the President he has the authority, the President has admitted he has the authority, there is established an obvious way to take care of this situation.

Now, as we come to the closing days of Congress, it is up to the President to take the established method to protect the Reciprocal Trade Act in which he believes, or in which he purports to believe, and go the regular administrative route in trying to give relief to this industry.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I cannot understand how the gentleman and those who preceded him, as Members of

this Congress feel that they can carry out their responsibility to the lead and zinc industry by trying to shift this monkey on to the back of the President. They know, and does not the gentleman agree, that the Congress can take action on this matter? There is nothing at all that prohibits it; is not that correct?

Mr. METCALF. Congress could repeal the Reciprocal Trade Act and it could change the tariff. We can do anything we are empowered to do under the Constitution.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I want to be reasonable with the gentleman.

Mr. METCALF. But within the framework of the act, in order to carry out the provisions of the act, this Congress should require the administrative agencies to exhaust the administrative remedies.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Even within the framework of the Trade Agreements Act, does not the gentleman agree that we could pass the bill that is now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Finance Committee of the other body, and that that would be perfectly consistent with the Trade Agreements Act as such and not inconsistent with it? Otherwise the gentleman is saying that Congress might just as well cease to function in any matter relating to trade or tariffs.

Mr. METCALF. I do not say that Congress should cease to function. I do say, however, that it would be inconsistent with the framework of the present Trade Agreements Act for us to pass this special legislation to take care of the lead and zinc industry when the administrative agencies have not exhausted the administrative remedies that were written into the law to take care of this very situation. If we have a hearing before the Tariff Commission and we find that the relief granted by the present act is not adequate, I believe Congress should reappraise, reevaluate the whole tariff program so that we can take care of sick industries or industries in a critical situation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will agree that our Trade Agreements Act needs some reevaluation, and so forth. But what disturbs me is this, because I am interested in this problem of the lead and zinc people, too. We have some in Wisconsin and they are in very serious difficulty. I want to see something done. But also I want to see something done that would be dependable and frankly, amongst those of us who are discussing this matter may I say that any action by the President under the administrative procedures cannot have the same certainty of continuation, because what the President can do he can also undo. I would much rather, therefore, that it be put in the hands of Congress, put on the statute books, so that there would be some degree of certainty to the industry.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am very pleased to know that the gentleman and his colleagues on that side of the aisle are taking such an active interest in this matter. As the gentleman knows, his party for years recommended low tariffs, or, in fact, no tariffs at all. That was about the only difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party until about 25 years ago. It is not only the lead and zinc industry that is in trouble because of the low tariffs that exist. Many other industries are in trouble. The tungsten industry is in trouble. It is going to continue to be in trouble as long as we have the kind of tariff we have today. Now we have the escape clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] who has a special order to follow that of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. We have the escape clause in our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which, as the gentleman says, the President has the power to impose.

But if he would impose that escape clause for lead and zinc, you can imagine what would happen to the President. The House would come down on his head because almost every industry in America that is in trouble today because of low tariffs would insist on the very same thing. If they could induce the President to impose the escape clause for every industry that is in trouble today because of low tariffs, then I would be happy, and I hope the gentleman and his party and all those who are interested in this matter are successful in getting him to do just that. But this problem of lead and zinc and these other things just did not occur today or yesterday. They have been happening and growing for many years. This Congress should have absolutely taken a position and passed a law that would relieve this terrible situation that exists.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. May I give a short response to the gentleman from Iowa, then I shall be glad to yield all the time I have to the gentleman from Missouri.

I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that we have a law. Congress, as I see it, does not have to pass any additional law. It is written into that escape clause that whenever a case is made before the Tariff Commission where it is demonstrated that a domestic industry is critically injured as a result of the tariff, and it does not make any difference whether it is the lead and zinc or the ceramics or the tungsten industry or anything else, when the case is made before that Tariff Commission that there is a critical situation in a domestic industry, then the President should grant relief. If too many cases are made, or there are too many instances where relief should be granted, then is the time to come back to the Congress and say, "Well, we have to have some reshaping or reevaluation."

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows there are hundreds of industries in trouble today because of that.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I hope that the gentleman from Iowa is not overlooking the basic point involved in this whole thing—the national security. We should not be talking about escape clauses, reciprocal trade versus rigid tariffs, or differences of trade philosophy. Here we have vital ores, essential to the national security. The gentleman talks effectively about hundreds of different items that are in similar trouble as lead and zinc, are they essential to national security? If so, let's make sure we husband those supplies and their production capacity too.

Are imports as far out of balance in those other industries as in lead and zinc? Are imports such a disproportionate percentage of the total product consumption in the United States?

This is no trade ideology matter. I would not stand on this floor and ask rigid high level protections for industry. The lead and zinc people are not asking their government to shut off imports. They are interested in getting a better balance of imports with domestic production. If lead and zinc are essential to national security, if there is a situation internationally which requires vigilant attention to sources for critical materials, the case proves itself on its merits.

Under section 7 (b) the President has the authority. He says he has the authority. There is no point in getting into any argument about which came first, the chicken or the egg. What difference does it make whether the Congress or the President should act. The President says he has the authority to do it now. Let us get some action.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not miss the point at all. I know exactly what the trouble is and I hope it can be resolved.

Mt. METCALF. The case right now comes down to this. The President admits he has the authority. He says the proper way to proceed is through the Tariff Commission. The point today is that we have an industry that is in trouble and the President should act quickly. Anyone who reads the hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Senate Finance Committee will be convinced that there is a case for relief under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act. Everyone who has studied this question has admitted that there is a need for relief of the lead and zinc industry.

Today all I want to ask is that the President on the basis of the evidence before him and on the basis of the power and authority granted to him act quickly for the relief of this industry so that if there is a need for additional legislation, we, in Congress, can know about it and have time to enact such legislation.

LEAD AND ZINC IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to make a statement and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I would like for just a minute to comment on some of the statements that have been previously made by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman one thing at this point before he starts his speech, that he also might address some of his remarks to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means who is present instead of addressing all of our remarks to the President of the United States.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I hope I am addressing my remarks to all of the people who are gathered here in this Hall at this moment. I appreciate very much the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], for whom I have very high regard and very great respect. On the question of where the responsibility for failure to act in this situation should be placed, I think it would be a great tragedy if we become involved at great length in debating and counterdebating that question while thousands of lead and zinc miners all over the United States go hungry and their families go without clothing for the school term, which will begin in a very few weeks.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the fact and I will not in anyway question the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, that Congress does have the power to meet this situation. I do not think the gentleman from Wisconsin will question either that the President of the United States also has the power to meet the situation. What we, who represent the districts where the mines are located and where the men are out of work—what we hope is that speedily we will have a recognition of this responsibility by either the Congress or the President and that we will have substantial and speedy action to meet this problem and get the mines of our country operating once again and the payrolls in operation once again for our miners.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at this point, I want to tell him I agree with what he has said one hundred percent. May I suggest to him that then the approach to this should be—let us have the Congress proceed and let us have the President proceed and whichever arrives there first, so much the better because we will get some action. But let us not sit back in the background to wait and see what happens downtown.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman knows, of course, that I appeared befor the House Committee on Ways and Means to urge that it act on this legislation. I introduced the legislation along with Members of the House on the Republican side of the aisle. It was sent to the Congress by the White House and by the Secretary of the Interior. By the same token, I also went before the Tariff Commission in 1954 when we had this emergency situation at that time to urge relief be afforded to this industry under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The gentleman from Montana and I have supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the past and have voted for its extension. But, I have also urged when I voted for its extension that the Tariff Commission and the President of the United States act more expeditiously and more effectively in the future to carry out the escape clause and the peril point provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act because if we do not implement those sections, if we do not give to our American industry the protection which it has been given by law and if we do not afford that protection as we carry out the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, it is going to become increasingly difficult for those of us across the country who represent these impacted areas to go along with this legislation in the future. I venture to say unless we see in the near future action by the Tariff Commission and by the President on the problems of some of these terribly hit industries in this country under the escape clause or under Section 7 (b), you are not going to see in this House the majorities for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the future that you have seen in the past. On the contrary, you may very likely see a defeat of this very useful legislation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Unless this reciprocal trade agreement program is made to work, many of us who have favored the program over the years may have to vote against it and vote for some other method of relief than this escape clause as it is presently administered. But, no matter what action is taken, the President is the man who has the ultimate decision to make. In his letter to the President, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said:

> I am confident that you would not want to see the Congress by-pass and undermine your present authority under trade agreements legislation by acting on individual items.

If the President would decide, after we had passed legislation in accordance with the Secretary's recommendation that he did not want his authority undermined, he would veto that legislation. If he decided he wanted to continue this authority on the broad program, he would have to go to the Tariff Commission anyway. So the President is the man who has to make the final decision.

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is reinforced by the letter which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee sent to the President on August 15, 1957, when he said:

> I sincerely urge you to personally review the situation in the lead and zinc industries and the proposal submitted to the Congress. Upon such a review, I am sure you will be convinced as I am that you do have ample authority to provide such relief as you deem necessary in the national interest to the lead and zinc industries. I am also confident that you will agree that to by-pass the existing provisions of our trade agreements law will undermine the trade agreements program.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has very well forecast in this letter the difficulties that lie ahead for support of this program if we continue to see the administrative implementation of it that does not respect the escape clause and the peril point provisions and other protective features that have been written into the law by the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Too often, we forget that the Tariff Commission was established by the Congress to act for the Congress in carrying out the detailed adjustments in overall Congressional programs on tariffs. Created by the Congress, an agent of the Congress, its recommendations to the President of the United States are, in fact, if not in name, the same as presenting the President with an act of Congress for the President's signature or veto. Does the gentleman feel that that is being forgotten too many times?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman has made a very good point. The Tariff Commission's recommendations should receive more weight at the White House than they have received. They have failed to receive the weight to which they are entitled, both in Republican and Democratic administrations. I think that is a very unfortunate situation.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to make one more statement, then I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a local problem. This is not a problem of three States in the tristate district or some Northwestern States. The lead and zinc industry spreads all over this country from the State of New York to the State of California. There are 27 States in this Union where lead and zinc are produced by the mining industry and by miners who rely upon healthy mining conditions for their livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent at this time to insert this list of the 27 States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

THE LEAD AND ZINC MINING INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Where is the industry located? In 27 States of the Union from New York to California: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask unanimous consent

at this time to insert the testimony of Mr. Tom Kiser, vice president of the Tri-State Zinc and Lead Ore Producers Association, before the House Ways and Means Committee on August 1, 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF TOM KISER, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE TRI-STATE ZINC AND LEAD ORE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION BILL, TRANSMITTED TO CONGRESS ON JUNE 19 BY SECRETARY SEATON

I am Tom Kiser, vice president, Tri-State Ore Producers Association. I am here to represent the association, small miners, retail merchants, civic organizations, schools, and anyone else affected by our economy.

The tristate district, comprised of Oklahoma, Kansas, and Missouri, covers an area of approximately 100 square miles. There are approximately 85,000 American taxpayers in this area whose economy is very much affected by the drastic reductions in the price of lead and zinc—I might add that even though our trucks and tractors, drill steel, blasting powder, and many other supplies are jobbed locally, they are manufactured elsewhere, mostly in the East.

We of the tristate district want to thank the Interior Department for establishing the peril points at 14.5 for zinc and 17.0 for lead. We feel that at that price we can operate at a fair and reasonable profit and do some development work.

No doubt you gentlemen are aware that we have been operating on 16-cent lead and 13.5 zinc until May of this year. When the price broke to 14-cent lead and 10-cent zinc, it was brought about by ever-increasing foreign imports, no doubt encouraged by our liberal foreign-aid policies, developing and equipping foreign mines.

While many tristate mines and other mines in the United States have suspended operations, others have cut back or curtailed production, hoping for some emergency action that will enable them to survive the crisis. However, if something isn't done soon the situation will grow continually worse. It seems to be a process of elimination, eventually every mine in the tristate district is most likely to be forced out of business because of foreign imports.

Along with them will go the various supply houses, retail merchants and the whole economy of our area.

The tristate district has produced well during three major wars and will do so again if called upon, provided it has a fair price to maintain it now.

Therefore, I want to urge you gentlemen on this committee to give us your support in establishing these peril points the Interior Department has recommended. However, due to the very recent increases in the cost of electric power, blasting powder, workmen compensation insurance and steel, and the fact zinc has dropped to 10 cents and lead 14 cents, which I am sure is much lower than the Department ever anticipated.

We of the tristate district would like to have some assurance the peril points will be maintained. There is possibly a million American taxpayers in all the combined lead and zinc districts of the United States who are directly concerned or in sympathy with lead and zinc miners, who would also like to see some assurance of the peril points being maintained.

To do this we are going along with the Emergency Lead and Zinc Committee in asking for amendments which should assure the peril points are maintained.

On behalf of my association and all those affected by this crisis in our area, I thank you for the opportunity to bring our problem before you.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this time the letter of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to the President of the United States on August 16, 1957, dealing with this particular problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

AUGUST 16, 1957.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you in connection with the proposal of the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the administration, for the enactment of sliding-scale import excise taxes on lead and zinc.

Although the communication from Secretary Seaton on this subject was not received by the Committee on Ways and Means until June 19, 1957, at a time when the session was far advanced and the committee was diligently following an agenda previously determined by it, due to the importance of the subject and due to conditions in the lead and zinc industry as depicted by the communication of the Secretary, the committee broke into its agenda and conducted hearings on August 1 and 2, 1957.

I have now had time to carefully review and study the testimony which was presented to the committee at the public hearing on this important subject. It is my sincere conviction that you already have authority, previously delegated to you by the Congress in the trade agreements legislation, to afford relief to domestic industries from import competition in appropriate cases. The testimony of your representatives at the public hearings, in conjunction with the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, indicates that the lead and zinc industries properly constitute such a case in the opinion of the administration. The testimony further shows that your present authority is adequate to afford the relief which you have recommended to the Congress.

As you will recall, one of the principal purposes of the so-called escape clause provision (section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951) and the national security amendment (section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955) was to afford you an avenue under which you can provide relief from import competition to domestic industries according to the procedures and standards set forth therein. As may further be recalled, the committees of the Congress and the Congress in past years have devoted much time, thought, and attention to providing you with these powers so that our domestic industries can be afforded protection in appropriate cases and so that the national interest can be served by Presidential action without resort to further legislation.

It is clear that in this instance you have not made recourse to existing administrative procedures which are available to provide relief to these industries. In addition, you have not advised the Congress that your existing authority under the escape clause and the national security amendment is inadequate in these matters generally, although a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means last fall specifically called upon the administration for any recommendations which it might have for modifying or strengthening these provisions of existing legislation.

The testimony presented to the Committee on Ways and Means during the course of the public hearings on August 1 and 2, 1957, indicated that the proposal for a sliding-scale import excise tax on lead and zinc is almost identical in major respects with the recommendations of the Tariff Commission made to you under the lead and zinc escape clause proceeding in 1954. You rejected this recommendation, stating among other things, that the proposed relief did not meet the needs of these industries. The testimony of your representatives further indicated that the situation today in the lead and zinc industries is substantially the same as it was at the time of the escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission and your rejection of the unanimous finding of the Tariff Commission.

The testimony at the public hearings also clearly showed that the proposal which the Secretary of the Interior now recommends on behalf of the administration is almost identical in effect to a proposal that was before the Committee on Ways and Means in 1953 and on which a strongly adverse report was submitted by the State Department. The State Department set forth 10 reasons why this proposal was inadvisable and contrary to the national interest. This report was made a part of the recent public hearings.

The proposal which the administration has now recommended would not become effective, in event of its enactment, until January 1, 1958. Yet, under the national security amendment any relief found appropriate could be put into effect by you almost immediately. Also, under the escape clause I see no reason why you cannot direct the Tariff Commission to report to you within a stated time as to measures which it may deem appropriate for relief of these industries, and I see no reason why you could not have done so on June 19, the date of the proposal, or even earlier for that matter. It is clear from the testimony presented to our committee, aside from the merits of the proposal, that relief can be afforded by you much more speedily than would be the case even with enactment of the proposal.

As you of course know, I have been a strong and consistent supporter of the reciprocal trade agreements program since the inception of the program in 1934. I have consistently supported and worked for proposals which you have made to continue our foreign-trade policies, including, for example, your proposal during the last Congress and in this Congress for approval by the Congress for membership in OTC.

You have gone on record strongly supporting the reciprocal trade agreements program. At your request the Congress has provided three extensions of your authority during your administration. An important consideration of the Congress in providing these extensions was the fact that should trade agreements concessions result in such import competition that domestic industries are injured or are threatened with injury you would have the authority where it is in the national interest to relieve domestic industries of such injury.

I cannot refrain from expressing to you my very great concern as to the impact of a proposal such as the one which your administration has made concerning lead and zinc on the whole structure of the trade agreements program. In stating this, I do not intend to imply that the lead and zinc industries may not need relief. My concern is due to the fact that this proposal would completely bypass existing authority given you in present trade agreements legislation. You are asking the Congress to do that which you already have ample authority to do. The authority which you have is not selective, but broad and general, and applies to any and all industries which are injured or threatened with injury as a result of trade agreements concessions. I am sure you are aware of the fact that there are many other industries that are asking for relief from import competition. Among these are textiles, velveteen and ginghams, tuna fish, hardwood-plywood, stainless steel flatware, fluorspar, natural gas, petroleum, and many others. There are numerous bills now pending before the Committee on Ways and

Means which would provide relief from import competition on the above specified items and many additional ones. I am confident that you would not want to see the Congress bypass and undermine your present authority under trade agreements legislation by acting on individual items.

I sincerely urge you to personally review the situation in the lead and zinc industries and the proposal submitted to the Congress. Upon such a review, I am sure you will be convinced as I am that you do have ample authority to provide such relief as you deem necessary in the national interest to the lead and zinc industries. I am also confident that you will agree that to bypass the existing provisions of our trade agreements law will undermine the trade agreements program.

I can only observe in closing that there is considerable sentiment that, in the absence of your exercising such authority as you may have for an expansion of our foreign trade and the protection of domestic industries, the Congress will be forced to study again the delegation of authority made to you under the trade agreements legislation. This is an eventuality which neither you nor I would contemplate with equanimity.

The other 14 Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means concur with me in this letter.

Very cordially yours,

JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for yielding at this time. I simply wanted to make this observation. We have discussed this matter before. I have all sympathy for the people in this mining industry. I hope that either the Congress or the President does something about it, and does it promptly. But is it not a fact that under the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of the Congress to levy tariffs?

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is a fact. It is the duty of the Congress to levy tariffs.

Mr. BOW. And the Congress has in the past delegated that constitutional authority to the Executive?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct also.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman agree that perhaps it is time that the Congress got back its constitutional duties and authority in these matters?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think we are approaching a joint and collective state of mind on that question which we are very likely to see become a prevailing state of mind unless this delegated authority is exercised with proper regard for the rights and interests of American industry and American workers.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I wanted to say that at no time do I believe we should ever delegate our constitutional duties and authorities.

The gentleman from Missouri a few moments ago said that no industry had been hurt as badly as lead. I would like to point out to the gentleman the pottery industry in the State of Ohio. This industry has been practically destroyed. And we have other industries in the State, the glass industry. The gentleman from West Virginia has some industries in his State. He also is in the position of being hurt by these things.

I think it is time that we reestablished our constitutional authority and took effective action in the Congress to meet these problems.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Ohio will agree with me that we are very likely to have another week of Congressional activity here at least, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin are genuinely sympathetic toward the problems of the lead and zinc industry as are the gentleman from Montana, the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman from Oklahoma. I hope these gentlemen will join us in calling upon the President of the United States to make clear at once what his intentions are with regard to action under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act, upon the lead and zinc problem.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I just want to join my colleagues on this problem because we have some rather important lead and zinc production in my district. I understand, of course, that part of the trouble is that some of the mine owners in this country also own mines abroad. Would the gentleman comment on that; if they do, is not that the cause of some of our unemployment in this country?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is undoubtedly. I think we have some American ownership of foreign mines that affect our own production problems.

Mr. HORAN. If that be true, I think the Tariff Commission ought to take into consideration that fact, for it means unemployment in this country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I believe we all recognize that this is going to be a long-range problem and more or less of a permanent problem affecting the domestic lead and zinc industry in this country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is true.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We are always going to be dependent to some extent, possibly, on imports of lead and zinc to meet all of our needs.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But the domestic producer finds himself caught in a price competition because of these foreign imports.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The result is that our domestic market is open to these imports that make it difficult for the domestic miner to meet the price and still stay in business. He cannot operate at a loss indefinitely. That I think really is the crux of the problem facing the domestic lead and zinc industry. Is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The cheap labor situation, lower taxes, lower land values in many of these foreign producing areas are all factors that affect our domestic production.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And that this is really going to be a long-range problem; it is not just a temporary emergency that faces the industry.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think it is going to be a problem of fluctuating seriousness as it has been in the last 10 years. This is the third instance in the last 10 years in which this crisis has arisen with the lead and zinc industry of the country.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wish to follow this thought with the gentleman, because I think he recognizes that I am desirous as he is or any other Member of this House to have an environment in which our domestic lead and zinc industry can exist and continue to operate and where we will not become wholly dependent upon foreign sources.

I think it is a long-range problem as well as a temporary one which we must face.

I ask the gentleman this: Does he not feel that, being a long-range problem, it would be much better as a long-range solution to have the protection written into the statutes and on the statute books rather than being dependent upon an Executive order which can be changed at will by any President?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I see advantages and disadvantages in the gentleman's approach. I see the disadvantage that a tariff level established by the law might prove in a few years with a different price situation or continued inflation to be entirely inadequate and we might once again face the same legislative problem.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MONETARY PROBLEMS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, evidently this session will come to an end pretty soon. As evidence of the fact that Members are thinking about going home, about 125, according to the last rollcall, have probably already gone home. We certainly expect to get through within the next week or two.

The object of taking this time is to invite the attention of the Members to a subject about which there is a lot of misinformation over the country; that is a subject that involves not only our economy, our progress, taxation, inflation, high prices, high costs, but all other economic problems. I do not have a prepared statement and will not use notes but I do expect to cover certain points I believe are important.

VALUE OF MONEY

I refer to the power and authority of an agency that has the power and authority delegated to it by the Congress of the United States. Prices are determined by many factors, but one factor

has more to do with the question of prices than any other one particular factor. That is the value and the cost of money. The Constitution is very plain that Congress shall have all power over money, but, obviously, Congress cannot administer that power. So Congress has delegated it to the Federal Reserve System, which is all right if properly administered.

REPEAL OR CHANGE ONE PART

I am for the Federal Reserve System, I think it is a fine System, a great System, and I have no desire to offer any suggestion that would lead to the repeal of a substantial part of it, except one.

That is to have the Government and Government officials carry out this important function of regulating the value of money; in other words, to determine the supply of money, the cost of money including interest rates. It is a subject that we cannot dramatize. There is not enough interest in it. But yet it is the most important subject that the Members of Congress have to deal with. Members of Congress do not pay sufficient attention to it because they are not equipped to keep up with the different bills that come before Congress and at the same time study these economic problems affecting this particular power.

MISINFORMATION

Two days ago in the other body, a Member of that body inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, commencing at page 15283, a statement that was made by Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System before the Senate Committee on Finance on August 13. The reason I mention that statement is that it gives evidence of misinformation that is misleading information. Such information is passed from one person to another, from one Member of Congress to another; it is disseminated in different ways, and it is published in many newspapers of the country without opposition. Yet, at the same time, if you closely read Mr. Martin's statement you have the facts, the proof, right there.

Mr. Martin says that the "Federal Reserve bank has a board of nine directors, of whom six are elected by the member banks. Of these, three are bankers. Three more must not be bankers, but must be engaged in some nonbanking business. The other three members are appointed by the Board of Governors in Washington."

The point that Mr. Martin does not fully explain is that out of the 12 Federal Reserve districts in the United States, the private commercial banks select the directors representing two-thirds of each bank; in other words, they run each Federal Reserve bank and the 24 branches. Mr. Martin says here that there are three bankers and three in nonbanking business. He fails to bring out a point that I have often made with Mr. Martin when I have interrogated him before different committees of the House in the past, that these other three selected by the banks, a majority of them are also holders of bank stock. Therefore, that gives the bankers a majority in interest. Of course, others are interested, too, because they are selected by the banks. But a majority are interested in stock ownership in the banks.

That is a serious problem. That means that we have delegated power to people who have a private interest in regulating the supply of money, in their own interest. And we must recognize that the private enterprise system itself is self-interest. People work for themselves. You cannot get that out of human beings. It is not possible to do it. It would not be right to do it. That is expected. We expect self-interest to be there in an individual or in a corporation that is conducted by individuals.

That self-interest would dictate that they would like to have high interest if high interest would cause them to have a more profitable business. That is exactly what they have been doing, having so much power and control over the Federal Reserve banking system that the Congress has delegated the power to, and two-thirds of each board of directors of each of the 12 banks selected by the bankers themselves having a private interest and a selfish interest in having the supply of money as short as possible and the interest rate as high as possible. That is what has happened in this country the last 18 months, at least.

AN ABOUT FACE

Commencing in January 1953, a long step was made in that same direction, but they made the step so quickly and so suddenly that it almost threw the country into a recession or a depression and they had to take an about-face. On May 11, 1953, they commenced to go the other way and let interest rates go down and the supply of money become greater. But after that was over they commenced the hard money, high interest in 1955, the latter part, to really put on hard money and high interest in this country.

HIGH INTEREST CAUSES LESS FEDERAL TAXES

The taxpayers are interested in this. A large part of the national income, a substantial part, is payment of interest, and a large part of the interest that is paid is paid by large concerns, large corporations. The more interest that they pay the less taxes they are paying. So that affects your budget. It is a tax-deductible item, therefore, the higher the interest rate is and the more interest the corporations pay the less taxes they pay into the Federal Treasury. So it affects all taxpayers and reduces the amount that is collected in revenue. It is an important question.

MEMBER BANKS DO NOT OWN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

But there is another question that I want to address myself to, and really what I wanted to invite your attention to for your consideration. I have said myself, which was a true statement, on the floor of this House many times in years gone by that all the stock that is owned in the 12 Federal Reserve banks is owned by the private commercial banks, the members of the System. That is absolutely true. At one time I even offered a bill to the effect that we should have the Government buy that stock, recognizing that it was stock that was owned by the commercial banks. But since that time we have had an investigation and study by the Joint Economic Committee composed of Members of the House and Senate. In 1952 I happened to be chairman of that committee, and we went into this question thoroughly and discovered that what they call stock in the Federal Reserve System is not stock at all. It is not stock. They call it stock, and they still claim that they own the System because they own that $330 million in stock. It is not true at all. It is a misnomer. That is misinformation. It is a hoax. It is not true.

What does the proof show? The proof shows that every bank that is a member of the System makes an involuntary investment into the Federal Reserve bank in the district in which it is located of 3 percent of its capital and surplus. As this capital and surplus goes up they have more invested. As it goes down they have less invested. Is it stock? It carries no proprietary interest. That is the test of real stock, genuine stock, stock that is worth something, that you can do something with. So it carries no proprietary interest, not at all. The bank that holds that stock cannot sell it. The bank that holds that stock cannot hypothecate it. The only thing that stock amounts to is that the bank collects 6 percent every year as a dividend on it. That stock serves no purpose whatsoever. Imagine $330 million in so-called stock having any real worth in the Federal Reserve banking system, that owns $23 billion worth of bonds, for instance, and has assets of tens of billions of dollars. It serves no useful purpose, should be returned to the member banks and the taxpayers saved $20 million a year.

The 12 Federal Reserve banks have a surplus of $745 million. It really belongs to the Government. We could use $330 million of this surplus fund to pay the banks for their so-called stock and there would remain $410 million, in these surplus funds which is not needed and for that reason we could consider paying it into the Treasury and save the taxpayers that much.

I have over the last two decades interrogated the heads of the Federal Reserve banking system, Mr. Eccles, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Martin, the Open Market Committee composed of 12 members who really run the show, and many others. This you can put down as the absolute fact—that the Federal Reserve banking system is not owned by the private banks. It is owned by the Government of the United States.

FEDERAL RESERVE INDEPENDENCE

Before 1951, the Federal Reserve Board had been looking for an opportunity to declare its independence from the executive and at a time when the then executive was at a low point in popularity, we will call it, the Federal Reserve Board defied the President of the United States and said, "We are not going any longer to support the price of Government bonds at par and above par. We are just going to let the bonds go down, down, and down." So, Mr. Truman, the President of the United States, called the Federal Reserve Board and the Open Market Committee into the Executive offices of the President at the White House and he told them how ter-

rible that would be and that it would be greatly destructive to the public interest. The President got a promise from them that they would not do it. There are letters to that effect. They are in the RECORD. I put them in the RECORD in 1952. So, Mr. Truman resisted it. They promised then that they would not do it. But, after they left the White House, notwithstanding their promise, they defied the President of the United States and on March 4, 1951, they quit supporting the prices of Government bonds. But their wings were short and they did not yet have a feeling of security in that new power of defiance and secession so they went rather slow and easy in 1951 and 1952. They did not do much about it. But, when the present President came in and said, "We are going to recognize the independence of the Federal Reserve Board," that gave them real independence. That is what they had been waiting for and they did not have it until this administration gave it to them. They do not have it now so far as the Congress is concerned because they are agents and servants of the Congress of the United States. They are obligated to carry out the will and wishes of the Congress of the United States. They are not independent of the Congress. Let me read you another statement that Mr. Martin made in this statement of August 13 that proves the point I made about the stock:

> The stock of each Federal Reserve bank is held by the member banks of its district. This stock does not have the normal attributes of corporate stock.

From whom does this come? It comes from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He says this stock does not have the normal attributes of corporate stock. He said further:

> Rather it represents a required subscription to the capital of the Reserve bank and the dividend being fixed by law at 6 percent, the residual interest and the surplus of the Federal Reserve banks belong to the United States Government not to the bank stockholders.

Now that is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board speaking to the Senate Committee on Finance on August 13.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. The gentleman from Texas is making a splendid statement and there should be more Members here to listen to him. Is it not a fact that these banks which the gentleman mentions are getting 6 percent on money that is not used? Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the credit is there but the money is not used. The other day when Mr. Martin was on the witness stand—and over the years I have interrogated him to the extent that I know the questions that I can ask him and get short answers to—so I asked Mr. Martin, "Is it not a fact that whenever the Federal Reserve banks buy United States Government bonds that they take the money from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing which does not cost the Federal Reserve bank anything and trade that money for Government bonds and then keep the Government bonds and charge the Government interest on those bonds?"

He admitted that it was true. There was nothing else for him to do because I know it is true and the records show it is true. Now, then, the Federal Reserve banking system is collecting each year in that way $600 million in money—interest on these Government bonds that they have bought with Government money; money that is collected from the taxpayers each year.

They use that money for any purpose that they want to use it for. Then after they have used all they want and for whatever purpose they want to use it, 90 percent of it goes into the Treasury. But there is no audit of their books. Remember this—it is a startling and a shocking statement—although the Federal Reserve banks have issued and distributed hundreds of billions of dollars in United States Federal Reserve notes, yet no audit has ever been made by the Government of the United States. Do not forget that. The only audit that has ever been made is a self audit, where they have appointed their own auditors who have made their own investigation and their own report to them. That is the only audit that has ever been made.

On this stock I asked another question of Mr. Martin. "Is it a fact, Mr. Martin, that buying these Government bonds you do not use this stock of the member banks?" He had to answer that he did not. I said, "Is it not a fact that you do not use the reserves of the member banks to buy those bonds?" He had to answer that he did not. He had to reply that these $23 billion of bonds held by the 12 banks were all bought on the credit of the United States, without using anything that belonged to the member banks.

All right. Where do we go from there? We know that is not good business. Suppose the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] should have a mortgage of a thousand dollars against his home, and he gave me out of his pocket $1,000 and said, "Mr. PATMAN, take this money and pay it to the man who holds that $1,000 mortgage." He says, "I want to pay off my mortgage."

I take Mr. Dorn's $1,000, and I carry it to the man who holds the mortgage. I pay him the $1,000, and I ask him to transfer the mortgage to me, not to Mr. Dorn, transfer to me that mortgage, and I hold that mortgage and continue to charge Mr. Dorn interest every year. That would not make any sense, neither commonsense, book sense, or horsesense. That is exactly what we permit to be done in the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve takes money from the Bureau of Engraving: Federal Reserve notes. Who promises to pay these notes? The United States Government. Such a note is exactly the same as a bond. The only difference is it does not bear interest. It carries the same obligation to pay. The United States Government promises to pay, on demand, so many dollars. They take those notes and trade them for United States Government bonds, just like I would trade that $1,000 for the mortgage. Then they keep those bonds in a lock box, in the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and they collect interest on those bonds. Does that make sense? No, it does not. But it is going on all the time.

Suppose the Congress should say, "Well, instead of having appropriations each year from the Congress, we are going to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to have printed so many billions of dollars worth of Government bonds drawing 3 percent interest and turn them over to the Clerk of the House and the clerk of the Senate and let them draw the interest on them every year and make no accounting to anybody; have no Government audits, no supervisors, no investigations, as we would have our own money." That would be a comparable situation if we took Federal Reserve notes from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to pay for them.

That is what the Federal Reserve is doing. Maybe that would not be so bad if the Federal Reserve were being used solely in the public interest, but I do not believe it is. I am not charging any corruption, I am not saying that they are evil men, I am just saying that the System is not being operated in what I consider to be or what I believe to be in the public interest.

All right. Now, Mr. Martin, in making these declarations in these statements has also made some concessions. You have got to read the fine print in order to find out the concessions. Remember this, the Federal Reserve banking system does not belong to the banks of this country, but the banks of the country select a majority of the directors of each Federal Reserve bank and, therefore, they have a lot of control over the System, sufficient control and influence that they have gotten what they wanted. The greatest power 12 men ever had is in the Federal Open Market Committee.

MONEY SCARCE—INTEREST RATES HIGH

The bankers want money scarce and they want interest rates high. Why do they want money scarce? Because they, the commercial banks, have the exclusive privilege of issuing money, exclusive privilege except what is created by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. That is the only way we can expand in this country, that is by debt. The only way you can have more money is to have more debt. That is the capitalistic system. I am not condemning it; I am for it if it is worked in the public interest and not against the public interest. That is what is happening.

BONDS FORCED DOWN

We have $160 billion in marketable bonds, the bonds that are sold in the markets every day, open markets, $160 billion worth. If they were liquid the people could turn their bonds in and get their money. If a neighbor wanted to build a house and could not get the financing you would probably sell your bonds and let him have your money and you would draw more interest on it. But if the bonds are run down in price to where you would be taking a loss, you would not want to turn them in and get cash on your bonds, your bonds would be immobilized and taken out of competition with the bankers. The bankers and the moneylenders know that when

they run the price of bonds down to 95, 90, or down to 85, they immobilize all of that money and take it out of competition with the banks, while the banks can create and lend $6 for every $1 of reserves they have. So the demand would be much greater for the scarce money; naturally it would be; and the demand being much greater for the scarce money interest rates go up.

I just want to put these facts before you, my friends, so that during this recess you will possibly give them some consideration. I know this is a rambling speech, without preparation, but I do hope Members will study these problems.

We have the finest commercial banking system in the world if it is operated as banks are organized to operate. We have a fine Federal Reserve banking system. If you will just take the bankers off the policy-making boards, if you will just say, as Woodrow Wilson said when he asked for the passage of the Federal Reserve Act, that bankers not be given the privilege of being on a board that would determine the volume of money or the rates of interest. President Wilson said it would be just as reasonable to put railroad owners on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight rates as to put bankers on the Federal Reserve Board to fix interest rates and determine the supply of money.

When Woodrow Wilson got the Federal Reserve Act through in 1913 there were no bankers on the Federal Reserve Board. But all that has been changed; it has become a central banking system. We have a central bank now where we had a system of regional banks, each bank autonomous, 12 regions. It has been changed into one system. There was no central bank before 1935. It is different now. It is not the same system at all; it is entirely different. It was completely changed in 1935. The Federal Open Market Committee that now has the real power to control money and interest rates is composed of the seven members of the Board and five presidents of Federal Reserve banks who are selected by boards of directors, a majority of whom (two-thirds to be exact) are elected by the private commercial banks.

The local Federal Reserve banks have little power themselves now. The power is centered in Washington and New York. Most of the power is in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. An employee of this bank buys and sells Government bonds by the millions of dollars each year for all 12 Federal Reserve banks.

You take the Federal Reserve Board of seven members, do you know how many people help them perform their duties? Twelve bankers, one from each Federal Reserve district, and 12 presidents of Federal Reserve banks; 5 of them can vote on the Open Market Committee. So they are right around this board of seven. Do you think the public has much of a chance of getting any sympathy in a case like that where there are 7 members of a board to represent the public, surrounded by 24 bankers and people who are selected by representatives of the banks to represent them? In other words, three to one. Suppose the law required each Member of Congress to confer with and advise with three bankers before casting a vote? Suppose the law permitted 1,800 bankers to surround the 435 Representatives and 96 United States Senators in all their deliberations and actually allowed 400 or more of them to vote? What chance would the people have?

So I ask that these questions be considered, Mr. Speaker, and let us do something about it at the next session of the Congress.

LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, these remarks are by way of comment and correction on the speech made Tuesday, August 20, 1957—RECORD, pages 15404–15406—by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] and entitled "Foreign Policy." With much of what the gentleman says I heartily concur.

I make these comments because much of what the gentleman says appears to be directed against the policies I have been advocating to make our fight against international communism in Latin America more effective.

The gentleman does not mention, much less meet head on, my recommendations that we differentiate between the dictatorships and the democracies and frame our policies accordingly by cutting off all financial aid to the dictatorships, by instructing our ambassadors not to appear to be warmly intimate with the dictators and to help the democracies in every way possible.

Instead he states:

> Just a few words today from the President, the Secretary of State, or even the Secretary of Defense actually, would bring an end to the mysterious and ridiculous attack on the Dominican Republic.

I gather from what the gentleman later states about his confidence that the Joint Chiefs of Staffs "will support the fact that the Dominican Republic is vital to us," that the gentleman believes this to be true and controlling. He wants the "attack" on the so-called Dominican Republic to stop because of its presumed great military importance, because the Jews there are enthusiastic about the Government and because the archbishop there apparently will certify that everything is just fine.

The gentleman is in error in characterizing the attack on the so-called Dominican Republic as "mysterious and ridiculous." There is no mystery about opposition to a ruthless dictator and there is nothing ridiculous about the murder of Gerry Murphy, the young son of two of my constituents in Eugene, Oreg.

It was my privilege to testify yesterday before the Federal grand jury considering the Murphy-Galindez cases. I urged them to indict Trujillo for the murder of Gerry Murphy. The evidence is overwhelming and most of it appears in notes from our State Department. We rejected the official Dominican explanation for the death of Gerry Murphy. We asked twice, in our most formal and urgent manner, that General Espaillat, formerly consul general in New York, be "amenable for the usual processes of investigation and trial." This was refused.

Gerry told his fiance just before he disappeared that he had to go to the dictator's palace. He had earlier told her that he believed he had flown Galindez from the United States. The elaborate explanation built around the de la Maza suicide shows guilt by Trujillo. Refusal to make Espaillat available shows guilt. The chain of circumstances is strong and unbroken.

Murder of Gerry at Trujillo's order fits the pattern of this dictator's way of life. One murder has no moral meaning to a man who ordered thousands of Haitians slaughtered in 1937. The decisive factor then, as now, was his estimate that he could get away with it.

As for the military importance of that unhappy land, I say show me, please, how it can be of any substantial importance in case of an attack by the Soviet Union. By Latin American standards they have a formidable military force, but compared to the forces of a great power they have nothing.

The real danger from international communism in Latin America, and especially in dictatorships like Trujillo's, is from within, since totalitarianism prepares "a climate for the growth of communism," as a notable editorial in the New York Times, August 21, 1957, puts it.

This editorial also is an apt reply to the gentleman's recommendation that we ought to give the so-called Dominican Republic credit, a pat on the back, encouragement and so on. The editorial in its entirety is as follows:

> A PROBLEM IN POLICY
>
> The Kingmaker of the Caribbean, Generalissimo Rafael L. Trujillo, has just had his brother Hector crowned as President of the Dominican Republic for another 5 years. President Trujillo is a weak, amiable, agreeable person who will continue to act as the formal front for his formidable brother, the military dictator of the last 27 years. One thinks in terms of a coronation because the Generalissimo is certainly trying to establish a dynasty to carry on the family rule after he dies.
>
> The ceremony last week was a reminder of the curious anomaly in American foreign policy, one that creates a great deal of critical discussion, especially in Latin America, although not exclusively there. This is the extent to which American policy concentrates on anticommunism to the exclusion of antifascism or—in this case—antimilitarism and dictatorship. During the 1930's the danger to the Free World of fascism was clear, so clear that we ended up fighting against fascism in the greatest of all wars, with communism as our ally.
>
> Having defeated the Axis we found that the other Janus-face of totalitarianism—communism—was the present danger. As a result, we have taken the line in the cold war that whoever fights communism is therefore our ally. When Guatemala threatened to go Communist we intervened to overthrow the Arbenz regime. On the other hand, our

relations were notably friendly with Peron of Argentina, Perez Jimenez of Venezuela, Somoza of Nicaragua, Batista of Cuba, Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, Franco of Spain.

Yet it is surely as clear today as it ever was that the enemy of liberal democracy is not just communism but totalitarianism in any form. It should not be sufficient for a military dictator such as Generalissimo Trujillo to say that he is anti-Communist to win American support and encouragement, and yet this is what has happened everywhere in these postwar years. One weakness of the policy is that these dictators in reality prepare a climate for the growth of communism and most of them, Trujillo included, have dealt with the Communists when it suited their purpose.

Anticommunism covers a multitude of sins for the American State Department. So does a rug when the dirt is swept under it.

Several other corrections need to be made. The gentleman says he does not "carry a pistol around the Congress as evidence of my crusade and willingness to work for my constituents." I do not, either. When I do carry a gun, I do so because many responsible and informed persons, including the Washington police, have urged that I do so.

Would the gentleman advise I ignore this advice?

I never carry a gun around the Congress. The Dominican effrontery is immense, but I doubt that it would include an attack on these premises.

After reciting a press report that I favor trading with Red China as a boon to the Oregon economy, the gentleman asks, "Just who does the House think we fought a war with in Korea?" I remind the gentleman we also fought a war with Japan and with Germany and today we trade with them.

I also remind the gentleman that such trade would be in nonstrategic goods and that we, in return, would obtain many items which would strengthen our economy.

The gentleman's reference to the "millions and billions we might vote out of the Treasury to get a 20th century crusade going against so-called dictators" is, to say the least, obscure. I have made no such proposal. I do believe in stopping foreign aid to Latin American dictators because we get nothing in return for the taxpayers' dollars. And, I want to add, they are not so-called. The dictators are real dictators and even our State Department, if pressed, will admit it.

Latin America offers tremendous opportunities for private and public investment. Our military and economic aid, however, should be restricted to those instances where our national security is enhanced accordingly.

I was astonished and disgusted by the letter to the gentleman from the President of the House of Deputies of the so-called Dominican Republic and which the gentleman sets forth in full in his speech.

It vilifies Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, who is an outstanding democratic leader in Latin America, as one who has "dedicated himself to favoring the agents of international communism." It also libels the FBI. I cannot understand why the gentleman consented to be a party to such smears.

For myself, I care not what any harlot parliamentarian of the so-called Dominican Republic says. I know his lips speak his master's words. But I am amazed that the gentleman from Wisconsin would give such a statement any weight at all. The gentleman must know that the legislative body there does what Rafael Trujillo says, just as do the President and the other officers. It is more a prison than a republic.

In closing, let me say that I am grateful for the gentleman's interest in Latin America and in our fight against international communism there. I wish more Members would undertake to inform themselves on these subjects.

It is clear that our aims are identical. We do disagree with regard to the value of dictatorships as allies in the struggle against international communism. This is a matter for further consideration by Congressional committees and in the Halls of Congress. Certainly how we resolve this issue could well decide the ultimate battle between the forces of freedom and tyranny.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 8490.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALLEN of California, for 30 days, beginning on August 23, 1957, on account of personal and official business.

To Mrs. HARDEN (at the request of Mr. DAWSON of Illinois), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, for 45 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes on tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), on Tuesday next, his subject being One Hundred Years in This Chamber.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. LONG.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN) and to include a speech by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 491. An act for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 864. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 293. An act 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;

H. R. 787. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the United States of America and the State of California;

H. R. 1944. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to make inapplicable, in the case of the survivors of certain members of the Armed Forces, the provisions which presently prevent the payment of benefits to aliens who are outside the United States;

H. R. 2741. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands of the United States to the Hermann Hospital Estate, Houston, Tex.;

H. R. 2842. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of certain tanning extracts, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to suspend temporarily the tax on the processing of coconut oil;

H. R. 2979. An act for the relief of Mary Hummel;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico, between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America;

H. R. 3583. An act for the relief of Chandler R. Scott;

H. R. 3658. An act to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits;

H. R. 4602. An act to encourage new residential construction for veterans' housing in rural areas and small cities and towns by raising the maximum amount in which direct loans may be made from $10,000 to $13,500, to authorize advance financing commitments, to extend the direct loan program for veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6166. An act for the relief of Michael S. Tilimon;

H. R. 6456. An act to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned;

H. R. 6952. An act to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries;

H. R. 7458. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7467. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the citizenship and residence qualifications of the directors or trustees of certain companies in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7697. An act to provide additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance of interests of the United States in and to fissionable materials in certain tracts of land situated in Cook County, Ill., and in Buffalo County, Nebr.;

H. R. 8079. An act to amend the act of June 20, 1910, by deleting therefrom certain provisions relating to the establishment, deposit, and investment of funds derived from land grants to the State of New Mexico and Arizona;

H. R. 8240. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8753. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include California, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Rhode Island among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage;

H. R. 8755. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social-security coverage, under its agreement, separately for those of its employees who are covered by a retirement system and who desire such coverage, to include Alabama, Georgia, New York, and Tennessee among the States which may obtain social-security coverage for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system on the same basis as other State and local employees, and to extend the period during which State agreements for social-security coverage of State and local employees may be made retroactive;

H. R. 8892. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social-security purposes and to permit such a minister to include, for social-security purposes, the value of meals and lodging furnished him for the convenience of his employer and the rental value of the parsonage furnished to him, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8929. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1935, as amended, to permit the disposal of lands and interests in lands by the Secretary of State to aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 959. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed or food on the farm, and for other purposes;

S. 1866. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers," approved May 10, 1956, in order to provide adequate time for the formulation and consideration of rules and regulations to be prescribed under such act; and

S. 2431. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Klamath River Basin compact between the States of California and Oregon, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1652. An act for the relief of Rajka Markovic and Krunoslav Markovic;

H. R. 1797. An act for the relief of Maria Sausa and Gregorie Sausa;

H. R. 2058. An act for the relief of the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 2237. An act authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to Johnson City National Farm Loan Association and the East Tennessee Production Credit Association, local units of the Farm Credit Administration;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of the estate of Leatha Horn;

H. R. 2816. An act to provide for the conveyance of Esler Field, La., to the parish of Rapides in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5757. An act to increase the maximum amount payable by the Veterans' Administration for mailing or shipping charges of personal property left by any deceased veteran on Veterans' Administration property;

H. R. 5807. An act to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended;

H. R. 6521. An act to modify section 3 of the act of June 30, 1945 (59 Stat. 265);

H. R. 7383. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7825. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 8429. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act;

H. R. 8586. An act for the relief of Pasquale Pratola;

H. R. 9188. An act to amend the act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain lands and improvements comprising the Castle Island terminal facility at South Boston in exchange for certain other lands;

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 19, 1957, as National Olympic Day;

H. J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels for utilization on essential trade routes 3 and 4;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain persons;

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the second World Metallurgical Congress;

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the St. Lawrence Seaway celebration to be held in Chicago, Ill., from January 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959; and

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 23, 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:

1153. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1958, involving an increase of $114,625,000, for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 229); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1154. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 30 reports covering 43 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1155. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize construction of a U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial at Pearl Harbor"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1156. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1157. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the custodianship functions of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1158. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration for the period March 31, 1957, through June 30, 1957, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. McMILLAN: Committee of conference, H. R. 1937. A bill to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation by the Armory Board of the District of Columbia of a stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1220). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 399. Resolution to increase the postage allowances of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1221). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 9282. A bill to provide additional office space in home districts of

Congressmen, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 401. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the historical data regarding the creation and jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and providing for additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 9406. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 279. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 64 and House Resolution 65; without amendment (Rept. No. 1225). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration, House Concurrent Resolution 188. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the document entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem; 56 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–1956"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 31. Concurrent resolution favoring the fulfillment of the program recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission for the publication of certain documents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1227). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. S. 2434. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 392. Resolution authorizing the printing of certain proceedings in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 401. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the historical data regarding the creation and jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and providing for additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 176. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of certain material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and providing for additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 215. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain public hearings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 39. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document and for additional copies of the report of the Commission on Government Security; without amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9131. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1235). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 8490. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 9406. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9407. A bill to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 9408. A bill to prevent the unauthorized censorship by broadcasting, television, telephone, telegraph, and all similar companies, or networks, of songs, tunes, words, lyrics, and other material and things; and providing certain procedure to be followed in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 9409. A bill to amend titles 10 and 14 of the United States Code to provide that cadets and midshipmen entering the service academies hereafter shall agree to serve 10 years on duty after graduation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (by request):

H. R. 9410. A bill to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 9411. A bill to prohibit the inclusion of certain matter on envelopes and like wrappers containing mail matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 9412. A bill to provide that the income derived from the rental of living accommodations, where the owner of the property provides services in connection with such rental, shall constitute net earnings from self-employment for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 9413. A bill to establish a program of national scholarship loans for undergraduate and graduate study in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 9414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 9416. A bill to amend the laws relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and first assistant physician of the hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 9417. A bill to permit a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 and is disabled, or whose spouse has attained the age of 65 and is disabled, to deduct up to $20,000 of medical expenses incurred in any year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the admission of new States as sovereign States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 227. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the promulgation by the Secretary of the Treasury of certain Federal firearms regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 9418. A bill for the relief of Ming Sang Quon (Quon Ming Sang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 9419. A bill for the relief of Lily Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 9420. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Felisini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 9421. A bill to provide for Federal grants to the Blinded Veterans Association, Inc., to aid in the establishment of a program of assistance for blinded veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9422. A bill for the relief of John (Giovanne) Tiberio; 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:

335. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Wilfred A. Kenney, Sr., and sundry citizens of Durham, N. C., opposing jury-trial amendment in civil-rights legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

336. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Clema Bingham, Norwalk, Calif., requesting a thorough Congressional investigation of the Food and Drug Administration to correct abuses and restrain this branch of Government from trying to destroy the Hoxsey treatment for cancer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1957 were received after April 20, 1957, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $458. E. (9) $431.14.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,858.83. E. (9) $9,858.83.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $6,876.22.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,778. E. (9) $10,778.

A. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $50,736.13. E. (9) $23,935.93.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $5,846.10.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $473.27.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gene R. Arnold, 7424 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, Md.
B. Reserve Equalization Committee, care of Floyd Oles, 1018 South 60th Street, Tacoma 8, Wash.
E. (9) $44.71.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,237.73.

A. Beghtol, Mason, Knudsen and Dickeson, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $25.33.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mills Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,654.48. E. (9) $2,654.48.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,850.87. E. (9) $2,850.87.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. Hub Hill, 2121 North Field Street, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $708.76.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. North Texas Municipal Water District, Wylie, Tex.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $402.81.

A. Roland Boyd, 202 Central National Bank Building, McKinney, Tex.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,500.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mrs. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Sr., Grossenbaumerstrasse 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $127.94.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft für Privatrechtlichte Auslandsinteressen, e. V. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $290.05.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $242.55.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Bernard N. Burnstine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Butler & McKinney, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Richard Haster and wife, and A. E. Arnold, 2435 West First Street, Santa Ana, Calif.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $101.33.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Metal Trades Council, AFL–CIO, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $3,909.40. E. (9) $2,702.50.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Cliff D. Carpenter, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $149.87.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frankie Childers, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,232. E. (9) $780.

A. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act, National Consumers League, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $1,794.55.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,412.41. E. (9) $5,131.04.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $84.64.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,325,983.10. E. (9) $5,505.35.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $310.51.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $700.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $145.81. E. (9) $211.56.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $64.60.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $824.99.

A. Dorothea de Schweinitz, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act of the National Consumer's League, 438 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,120. E. (9) $85.73.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $1,200.17.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $638. E. (9) $76.75.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Room 7319, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,109.05. E. (9) $495.53.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $11.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $641.62. E. (9) $641.62.

A. Clyde L. Flynn, Jr., Elizabethtown, Ill.
B. Independent Fluorspar Producers Association, Attention, J. Blecheisen, Rosiclare, Ill.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $4,292.23.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Leo Goodman, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $ 1,080. E. (9) $354.33.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $200.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $114.35.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $88.68.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William B. Henderson, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,466. E. (9) $3,385.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $147.38.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,514.29. E. (9) $1,514.29.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $115. E. (9) $27.44.

A. Ray L. Hulick, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $16.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,467.10. E. (9) $2,467.10.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,892.50.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $4,714.50.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.21.

A. Franklin R. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Room 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P. Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. King & Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,146.23.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $755. E. (9) $175.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Rose Leibbrand, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $23,390.85. E. (9) $2,109.93.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Linen Supply Association of America, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $138.62.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $504.85.

A. Harry B. Madsen, 1559 North McKinley Road, Lake Forest, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,175. E. (9) $418.09.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
E. $46.16.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,617.50. E. (9) $752.40.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E (9) $2,349.59.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, 1710 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,152.

A. Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, 1908 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, 132 West 43d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $675.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $84.45.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
E. (9) $146.51.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $62.49. E. (9) $105.14.

A. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $257.70. E. (9) $257.70.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $1,066.10. D. (9) $412.03.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,014.09. E. (9) $1,192.52.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,894.63. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $19,050. E. (9) $17,845.75.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $832.34. E. (9) $1,923.16.

A. National Council Against Conscription, Box 170, Nyack, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,592.16. E. (9) $1,020.87.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,197.50. E. (9) $5,500.

A. National Council of Salemen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $107.38.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,375.11. E. (9) $7,375.11.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $825.15.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,475. E. (9) $15,498.75.

A. The National Rural Letter Carrier's Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,692.25. E. (9) $5,879.91.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,838.16. E. (9) $13,144.20.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $392.50.

A. John W. Nerlinger, 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $136.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $834.40.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $32.52.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D. C.
D. (6) $737. E. (9) $787.30.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $28.02.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $136.37.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $37.70.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $141.35.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,939.18. E. (9) $1,010.73.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $23.55.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $70.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,712.28.

A. Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,600. E. (9) $95.74.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N. Y.; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, New York; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,499.97. E. (9) $5,639.44.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush, Chicago, Ill.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,044.83.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Rice & King, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. D. Gottlieb & Co., 1140 North Kostner Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $32.70.

A. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $19.40.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $268.68.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 8 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 8–108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 1975 West Sixth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of U. S. A., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $325.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $286.99.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufactures Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $48.17.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $202.65.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Paul Sifton, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $1,740. E. (9) $1,291.70.

A. R. S. Smethurst, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C .
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,309.80.

A. William D. Snow, 970 Spitzer Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., 325 Farwell Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $93.26.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $4,482.39. E. (9) $4,130.90.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $340.12. E. (9) $148.28.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $175.86. E. (9) $175.86.

A. Eugene C. Struckhoff, 93 North Main Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston and Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,096.44.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,375.25.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Manufacturing Co., 3401 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $21.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Glenn E. Watts, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $526,82.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $383.22.

A. Roger J. Whitford, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Marian Diane Dalphine Sachs, Beekman Hotel, New York, N. Y., and Arthur Sachs, care of Moses & Singer, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank G. Wolliney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poulty Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $179.95.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $65.64.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1957:

NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register" place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reportingrequirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "EMPLOYEE".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employees; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat oflegislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarter ly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expand except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during the Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through_____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Doe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6"), and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$,750.00	7–11	Doe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $272.50.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,362.98. E. (9) $25.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $31.25.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,301.50. E. (9) $10,438.77.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,420.66. E. (9) $6,420.66.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,080. E. (9) $364.15.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) 426.16.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $6,400.70. E. (9) $6,400.70.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $25,374. E. (9) $25,374.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $32,584.61.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,965. E. (9) $11,013.68.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $594.75.

A. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,899.08. E. (9) $11,289.08.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $156,188.29.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,836.40.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $838.34. E. (9) $903.89.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $12,244.03.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $26,475.43. E. (9) $3,670.59.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $334,964.87. E. (9) $3,233.44.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc. (Development Fund-Legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,593. E. (9) $500.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $482.37. E. (9) $482.37.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,262. E. (9) $8,510.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,841.56. E. (9) $1,879.32.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $86,201.29. E. (9) $9,301.74.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,470.15. E. (9) $2,430.15.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $1.24.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,000. E. (9) $4,708.57.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $8,749.08.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,120.66. E. (9) $2,105.86.

A. American Veterans World War II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,562.50.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,338. E. (9) $2,301.16.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $1,620.10.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $119. E. (9) $491.92.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $87. E. (9) $1,174.40.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $434.45.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class I Railroads Operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,368.99.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Simon & Shuster, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20,540.45. E. (9) $20,540.45.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,076.96. E. (9) $2,076.96.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,863.56. E. (9) $2,863.56.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $2.25.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. George P. Baker, 16 Eliot Street, Cambridge, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,015.49. E. (9) $250.22.

A. Baker, McKensie & Hightower, 901 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.95.

A. Baker, McKensie & Hightower, 901 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $37.78.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Hartman Barber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $984.92.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James M. Barnes and Thurman Hill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Co.'s, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D .C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $87.67.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. William J. Barnhard, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $154.88.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $101.92.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
E. (9) $156.77.

A. Bert Bell, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $2,362.04.

A. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,307.44.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,854.75.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.25.

A. Sam B. Berrong, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $116.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,302. E. (6) $674.74.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, and American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $105.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Kenneth M. Birkhead, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans' Committee, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.95. E. (9) $38.45.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $487.50.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corporation, Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road, Washington, D. C.
B. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $86.52. E. (9) $41.84.

A. Mrs. Paul Blanshard, 408 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.
D. (6) $249. E. (9) $90.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,475. E. (9) $131.72.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $141.04.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $454.20.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,863.56.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $423.24.

A. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $2.78.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $12.50. E. (9) $4.05.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $26.35.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 400 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $207.69. E. (9) $16.53.

A. W. S. Bromley, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $100.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $490.68.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,995.71. E. (9) $7,995.71.

A. C. R. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,445.80.

A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American and Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $545. E. (9) $94.26.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,383.76.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $168.75.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) 1,350. E. (9) $20.36.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
(D) (6) $1,350.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1335, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $600.

A. Thomas Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,091. E. (9) $395.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $11,724.98. E. (9) $205.56.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $110. E. (9) $110.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $70.14.

A. William J. Burns, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $90.

A. Robert M. Burr, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Clint Bush, 8233 South Peoria Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $300.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $3.17.

A. Butler & McKinney, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Richard Haster and wife, and A. E. Arnold, 2435 West First Street, Santa Ana, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $83.14.

A. Lawrence V. Byrnes, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,313.50.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $62.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $340.81.

A. Campaign for the 48 States, 312 Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $4,165.44. E. (9) $18,489.69.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,961.56. E. (9) $296.16.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Cliff D. Carpenter, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $18.77.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton 2, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,352.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,732.19.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 1143 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,345. E. (9) $159.48.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice N. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Colodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Great Eastern Shipping Co., Ltd., 14 Jumshedji Tata Road, Bombay, India.
D. (6) $200.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $6,654.79. E. (9) $4,593.28.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $179.69.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,769.24.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Papermakers' Felt Association, 1215 Unity Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $41.50.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. Herman Clott, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287. E. (9) $692.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $235.54.

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,478.94.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $448.51.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,972. E. (9) $4,104.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $325.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,825. E. (9) $7,112.75.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $67.53.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Council of Life Underwriters, 208 South La Salle Street Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industrials, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,070. E. (9) $16,159.08.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $805.76. E. (9) $805.76.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $36.15.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago and North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $8.31.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T. H., United States of America.
E. (9) $17.92.

A. Covington & Building, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $99.98.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $70.77.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Gilbert Cox., Elliston, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $177.80. E. (9) $177.80.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $330.51.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.99.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,478.94. E. (9) $1,478.94.

A. Arthur J. Cunningham, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2250.65.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $675.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, Via Zuccarino No. 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $30.50.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Kuo York Chynn, Columbus Hospital, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $48.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,050.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C. Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,995. E. (9) $2,512.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $10.50.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $11.30.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $286.25.

A. Joffre C. David, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $249.96. E. (9) $330.83.

A. Alan P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,989.39. E. (9) $6,911.02.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,710.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $269.99.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,304.25.

A. Joseph E. Davis, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $28.65.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.22.

A. John D. deButts, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,125.01.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $824.99.

A. Dorothea de Schweinitz, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act of the National Consumers League, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,440. E. (9) $18.55.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Philip M. DeVany, 1109 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $5.

A. R. T. DeVany.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $23.46.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,731.75. E. (9) $106.75.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $3,126.84. E. (9) $126.84.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,269.24.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,125.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 303 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,820.68. E. (9) $16,177.72.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $18,794.32.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $41.19.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,624.99.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. G. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,352.18. E. (9) $107.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $392.55.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. A. Dosier, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Donald H. Dunham, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $150.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $232.50. E. (9) $5.49.

A. William E. Dunn, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,139.69. E. (9) $842.64.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Room 7319, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,919.25. E. (9) $904.73.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y., and 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $55.72. E. (9) $44.87.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $500.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $71.29.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,437.50.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $22.16.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $7,250. E. (9) $55.10.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 801 19th Street Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $315.44.

A. Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
E. (9) $541.83.

A. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $55,112.16. E. (9) $21,249.35.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League of the United States of America, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $5,850.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
D. (6) $500.

A. Financial General Corp., 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Joel H. Fisher, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Civil Aviation Medical Association, 150 East 71st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $78.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bangor and Aroostock Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Main.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. John B. Fisher, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $11.39.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1608 Orington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (legislative fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,867.33.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
D. (6) $697.01. E. (9) $697.01.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,370.36.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $134.39.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $45.87.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $85.50.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bulova Watch Co., Inc., Bulova Park, Flushing, N. Y.
D. (6) $120.

A. Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $9.64.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $535. E. (9) $535.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $783.75. E. (9) $589.50.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $979.69. E. (9) $740.27.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. Allie Frechette, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. James G. Frechette, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $23.01.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $36. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,822.21. E. (9) $5,285.33.

A. George Milan Fuller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $261.39.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $3.75.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,866.02. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Associations, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D.(6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,867.50. E. (9) $146.20.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $574.29.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal, & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. North German Lloyd, Bremen, Germany.
E. (9) $25.

A. Ginsburg, Leventhal & Brown, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Society To Study Private Property Interests in Foreign Countries, Contrescarpe 46, Bremen, Germany.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $475.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $6.

A. John A. Gosnell, 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street Building, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,605.83. E. (9) $7,280.76.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $88.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $81.80.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $18,950.20. E. (9) $11,997.97.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $241.83.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $16.05.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Warren Griffiths, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $846.16. E. (9) $3.40.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $25.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $478.01. E. (9) $478.01.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $478.68.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $190.45.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $134.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $235.88.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $725. E. (9) $5.42.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $670.59.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.12. E. (9) $726.28.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.50. E. (9) $225.

A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,322.50. E. (9) $11,687.45.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $666.66. E. (9) $29.10.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. Douglas L. Hatch, 715 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Tungsten Mining Corp., Henderson, N. C.
E. (9) $32.18.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Institute, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,599.99. E. (9) $3,441.14.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 601 Associations Building, Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Plywood Corp., 55 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $283.22. E. (9) $35.14.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $139.25.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $318.36.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $328.40.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings & Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Charles H. Heltzel, 606 Commerce Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $175.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,699.29. E. (9) $1,574.29.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y. and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $239.10. E. (9) $239.10.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $34.25.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $1,616.04.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $63.07.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. J. Hickley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $196.88.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,587.52. E. (9) $337.52.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. John R. Holden, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterans World War II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. G. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Homestake Mining Co., Lead, S. Dak.
E. (9) $531.36.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeyman Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists International Union, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,220.65. E. (9) $1,450.65.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,304.25.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Cline House, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $54.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,725.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $499.38.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,507.73.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.

A. Raymond E. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $18.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,090.30.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $17,347.16.

A. John L. Ingoldsby, Jr., 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Commerciale Antoine Vloeberghs, S. A., 209 Avenue D'Italie, Anvers, Belgium.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,967.72. E. (9) $1,967.72.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $113.54.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,339.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,107.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers' Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3.22.

A. Iron Ore Lessors' Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
E. (9) $1,058.47.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.
E. (9) $37.75.

A. Robert C. Jackson. 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $1,866.66. E. (9) $145.52.

A. Japanese American Citizens' League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $375.

A. Daniel Jaspan, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,487.50. E. (9) $79.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrialles Et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basle, Switzerland.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,684.45.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. P. Johnson, 1806 Overlook Lane, Santa Barbara, Calif.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Reuben Lee Johnson, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,979.04. E. (9) $44.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Cullen B. Jones, Jr., 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc., 44 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $122.46.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $150.00. E. (9) $448.37.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $28.25.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 501 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $457.86.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $512.69.

A. Journeyman Barbers, Hairdressers, and Cosmetologists International Union, 1141 North Delaware Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
E. (9) $3,220.65.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsia, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, N. Y.
E. (9) $18.75.

A. Max M. Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lipschultz, Altman, Geraghty & Mulally, 530 Minnesota Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Kenneth C. Kellar, Lead, S. Dak.
B. Homestake Mining Co., Lead, S. Dak.
E. (9) $531.36.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William Edward Kelly, 9532 Justine Drive, Falls Church, Va.
B. The Mosaic Tile Co., Zanesville, Ohio.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. T. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,272.27. E. (9) $184.80.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $134.85.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $281.95.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $181.05.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $376.64. E. (9) $805.94.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,275. E. (9) $265.

A. W. A. Key, 401 North Hays Avenue, Jackson, Tenn.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
D. (6) $1,075.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Franscisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,399.62. E. (9) $1,309.60.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $10. E. (9) $2.92.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $215. (D) $90.24.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $315.40.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $283.12. E. (9) $2.85.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $6.50.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 N. Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $49.24.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,807.66. E. (9) $467.05.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Commercial Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. A. B. Wintershall, Kassel, Germany, and A. G. Salzdetfurth, Bad Salzdetfurth, Germany.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,809.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2649 North Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $450.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 903 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,046.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $35.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,700. E. (9) $6,926.01.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $47.62.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,372.50. E. (9) $4,372.08.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Russell A. Langdon, 20th Street at New Hampshire NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 20th Street at New Hampshire NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue., Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $850.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $755. E. (9) $200.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $927.50. E. (9) $3.90.

A. John M. Laxalt, 3636 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportes Maritimos Mexicanos, S. A., Insurgentes 432, Mexico, D. F.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $511.97.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $6,038.06.

A. James R. Lee, 605 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Product Section, National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $213.20.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $6,850.80.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,234.89. E. (9) $8,234.89.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $422.78.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $70.25. E. (9) $12.08.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Charles B. Lipsen and Associates, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Direct Mail Advertising Association.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $214.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $92.82.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $165. E. (9) $15.40.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $325.

A. Charles E. Lofgren, 20th Street at New Hampshire NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 20th Street at New Hampshire NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.93. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $96.98.

A. Harold O. Lovre, Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $140.75.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Emmco Insurance Co., South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Marian Diane Delphine Sachs, Beekman Hotel, New York, N. Y., and Arthur Sachs, c/o Moses & Singer, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–23 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio.
B. Pennsylvania-Ohio-New York Committee on Low Cost Niagara-St. Lawrence Power, Box 187, North Baltimore, Ohio.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $430.23.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,962.50. E. (9) $42.87.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $750.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,313.50. E. (9) $1,313.12.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,014.20. E. (9) $39.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,210. E. (9) $110.45.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,899.97. E. (9) $261.42.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $500.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1920 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert P. McElroy, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $117.23.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.26. E. (9) $1,491.65.

A. Rev. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $250.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $180. E. (9) $180.

A. James H. McKenzie, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.13.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $354.21. E. (9) $687.78.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,698.75. E. (9) $11.60.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $17.19.

A. Francis J. McNamara, 610 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,062.50. E. (9) $16.85.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $23.40.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $237.50. E. (9) $217.50.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund (Legislative), care Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $61.61.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Brothers, 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,417.50. E. (9) $417.47.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925.50. E. (9) $456.19.

A. James B. Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Don Mahon, P. O. Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $343.51.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $197.30.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, P. O. Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $250.

A. MacArthur H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $91.74.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,796.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,870.

A. John J. Marr, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $630.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $1,246.77.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $129.36. E. (9) $6.50.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. A. & H. Shillman Co., Inc., 106 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $22.83.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Franscisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $185.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $590.08.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh Pa., and Mechanical Contractors Association of Pittsburgh, Inc., 345 Fourth Avenue Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $884.45.

A. P. H. Mathews, 926 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,617.50. E. (9) $2,685.56.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $4.10.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $101.77.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $2,241.27.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $83,220. E. (9) $2,725.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ellis E. Meredith, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $140.09.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $475.83.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $153.43.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,281.71.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., Route 4, Box 235, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $525.55.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,337.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. World-Wide Broadcasting System, Inc., New York City, NW.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $129.85.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, and Maytag Co.
D. (6) $2,650. E. (9) $571.16.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Tennessee Products and Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $13.22.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $35.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,710.05.

A. H. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,650. E. (9) $28.25.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $379.85. E. (9) $379.85.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $158.90.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Kenneth R. Morefield, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Gordin-Mensh Realty Corp., 1915 Richmond Highway, Alexandria, Va.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $80.40.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brewers' Association of America, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $61.44.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. West Coast Pipeline Co., Mercantile Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $90.32.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $659.19.

A. William J. Mougey, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corporation, 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Walter J. Nunro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Co-op., P. O. Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
E. (9) $134.39.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,193.15. E. (9) $2,193.15.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,503.78. E. (9) $1,037.72.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,218.75. E. (9) $24.60.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,396.30. E. (9) $10,230.25.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,160. E. (9) $6,137.18.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $147.18. E. (9) $147.18.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,645.46. E. (9) $1,346.05.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,500. E. (9) $5,384.61.

A. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc., 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 95 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,766.50. E. (9) $1,766.50.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $1,061.17. E. (9) $1,854.32.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,112.08. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Imperial, Nebr.
D. (6) $860.17. E. (9) $860.17.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,422.28.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $400,682.17. E. (9) $5,469.94.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $22.86.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,918.40. E. (9) $2,012.59.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $4,471.84. E. (9) $4,471.84.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $158.39. E. (9) $620.95.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $200.16.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $565.30. E. (9) $565.30.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,870.24. E. (9) $2,036.36.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $86.74. E. (9) $86.74.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $107,401.14. E. (9) $12,434.59.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,923.53. E. (9) $6,923.53.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $171,161.38. E. (9) $26,880.41.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,254. E. (9) $1,254.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $27,946.42. E. (9) $21,641.46.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,499.07. E. (9) $1,843.71.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,446.39. E. (9) $1,886.33.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,065.26. E. (9) $4,065.26.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,609.59. E. (9) $10,609.59.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $5,452.04.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,346.25. E. (9) $11,657.45.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,598.72. E. (9) $3,647.53.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street Building NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,186.23.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $102,153.42. E. (9) $1,461.85.

A. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $379.86. E. (9) $379.86.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,736. E. (9) $3,746.76.

A. A Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,812.50. E. (9) $9,534.89.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William S. Neal.
B. National Association of Manufacturers of the U. S. A., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $2,522.32.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $19.20.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $384.

A. Otis E. Nelson, Hamilton Building, Wichita Falls, Tex.
B. Dr. P. K. Smith, et al., 1300 Eighth Street, Wichita Falls, Tex.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. George S. Newcomer, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,154.25.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,495.02. E. (9) $521.97.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,307.72. E. (9) $52.06.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Han Hong Wang, 157-16 20th Road, Whitestone, Long Island, N. Y.
E. (9) $2.99.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $656.25. E. (9) $78.40.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,051.07.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $93.50.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $10,993.50.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. McCabe-Powers Auto Body Co., 5900 North Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $89.94.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $141.50.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $239.61.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $122.63.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute and Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $117.47.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $574.29.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,308. E. (9) $2.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Bank, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,370. E. (9) $11.31.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,991.13.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Company, Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $2,462.81.

A. Morris E. Osborn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $245.27.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,884.62. E. (9) $29.30.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $25.43.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,624.99.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $19.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $562.50. E. (9) $99.27.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $47.50.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Shaeffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; and Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $332.50. E. (9) $41.93.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $3,120.65.

A. James G. Patton, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert T. Patton, 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Shell Oil Co., 1008 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,318.40. E. (9) $2,562.76.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $184.38.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $375.05.

A. Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $24.97.

A. Iris V. Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association International, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $207.33.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.41.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, 208 South Tennessee, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $29.45.

A. Kenneth Peterson, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,031.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $500.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $142.64. E. (9) $210.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $65.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $61.90.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $82.46.

A. Piper & Marbury, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $12.54.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 220–221 Lubbock National Building, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $3,135.86. E. (9) $3,700.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,417. E. (9) $20.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Admiral Corp., 3800 Courtland Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5.46.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, and Oregon Filbert Commission, Portland, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $438. E. (9) $27.96.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Stanley I. Posner, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Linen Supply Association, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $20.17.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $4.30.

A. Prefabricated Home Manufacturers' Institute, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $102,255.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Herman P. Pressler, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil and Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $2,255.64.

A. Allen I. Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $586.65. E. (9) $236.90.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $54. E. (9) $3.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $194.92.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $791.24.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $50.90.

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $261.04.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $540.37.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel Suite 506, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,021.73. E. (9) $11,021.73.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $71.85.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Imperial, Nebr.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $110.17.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,500. E. (9) $2,754.12.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U. S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $39,795.05.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,301.80. E. (9) $7,403.28.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, 219 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sigfried Olsen, trading as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., 1 Drum Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,040.

A. Harry H. Rieck, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $77.95. E. (9) $77.95.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
D. (6) $1,250.01. E. (9) $653.77.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $722.76.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,506. E. (9) $1,213.65.

A. E. W. Rising, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $237.94.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $167.40.

A. Philip J. Rodgers, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers' Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $260.80.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,201.75.

A. Watson Rogers, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers' Association, 1916 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors' Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 409 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Gerald E. Rowley, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $645.50.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $444.68.

A. Francis M. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and affiliated companies.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $274.05.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge, No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $60.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $430.39.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $208.73.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $527.50.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $142.73.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608-612 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James D. Secrest, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $94.41.

A. Leo Seybold, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $47.15.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,068.75. E. (9) $253.89.

A. John H. Sharon, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,603.47.

A. James R. Sharp, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Imported Hardwood Plywood Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.; Plywood Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N. Y.; American Association of Hardwood Plywood Users, Washington, D. C.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $893.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,633.33. E. (9) $263.08.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. W. Lee Shield, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $460.24. E. (9) $10.75.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperation Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $720.80. E. (9) $71.35.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $243.16.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $7,638.35.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $4,980.10.

A. W. E. Skinner, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $19.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, Post Office Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
D. (6) $2,280. E. (9) $2,688.21.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $135.41.

A. T. W. Smiley, 1150 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $265.30.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,962.

A. Wallace M. Smith, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,038.47.

A. J. D. Snyder, Room 1150, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,157.82.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $210.05.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $18,293.18. E. (9) $24,725.82.

A. W. W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Company, 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,800.38.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $316. E. (9) $184.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,935.73.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $18.75.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234 Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $230.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Textbook Publishers Institute, One Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $27.93.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif.
E. (9) $60.89.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. N. R. Caine and Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $56.96.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $18.81.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,712.25. E. (9) $15,572.82.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,450.

A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $20.95.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,033.

A. H. A. Stoner, 224 Main Street, Osawatomie, Kans.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $510.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $13.40.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $223.46.

A. Francis W. Stover, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,437.50. E. (9) $59.50.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $25.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,615.38.

A. O. R. Strackbein, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. International Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. B. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,166.52.

A. Joseph Monroe Sullivan, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $83.48.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $170.36.

A. Glenn J. Talbott, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $524.18.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers' Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $5,430. E. (9) $6,644.03.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $242.58.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $1,179.95.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,333.33. E. (9) $292.80.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,817.27.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,296.25. E. (9) $28.09.

A. Richard A. Tilden, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. R. E. Schanzer, Inc., 608–612 South Peters Street, New Orleans, La.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $255.43.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,418.75. E. (9) $188.34.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $335.15.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $770. E. (9) $272.05.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $59.22.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $16.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.88.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co.; Southern Pacific Co.; Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 736 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, Post Office Box 601, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $217.10.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,693.98.

A. United States Citizens' Association, Canal Zone, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $2,080. E. (9) $2,753.87.

A. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $43,228.49.

A. L. R. Van Bibber, 1404 Walnut Street, Marysville, Kans.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, BLE Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $525.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $105.60. E. (9) $12.60.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 528 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $28.05.

A. Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., Inc., 44 G Street NE., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,622.46.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.50. E. (9) $1.45.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $518.16. E. (9) $178.85.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $239.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Han Hong Wang, 157–16 20th Road, Whitestone, Long Island, N. Y.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $2,778.89.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,126.25. E. (9) $97.04.

A. J. R. Watson, 1 I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, 1 I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $548.53.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hilary Waukau, Box 82, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Lloyd W. Weaver, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (9) $750.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,844.95. E. (9) $443.15.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,304.38.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the U. S. A., 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $403.07.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,140. E. (9) $125.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $629.45.

A. Joseph T. West, 1 Salem Street, Houlton, Maine.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $735.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $2.41.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $2.43.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $2.41.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $82.78.

A. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Humane Association.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. Roger J. Whiteford, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Marian Diane Dalphine Sachs, Beckman Hotel, New York, N. Y., and Arthur Sachs, care of Moses & Singer, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Warren E. Whyte, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (6) $38.59.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $25.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.89.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $459.67.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $293.26.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $50.16. E. (9) $50.16.

A. John J. Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Whiteford, Hart, Carmody & Wilson, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,249.98.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $1,093.98.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $495.47.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frank G. Wollney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $225.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,250.42. E. (9) $1,626.86.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,805.91. E. (9) $2,079.54.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,662.50. E. (9) $49.38.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert D. Yeomans, West 2301 Pacific Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
B. Washington Water Power Co., P. O. Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $157.85.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $78.12.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $62.44.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1957:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3" and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report disregard this item "C 4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Joseph P. Adams, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Local and Territorial Airlines.

A. Howard R. Alexander, 106 North Main Street, Fon du Lac, Wis.

A. Association for the Best Use of Florida Lands, Inc., 614 Aledo Avenue, Coral Gables, Fla.

A. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Baker, McKenzie & Hightower, 901 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers' Association of America, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. N. C. Banfield, 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.
B. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.

A. Richard B. Barker and Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. William Dzus, Box 185, Babylon, N. Y.

A. Rex M. S. Beach, 3900 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Freedom of North Africa, Cairo, Egypt.

A. John J. Boland, 40 Wall Street, New York City, N. Y.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York City, N. Y.

A. Fleming Bomar and Joseph E. McAndrews, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association.

A. Wallace Mason Bradley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles Bragman, 838 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co., Care of T. D. Gray II, 901 Northwest 14th Court, Miami, Fla.

A. C. B. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John T. Carlton, Fort Hunt Road, Box 217, R. F. D. 1, Alexandria, Va.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Justice N. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Great Eastern Shipping Co., Ltd., 14 Jumskedji Tata Road, Bombay, India.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Detroit Atlantic Navigation Corp., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. M. F. Comer Bridge & Foundation Co., care of T. D. Gray II, 901 NW. 14th Court, Miami, Fla.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association.

A. Arthur J. Cunningham, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, Via Zuccharino No. 76, Mola de Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Kuo-York Chynn, 235 West 75th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Josephus Daniels, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 179 Allyn Street, Hartford, Conn.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Opal D. David, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act of the National Consumers League, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph B. Davis, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Detroit Atlantic Navigation Corp., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 5863 Chevy Chase Parkway, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carriers Conference, American Trucking Association, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph W. Dye, 527 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Renault, Inc., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Walter E. Doherty, Jr., 1 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Carpet Institute, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Mortimer B. Doyle, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John H. Eisenhart, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. First United Corp., 80 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Clyde L. Flynn, Jr., Elizabethtown, Ill.
B. Independent Fluorspar Producers Association, Rosiclare, Ill.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400–402 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 400–402 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. Allie Frechette, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. James G. Frechette, Keshena, Shawano County, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Gordon H. Garland, 300 Montgomery Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Westhaven Farmers Association, J. G. Boswell Co., Salyer Land Co., Salyer Grain & Milling Co., Salyer Irrigation District, Corcoran, Calif.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Douglas L. Hatch, 715 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Tungsten Mining Corp., Henderson, N. C.

A. Alan S. Hays, 527 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Renault, Inc., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad Co., 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motorola, Inc., 4545 Augusta Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Harry B. Hollins III, 1040 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United World Federalists, Inc., 179 Allya Street, Hartford, Conn.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. C. N. Hope, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Suzanne Hughes, 1607 West Exchange Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. John L. Ingoldsby, Jr., 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Commerciale Antoine Vloeberghs, S. A., 209 Avenue D'Italie, Anvers, Belgium.

A. Edwin C. Johnson, 1135 Grant Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Committee for Oil Shale Development, 1036 Grant Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Max M. Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lipschultz, Altman, Geraghty & Mulally, 530 Minnesota Building, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Kimon T. Karabatsos, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth C. Kellar, Lead, S. Dak.
B. Homestake Mining Co., Lead, S. Dak.

A. W. A. Key, 401 North Hayes Avenue, Jackson, Tenn.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Richard S. Kitchen, 320 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Committee for Oil Shale Development, 1036 Grant Street, Denver, Colo.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Commercial Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Wintershall A. G., Kassell, Germany, and Salzdetfurth A. G., Bad Salzdetfurth, Germany.

A. Julius Klein Public Relations, 1039 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Klukwan Iron Ore Corp., 110 Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska.

A. Randall J. Le Boeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Company of New York., Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Direct Mail Advertising Association, 3 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panamá, Panama.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charlton H. Lyons, Sr., 1500 Beck Building, Shreveport, La.

A. William D. McAdams, 1121 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterinary Medical Association.

A. Clarence A. McGillen, Jr., 8654 Piney Branch Road, Silver Spring, Md.
B. Parcel Post Association, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert H. McNeill, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Tax Council, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. MacArthur H. Manchester, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Marr, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Metropolitan Businessmen's Association, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Louis J. Michot, Jr., 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., and Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society Composers, Authors, and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. World-Wide Broadcasting System, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

A Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Tennessee Products and Chemical Corporation, Nashville, Tenn.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Lewis, Field, DeGoff and Stein, DeYoung Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Clarence S. Moses, 1900 Euclid Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Optical Association, 1900 Euclid Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Indpendent Airlines Association, Washington, D. C.; city of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.; Association of First Class Mailers, New York, N. Y.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. N. C. Northcutt, 110 Highland Road, Fort Mitchell, Covington, Ky.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Novins & Novins, 10 Washington Street, Toms River, N. J.
B. United States Poultry and Egg Association.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lineas Tres M., Vallarta 1, Mexico, D. F.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Renault, Inc., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Iris V. Peterson, 4201 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association, 55th and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Rufus G. Poole, Simms Building, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.

A. John Arthur Reynolds, 653 Cortland, Fresno, Calif.
B. Western Cotton Growers Association, 2201 F Street, Bakersfield, Calif.

A. James W. Robinson, 173 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Corn Millers Federation, 173 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 316 A Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Harry N. Rosenfield, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Society of Safety Engineers, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., San Francisco; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Metropolitan Business Men's Association, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hilliard Schulberg, 211 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington, D. C., Retail Liquor Dealers Association, Inc., 211 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.

A. Stephen M. Schwebel, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Denbel Realty & Construction Co., Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald H. Sharp, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. M. Q. Sharpe, Kennebec, S. Dak.
B. Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of Indians, Pierre Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.; Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians, Fort Yates, N. Dak.

A. George T. Slocum, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Verne W. Smith, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railroad Yardmasters of America, 537 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. H. A. Stoner, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., 8300 Burdette Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Counsel Associates, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence D. Todd, 1825 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, American Trucking Association, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Warren L. Turner, First National Bank Building, Grand Junction, Colo.
B. Committee for Oil Shale Development, 1036 Grant Street, Denver, Colo.

A. United World Federalists, Inc., 125 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Universal Research & Consultants, Inc., 221 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Cuba, Post Office Box 1383, Habana, Cuba; Embassy of Venezuela, 2445 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; Arab States Delegation, 120 East 56th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. L. R. Van Bibber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hilary Waukau, Box 82, Neopit, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gene T. West, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Marjorie M. Wise, 1310 Leyden Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Committee for Oil Shale Development, 1036 Grant Street, Denver, Colo.

A. V. T. Worthington, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-Refiners, 1500 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va.

A. Howard Zahniser, 6222 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Word of Appreciation to Army Legislative Liaison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as this first session of the 85th Congress draws to a close, it is only fitting and proper that we look about and thank those agencies and persons in the Government who have helped us discharge our obligations and responsibilities, as Members of Congress, to our individual constituents, to our districts, and to the Nation.

In the forefront of these alert and responsive people are the personnel of the Army legislation liaison, under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. J. H. "Mike" Michaelis and Col. Donald "Sandy" MacGrain. They have with them as fine a staff of intelligent and cooperative young men, as, I am sure, the Army can assemble. The results are self-evident. We, the Members of Congress, can call for Army liaison no matter what the situation and be assured of a correct, prompt, and courteous response. If we need an officer by our side to meet with visitors to our office, we can be sure they will be there and tide us over smoothly and smartly.

Many of my colleagues have expressed these same sentiments on many occasions. I feel that they should be officially and properly reflected in the RECORD before we adjourn so that there will be some tangible evidence of our appreciation for Army liaison's fine work in behalf of us all.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on July 19 several Members spoke in favor of the equal-rights amendment. I regret that

I was unable to participate in the discussion at that time and under leave to express my remarks would like to again reiterate my unqualified support for an equal-rights amendment.

One argument against the equal-rights amendment on which great stress is laid by opponents is that the passage of the amendment would cause endless confusion and litigation. Our whole history refutes such fear.

We have always believed that a bad law should be changed in the interest of freedom, liberty, and democracy. The equal-rights amendment to the Constitution would not be accomplished in a day, and every State would have time to amend her own laws before the amendment actually went into effect.

Of course there would be litigation, for every new law is subjected to litigation necessary to establish its constitutionality, interpretation, and application to our lives. Why should fear of changing laws prevent passage of the equal-rights amendment granting full citizenship to more than half our population?

I sincerely hope that Congress will recognize its responsibility and cause early passage of the equal-rights amendment.

Do-Nothing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL E. NEAL
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, if the 1st session of the 85th Congress deserves this sobriquet, it can be construed to mean the public will be the principal beneficiary.

It is true that the main efforts of this session have been directed toward making appropriations for domestic activities, Defense Establishment, and various programs of aid to foreign nations. Aside from attention to civil rights, no other major legislation of far-reaching effect on the national economy has been approved. This is a good omen. Congress for many years has been besieged by minority groups seeking legislation designed to relieve or materially benefit their special problems, resulting in added administrative agencies and a maze of Government intrusion into the affairs of helpless citizens.

The immediate result has been big government, heavy taxation, overgrown budgets, and inflation, to say nothing of the tendency to encourage evasions and dishonesty on the part of many citizens.

The average citizen no longer enjoys the freedom to engage in any enterprise without first employing an attorney to explore the possibilities of defeat or failure through the application of some public law. The prohibitions imposed by laws enacted and presently on the statute books are contributing more and more to discourage initiative, not only individual, but corporate. There is just too much law interfering with the proverbial freedom of progressive minded individuals and groups who up to now have succeeded in making America the outstanding creative Nation of the world.

Reviewing our international relations during the past decade reveals less than satisfactory success in challenging Communist influence in many parts of the Old World. It approaches the point of alarm when we see the trends in areas of our own hemisphere, the Caribbean, Central and South America, becoming more and more tolerant to the guiles of communism. Congress and the administration should manifest more direct concern for the stabilization of governments in these areas where our influence offers more assurance of creating and maintaining democratic strength to oppose the Communist threat through our back doors. The Old World has been the seat of power struggle during all history and we see no visible reason to expect anything different in the future. It is not to be expected that in the usual course of human experience, Russian communism can succeed in holding so many divisive peoples under her yoke for long.

The spirit of national freedom initiated in our Declaration of Independence and frequently enunciated through all our international contacts, has become altogether too strong among the smaller free nations to permit foreign domination and mass enslavement.

American democracy can be the instrument through which Communist philosophy will cease to appeal to civilized people, provided we discard our fears of Russian strength, unite and solidify the forces of our continental neighbors, and return to a national policy of economy, thrift, less exorbitant taxation, and a sound dollar of consistent value. A strong America of determined people need entertain no fear of Old World supremacy.

A Visit to the Dominican Republic, the Land Columbus Loved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a week's visit to the Dominican Republic on the island of Hispaniola, in the Caribbean Sea.

Mrs. Long and I had a delightful visit to the Dominican Republic, where we attended the festivities in celebration of the inauguration of Gen. Hector Trujillo Molina as President. We returned from 6 days in the island Republic, filled with pleasant impressions of the graciousness of the people and the beauty of the country.

We were welcomed at the General Andrews Airport by Dr. Alvaro Logrono Batlle, Minister and Assistant Chief of the Protocol Division; United States Ambassador Joseph S. Farland, Otto Vega, official in the President's chancery, and by Deputies Marino Caceres, Wenceslao Troncoso Sanchez, and Arturo Caventy, accompanied by their wives Isabel Tronocoso de Caceras, Rosa de Troncoso, and Marisa Thomen de Calventy. We enjoyed our reservations at the Ambassador Hotel, and have only praise for its comforts and superb service.

At the inaugural parade, we were privileged to have a seat along with delegates from 42 other countries. The parade itself was colorful and entertaining. The generalissimo wore a cream-colored uniform with a dark blue cap and neckband, braided with gold. Major units in the parade were drawn from the army, navy, air force, and national guard. For 3 hours we watched the well-trained and equipped units display their precision marching, and the air force put on an outstanding performance with Vampire jets.

Ciudad Trujillo is a lovely place. It is extremely clean and is dotted with magnificently landscaped parks. Avenida George Washington, named for our own first President, extends for miles along the seacoast and is lined with tall graceful palms, making it one of the most beautiful drives in the world. The obelisk in its path is reminiscent of our own Washington Monument.

Mrs. Long and I visited stores and found that they were well stocked and people were shopping much as they do here in the United States. We also visited many offices and businesses.

Outside the city, it was our pleasure to view several of the nicely kept sugar plantations and fruit farms. We saw the people industriously at work in their fields and around the sugar refineries, which were preparing to be opened for the new season.

The climax of our visit came on Friday night at a dance at the national palace, honoring the generalissimo and his brother, the President. It was most inspiring to see how the people who assembled there loved their officers, and to see the high regard these officers have for the people.

Both the generalissimo and President Hector Trujillo remained until the dance was over—in fact, I am sure the generalissimo remained until 1:30 in the morning. It was really admirable to see the way in which he remained as friendly and gracious at the end of the dance as he had been at the beginning of the ceremonies, although he had had more than 6 days' strenuous activity, attending dances, receptions, reviewing the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Everyone with whom we had contact voted the officials of the Dominican Republic most gracious hosts. I would like to add my own and Mrs. Long's vote of thanks for the many Dominican kindnesses that made our visit to the land Columbus loved so memorable an occasion, and to extend our best wishes for the continued well-being and prosperity of the Dominican people under the skillful administration of President Trujillo.

I felt that my friends will be glad to have this report of my visit to the Dominican Republic.

Henceforth when I have occasion to speak about our great friend and ally,

the Christian Dominican Republic, I can assure my colleagues that I will be able to speak with the authority gained from first-hand investigation—not from facts gained by hearsay, or even upon the advice of the experts on the Caribbean who are always available to me.

Memorial for Those Lost on U. S. S. Arizona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1957, H. R. 5809 came before the House and was passed by unanimous consent. This is a measure introduced by my able colleague, the delegate from Hawaii, Mr. Burns, and has for its purpose the construction of a memorial to the memory of those who lost their lives on December 7, 1941, in the sinking of the U. S. S. *Arizona*. I am proud of the fact that I was chairman of the subcommittee which heard testimony on this measure and which piloted it through the Congress. I am honored that I was permitted to help shepherd the measure through the House on August 19, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1941, there were 1,473 men and officers serving aboard the U. S. S. *Arizona*. Of this total complement, 1,157 were declared dead or missing as a result of this most treacherous attack on December 7, 1941, which day President Roosevelt declared to be a day dedicated to infamy. One hundred and sixty-one bodies were accounted for following the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor; but, today, the final remains of 996 American boys are still entombed in the hull of the U. S. S. *Arizona*. This ship, by decree of this Government, is the final resting place of almost 1,000 American men wearing the uniform of the United States Navy; and if there is a hallowed place on earth, this surely is the place.

My home State of Louisiana paid a fearful price when the losses of that black December day are added up. My State lost 24 young men who came from all parts of the State, one of them being from my home city of Shreveport; and the bodies of these men lie today entombed in this sunken ship. Their names and home addresses are: Achilles Arnaud, Arnaudville, La.; Claude Duran Arnold, Jr., Lake Charles, La.; Wilburn James Ashmore, Elizabeth, La.; Miller Xavier Aydell, French Settlement, La.; Malcolm Clark, Pollock, La.; John Quitman Davis, Tangipahoa, La.; Louis Felix Ducrest, Broussard, La.; Charles Donald Frederick, Albeville, La.; Ivan Joseph Huval, Folsom, La.; Floyd Baxter Jones, Shreveport, La.; Joseph McNeil Legros, Norse, La.; Jessie Huall Murphy, New Orleans, La.; "J" "D" Naylor, DeRidder, La.; Amos Paul Pace, Robert Leo Pritchett, Jr., New Orleans, La.; Wilburn Carle Roberts, Pollock, La.; William Edison Stoddard, Vinton, La.; Robert Tyson, Oak Grove, La.; John William Whitaker, Jr., Pollock, La.; Adrian Delton Williams, Gonzales, La.; Robert Kenneth Willis, Jr., Pineville, La.; Vernon Wesley Woods, Springhill, La.; Thomas Raymond Jones, Tallulah, La.; Walter Samuel Savage, Jr., Monroe, La.

A number of years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting Pearl Harbor and going by harbor boat to the wooden tramway which at that time connected with the superstructure which was the portion of the U. S. S. *Arizona* which remained above water several hundred yards offshore in the Pearl Harbor. This ship is located in an arm of the Pearl Harbor. It is about 400 feet from shore; and lies on the bottom in between 36 and 38 feet of water. Within recent years, the ship seems to have settled somewhat and now about the only portions of it above water are a few funnels of air vents, forming a part of the upper portion of the ship. It is awe inspiring to be able to stand on the steel deck of what remains above water of that great battlewagon. It is impressive to be able to uncover one's head and watch Old Glory, flying from the original mast and waving in the breeze. It brings one nearer to God as he ponders prayerfully on the lives of those 1,000 Americans who peacefully slept that Sunday morning safely, so they thought, within the steel sides of this great ship.

The American people have not forgotten those brave Americans. Although 17 years have passed since then, I believe it is yet the proper time to provide by popular subscription a memorial, either on this ship or adjacent to it, befitting the rare courage and pristine patriotism of those 1,000 Americans who sleep now and forever in the waters of the Pearl Harbor of Hawaii.

Campaign Against Certain Latin American Republics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Thursday, August 22, calls our attention to another interesting chapter in the unprecedented campaign of the gentleman from Oregon against the sovereign governments of certain allied Latin American Republics. The gentleman's latest exploit entailed his unusual appearance before a Federal grand jury in Washington. This particular grand jury was impaneled on December 27, 1956, and is reportedly investigating the disappearance of Dr. Jesus de Galindez and Gerald Murphy. One would gather from reading the Times that this story was published as a result of a press release from the gentleman's own office in the House of Representatives. There can be no doubt that the gentleman's espousal of the revolutionary cause of certain Latin American exiles has brought him publicity not usually attendant to the office of a freshman Congressman. The fact that he was asked to appear on the Meet the Press program is indicative of the attention his activities have aroused. While there are very few, if any, of us who do not enjoy the favors of press coverage of our activities, there should be some restraints on the methods of procuring public recognition.

The grand jury is an institution basic to the fundamentals of Anglo-American jurisprudence. It was originally conceived and continues to be regarded as the only practical method by which a free society could bring to justice its enemies. In proceedings before the grand jury one is not protected by the normal safeguards of justice such as are available in open court. The availability of such safeguards would necessarily hamper and probably completely thwart the scope of investigation of the grand jury. Substituted for these basic safeguards is the historical secrecy of grand jury proceedings. Without such confidence, names and reputations of many innocent persons would be destroyed. The grand jury is one of those inviolate institutions of American justice which has gained the admiration and respect of peoples throughout the world. It is for this reason that I am amazed to see a Member of this body utilizing a Federal grand jury as a vehicle for promoting his own political well-being. What other reason could the gentleman have for making public statements from his office in the House of Representatives to the effect that he had made an hour appearance before this jury?

Not only did the gentleman announce that he had made such an appearance, but according to the New York Times, he volunteered the contents of some of his testimony. According to his press release, the gentleman from Oregon made two specific suggestions. One was that the grand jury indict Trujillo himself, and the other was that the grand jury call the Dominican Ambassador to the United States as a witness. The fact that the gentleman made public these suggestions is not nearly as amazing as the fact that he, a lawyer, seriously made such proposals to a Federal grand jury. Aside from the propriety of a Member of this body suggesting American legal action against the sovereign of an allied country and its duly accredited representative to the United States, the gentleman as a graduate lawyer must be aware of the traditional rules of international law in this regard.

In 1812 the great Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall, who more than any other jurist was responsible for the development of American law, had occasion to address himself to the subject of American regard for the sovereign rights of other nations. Chief Justice Marshall made the following wise and prudent comments:

> One sovereign being in no respect amenable to another; and being bound by obligations of the highest not to degrade the dignity of his nation, by placing himself or

its sovereign rights within the jurisdiction of another, can be supposed to enter a foreign territory only under an express license, or in the confidence that the immunities belonging to his independent sovereign station, though not expressly stipulated, are reserved by implication, and will be extended to him.

* * * A foreign sovereign is not understood as intending to subject himself to a jurisdiction incompatible with his dignity, and the dignity of his nation.

The assent of the sovereign to the very important and extensive exemptions from territorial jurisdiction which are admitted to attach to foreign ministers, is implied from the considerations that, without such exemption, every sovereign would hazard his own dignity by employing a public minister abroad. His minister would owe temporary and local allegiance to a foreign prince, and would be less competent to the objects of his mission. A sovereign committing the interests of his nation with a foreign power, to the care of a person whom he has selected for that purpose, cannot intend to subject his minister in any degree to that power; and, therefore, a consent to receive him, implies a consent that he shall possess those privileges which his principal intended he should retain—privileges which are essential to the dignity of his sovereign, and to the duties he is bound to perform.

Throughout our history, learned justices and statesmen and private citizens have restated in words far more meaningful than mine, the absolute precept of equality of sovereigns and the inviolability of their actions to the jurisdiction and judgment of the courts of other lands. The principle that the conduct of one independent government cannot be questioned in the courts of another rests upon the highest considerations of international comity and expediency. As Mr. Justice Clarke of the Supreme Court said in 1917, to do otherwise would "imperil the amicable relations between governments and vex the peace of nations." The very fact that an American grand jury, under principles of American and international law, has no jurisdiction over Generalissimo Trujillo or Ambassador De Moya makes more reprehensible the suggestions of the gentleman from Oregon. Since there could be no such indictment or summons process issue from this grand jury, the gentleman's suggestions can only serve the purpose of prejudicing grand-jury deliberations and promoting the gentleman's own political ambitions.

I cannot understand why the gentleman from Oregon was called to testify before this grand jury and thus allow him to use this sacrosanct institution as a political sounding board. The gentleman's anti-Dominican campaign has no place in grand-jury deliberations. From his previous statements both on the floor and to the press, the gentleman has not indicated knowledge of any concrete evidence which could be of benefit to this grand jury.

I trust that in the future, the grand jury will exercise more restraint in calling witnesses and confine itself to the detection and prosecution of citizens and residents who may be guilty of some violation of law. An intrusion into the delicate field of international relations by a Federal grand jury is unprecedented.

Surplus Disposal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in the surplus-disposal program by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Marketing Service Food Distribution Division has been doing a first-rate job.

I have always felt that in the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities to our friends in foreign countries we should at all times be definitely certain that the surpluses reach the people in desperate need of food and wherever possible it should be distributed in such a way so those who receive it are informed in a positive way who is supplying or donating the food.

Of course the ideal way to distribute food to areas of the world suffering seriously for want of food supplies should be through charitable organizations with a properly developed method of distributing the food.

In these remarks I am placing in the RECORD I find a most encouraging sign of following out the ideas I have expressed for many years and I include the list of the agencies approved for participation in the foreign distribution of surplus commodities under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

It is a wonderful thing to know we have these religious and semireligious organizations that are in a position to distribute food directly to the families in want throughout the world. Surplus farm commodities distributed in this manner, in my personal opinion, contributes greatly to the proper attitude that we wish the rank and file of the population in every area of the world to have toward our Republic. This is a positive way to "win friends and influence people." When friends are made through this source of distributing our farm surpluses they are friends indeed. The list is as follows:

AGENCIES APPROVED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE FOREIGN DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES UNDER SECTION 416 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

American Friends of Austrian Children, Inc., 202 East 19th Street, ninth floor, New York, N. Y.[1]

American Friends Service Committee, Inc., 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.[1]

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., 1775 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc., 3 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

American Korean Foundation, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

American Middle East Relief, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

American Mission to Greeks, Inc., 233 West 42d Street, Post Office Box 423, New York, N. Y.[1]

American National Red Cross, Washington, D. C.[1]

Assemblies of God—Foreign Service Committee, 160 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Catholic Relief Services—NCWC, 451 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Christian Children's Fund, China Building, Richmond, Va.

Church World Service, Inc., 215 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Congregational Christian Service Committee, 110 East 29th Street, New York, N. Y.

Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), 660 First Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

First Aid for Hungary, Inc., 6 East 65th Street, New York, N. Y.

Foster Parents' Plan, Inc., 352 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Hadassah, Inc., 3 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.; 65 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

International Rescue Committee, Inc., 62 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

Iran Foundation, Inc., 6807 Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Lutheran World Relief, Inc., 50 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Mennonite Central Committee, Inc., Akron, Pa.[1]

National Council of Young Israel, 3 West 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

Pestalozzi Foundation of America, Inc., 41 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

Romanian Welfare, Inc., 22 East 60th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

Save the Children Federation, Inc., 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., 989 8th Avenue, New York, N. Y.[1]

Unitarian Service Committee, Inc., 345 East 46th Street, New York, N. Y.[1]

United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., 105 Grand Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.[1]

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Plaza, New York, N. Y.[1]

United Ukranian American Relief Committee, Inc., 866 North Seventh Street, Philadelphia, Pa.[1]

Volunteer Border Relief, Inc., Post Office Box 981, Harlingen, Tex.[1]

World Relief Commission of the National Association of Evangelicals, 12–19 Jackson Avenue, Long Island City, N. Y.[1]

[1] Participating agencies as of July 1, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this very substantial list of organizations participating in our distribution of surplus products abroad, I include other information on the disposal of our surplus commodities at home:

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Food donations by the United States Department of Agriculture reached a record high in the fiscal year ended June 30, under an active Department effort to dispose of surpluses. A total of 2,818,400,000 pounds of food was donated during the year to recipients here and abroad through the direct distribution program conducted by USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

Distribution domestically was increased to 1,043 million pounds, up 32 percent over the total for fiscal year 1956. Foreign distribution rose to 1,775,400,000 pounds, an increase of 45 percent over the same period a year ago.

In this country, the biggest increases were made in distribution of surplus commodities for use in school lunch programs. A total of 426,300,000 pounds of food was distributed for this purpose during the year, an increase of 61 percent over the previous year. Distribution to institutions totaled 148,600,000 pounds, a gain of 14 percent. Distribution to needy persons in family units accounted for the largest quantity of food distributed domestically, with the total of 468,100,000 pounds up 18 percent over a year ago.

In addition to these uses, large quantities of surplus foods were used during the fiscal year in the relief of victims of natural disasters. Top priority on foods available for distribution is given to such use. For example, nearly 24 million pounds of food was

[1] Participating agencies as of July 1, 1956.

distributed for immediate relief of last August's hurricane victims in Puerto Rico. Subsequently, Puerto Rico entered the continuing program of distribution to needy persons, to aid in long-term rehabilitation after completion of the emergency feeding. Large quantities of foods were also used in emergency feeding when spring floods, tornadoes, and hurricane struck Louisiana, Kentucky, and Virginia, driving persons from their homes and forcing them temporarily to rely on community feeding.

In addition, surplus foods were rushed to the aid of refugees from Hungary, following the October revolution. Thirty million pounds of food was made available to aid refugees in camps established in Austria. In addition, some 175,000 pounds of food was used to aid Hungarian refugees after they arrived in this country, in centers such as Camp Kilmer in New Jersey.

Foods donated under the direct distribution program are currently being used by over 12 million school children taking part in school-lunch programs, and about 1.4 million persons in charitable institutions. In addition, about 3 million needy persons in family units are currently receiving donated commodities.

Distribution of surplus commodities to schools and institutions is made in all 48 States, the District of Columbia and 5 Territories. A total of 39 States and Puerto Rico are currently taking part in distribution of surplus foods to needy persons, with 949 counties and 80 additional cities participating in those States.

The number of agencies taking part in the foreign donations program increased to 24 during the year, and the number of countries in which food was distributed to needy persons increased to 88. Distribution of surplus foods in these foreign countries is made by voluntary United States agencies, with commodities donated to them after provision has been made for the needs of all eligible recipients in this country.

In view of these statistics, it is clear that the Department of Agriculture has moved a tremendous quantity of surplus foods into consumption, foreign and domestic. In fact, the reduction of inventories through donations and other disposal programs has been so substantial for most items that eligible outlets could readily absorb larger quantities than are available on a continuing basis. For example, at one time the Commodity Credit Corporation held sufficient quantities of butter to permit donation to the school-lunch program, welfare and institutional distribution programs and to foreign outlets as well. Since January, stocks and acquisitions of butter by CCC have permitted distribution only to the school-lunch program. Similarly in the case of salad oil and shortening, donation to foreign outlets had to be eliminated during the past fiscal year for lack of availability.

Donation of dry beans to foreign outlets also had to be stopped in the third and fourth quarters of fiscal 1957 and the quantities of nonfat dry milk for donation abroad had to be reduced for lack of adequate supplies in Government hands. At the present time, donations of rice for foreign relief are limited to broken kernel or brewer's rice.

Tax-Reform Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to list a number of organizations that have indicated their support of my tax-reform plan, H. R. 6452. This list, Mr. Speaker, is not confined to organizations in my home State of Connecticut which I have the honor to represent as the Congressman at Large, and in that capacity, represent the largest constituency on the Republican side of this House, but the organizations, which have volunteered their endorsement to H. R. 6452 as their basis for individual and corporate relief from our present confiscatory taxes, are nationwide.

May I once again stress the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the largest beneficial effect of the provisions of my bill will fall to those taxpayers in the $6,000 bracket and under. The total relief to individuals will approximate $10.6 billion over the 5-year forward scheduling and approximately $4.2 billion relief to businesses.

The list is as follows:

Optimist Club, Springfield, Ill.
Michigan Manufacturers' Association, Detroit, Mich.
Associated Industries of Rhode Island, Inc., Providence, R. I.
Chamber of Commerce, Bowling Green, Ohio.
Connecticut Farmers' Cooperative Association, East Hartford, Conn.
Associated Industries of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky.
Manufacturers' Association of Lackawanna County, Scranton, Pa.
Manufacturers Association, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y.
Economic Club of Southwestern Michigan, St. Joseph, Mich.
Connecticut Petroleum Association, New Britain, Conn.
Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, Chicago, Ill.
Jersey City Chamber of Commerce, Jersey City, N. J.
Automotive Electric Association, Detroit, Mich.
Associated Industries of Oshkosh, Inc., Oshkosh, Wis.
Connecticut Motor Club, New Haven, Conn.
The Valve Manufacturers Association, New York, N. Y.
The Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Hartford, Conn.
Coated and Processed Paper Association, Providence, R. I.
Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Chicago, Ill.
Manufacturers' Association of Lancaster, Pa., Lancaster, Pa.
Connecticut Public Expenditure Council, Inc., Hartford, Conn.
Furniture Manufacturers Association, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Bangor Executives Club, Bangor, Maine.
National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
Manufacturerers Association of Connecticut, Inc., West Hartford, Conn.
Manufacturers Association of Racine, Racine, Wis.
Americans for Tax Reduction, Rockford, Ill.
Screen Actors Guild (AFL–CIO), Hollywood, Calif.
Metal Treating Institute, New Rochelle, N. Y.
"99" Luncheon Club of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.
The Cotton Trade Journal, Memphis, Tenn.
Florida Taxpayers Association, Inc., Tampa, Fla.
Executives' Association, Long Beach, Calif.
Phoenix Association of Home Builders, Phoenix, Ariz.
Lumbermen's Industrial Relations Committee, Inc., Portland, Oreg.
Wyoming Taxpayers Association, Cheyenne, Wyo.
Investors League, Inc., New York, N. Y.
Chamber of Commerce of the Attleboros, Attleboro, Mass.
Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, Tampa, Fla.
Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Boise, Idaho.
The Printing Industry of Connecticut, Inc., New Haven, Conn.
Westlake Lions Club, Los Angeles, Calif.
Lorain County Industrial Association, Elyria, Ohio.
Associated Industries of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.
Texas Manufacturers Association, Houston, Tex.
Alton District Manufacturers' Association, Alton, Ill.
Kern County Property Owners Association, Bakersfield, Calif.
Manufacturers' Association of Berks County, Reading, Pa.
Defiance Chamber of Commerce, Defiance, Ohio.
Brookline Kiwanis Club of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
Connecticut State Grange, Litchfield, Conn.
Vinyl Fabrics Institute, New York, N. Y.
New London County Rural Letter Carriers Association, Old Lyme, Conn.
Pontiac Manufacturers' Association, Pontiac, Mich.
The Mid-Hudson Industrial Association, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Associated Industries of Arkansas, Inc., Little Rock, Ark.
Newark Chamber of Commerce, Newark, N. Y.
Nevada Citizens Committee, Las Vegas, Nev.
Defiance Manufacturers' Association, Defiance, Ohio.
Middletown Chamber of Commerce, Middletown, N. Y.
Michigan Retailers' Association, Lansing, Mich.
Hagerstown Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Hagerstown, Md.
Salt Producers Association, Chicago, Ill.
Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla.
Manufacturers Association of Hartford County, Hartford, Conn.
National Truck Tank and Trailer Tank Institute, Chicago, Ill.
The Associated Cooperage Industries of America, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
The Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council, Inc., Waterbury, Conn.
Northeast Wisconsin Industrial Association, Manitowoc, Wis.
West Coast Lumbermen's Association, Portland, Oreg.
Hague Chamber of Commerce, Hague, N. Y.
Macon Chamber of Commerce, Macon, Ga.
Manufacturers' Association of Delaware County, Chester, Pa.
Central Virginia Industries, Inc., Lynchburg, Va.
Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, Long Beach, Calif.
Marshall Chamber of Commerce, Marshall, Ill.
Bangor Chamber of Commerce, Bangor, Maine.
Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D. C.
Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, Richmond, Va.
Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers Council, Stamford, Conn.
Gray Iron Founders' Society, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.
High Point Chamber of Commerce, High Point, N. C.

Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Chicago, Ill.
Associated Industries of Maine, Augusta, Maine.
California Fish Canners Association, Inc., Terminal Island, Calif.
Bremerton Chamber of Commerce, Bremerton, Wash.
Suburban Management Council, Elmhurst, Ill.
Columbia Empire Industries, Inc., Associated Employers, Inc., San Antonio, Tex.
Optimist Club of Downey, Downey, Calif.
Greater Trenton Chamber of Commerce, Trenton, N. J.
Southern Farm Equipment Manufacturers, Inc., Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce, Montgomery, Ind.
Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Fort Worth, Tex.
McAllen Chamber of Commerce, McAllen, Tex.
Altoona Chamber of Commerce, Altoona, Pa.
North Wichita Optimist Club, Wichita, Kans.
Graphic Arts Association of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.
Kiwanis Club of Baltimore City, Baltimore City, Mo.
Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla.
Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla.
Yakima Chamber of Commerce, Yakima, Wash.
Pacific Coast Paper Box Manufacturers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
Hagerstown Manufacturers Association, Hagerstown, Md.
Columbia Manufacturers Association, Columbia, Pa.
West Branch Manufacturers Association, Williamsport, Pa.
Lancaster Chamber of Commerce, Lancaster, Pa.
Independent Business Executives Association, Chicago, Ill.
Manufacturers Association of York, York, Pa.
Midway Optimists Club of St. Paul, St. Paul, Minn.
Tulsa Retail Merchants Association, Tulsa, Okla.
Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, Shreveport, La.
Bossier City Chamber of Commerce, Bossier City, La.
Mississippi Manufacturers Association, Jackson, Miss.
Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, Montgomery, Ala.
Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Birmingham, Ala.
Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash.
Spokane Chamber of Commerce, Spokane, Wash.
Furniture Manufacturers Association of South California.
Southeast Los Angeles Press Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
Lawndale Chamber of Commerce, Lawndale, Calif.
Woburn Chamber of Commerce, Woburn, Mass.
Salisbury Chamber of Commerce, Salisbury, Mo.
New Bedford Chamber of Commerce, New Bedford, Mass.
Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.
Brockton Chamber of Commerce, Brockton, Mass.
Maine State Chamber of Commerce, Augusta, Maine.
Downtown Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Swissvale Chamber of Commerce, Swissvale, Pa.
Pittsfield Chamber of Commerce, Pittsfield, Mass.

Address by the Honorable James C. Davis, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1957

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am glad to include a most able and timely address delivered by our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, before the Tennessee Federation of Constitutional Government, at Nashville, Tenn., on August 16, 1957. The address is as follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. DAVIS TO THE TENNESSEE FEDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, NASHVILLE, TENN., AUGUST 16, 1957

It is a privilege for me to accept the invitation to speak to this group of Tennesseans. You are striving to preserve a right which belongs to us, a possession which is precious to us, which is at this moment in great danger of destruction—namely, constitutional government. The Government in Washington is stretching its long arm into your State and community, through the Federal courts, to strike down State sovereignty, to destroy local self-government, to deprive you and your legally chosen school authorities of the power to operate your public schools as you have been operating them and as you want to continue to operate them. It proposes to substitute instead control by court orders and edicts fashioned upon a new philosophy which stalks through our land, and which we are told we must accept whether we like it or not.

It is demanded of us that we cast aside our beliefs, that we surrender our convictions, that we give up customs under which we were reared and to which we subscribe. Meek obedience is demanded. Resistance is threatened with dire consequences and penalties.

The situation, indeed, is critical; the times are perilous.

Why have we come suddenly face to face with this unbelievable situation? It stems from a wrongful and fraudulent usurpation of authority and power by the United States Supreme Court, a usurpation of power which amounts to tyranny.

In every section of America today earnest protests are being voiced against the arbitrary, dictatorial action of the Federal Supreme Court, and its wrongful usurpation of powers it does not possess. Americans have always been quick to recognize and to protest injustice in the courts. It is significant that when the Colonies revolted against the injustice and tyranny of George III, the Declaration of Independence complained of judges who were dependent on the will of the King alone for the tenure of their offices, the amount and payment of their salaries, and that the administration of justice was obstructed by the sovereign power. These acts of tyranny and oppression were intolerable then to a free and liberty-loving people just as similar acts are intolerable now.

We are facing today, I believe, the most critical period which America has faced since 1776, when that small group of men met in Philadelphia to choose between security and peace on the one hand, which could be purchased at the price of continued submission to tyrannical oppression, or revolution and war with the world's greatest power on the other hand. With the certain knowledge that years of misery and suffering lay ahead, that they would fight against heavy odds, and that defeat and death might be the portion of everyone who participated, they believed in their hearts that free government was worth the price they had to pay. They threw their all into the balance as they fought for it. Our Government of liberty, freedom, and opportunity today is the result of that choice and of the fight which they made.

Freedom was not just a topic of idle conversation with them. "Integrity" was more than a word in the dictionary. Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, their associates, and their followers preached the doctrine that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God. They had the courage to practice what they preached.

When victory finally came to our forefathers they set up not a centralized government with unlimited powers, but a republic of sovereign States. And this was done for the purpose of guaranteeing local self-government to the citizen. They provided that the Federal Government should function as three coequal departments, each of the three to be separate from and independent of the others. The foundation of this free Government was a written Constitution. It was put in writing so that its lasting principles would not be subject to passing whims or fancies. They provided a specific way to amend the document, if changing times and conditions ever required it. All of us are familiar with that method of amending. Nothing less than a vote of two-thirds of the Congress to be ratified by three-fourths of the States will serve to change it. Without such concurrent action by those overwhelming majorities not a sentence or a word of the Constitution can legally be changed. Both those who wrote it and those who adopted that Constitution knew the need for reciprocal checks and balances in maintaining free government. George Washington, the Father of our Country, the greatest general, patriot, and statesman, knew that freedom and liberty would be preserved if these reciprocal checks and balances were maintained. He knew these checks and balances would be maintained if the Constitution were respected and followed, and if it were amended only in the manner provided by the instrument itself. Warning against any other method of change, he said in his farewell address on September 17, 1796:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

Thomas Jefferson feared, as George Washington did, wrongful usurpation of power by the Supreme Court. Jefferson expressed himself far more vigorously on the subject than did Washington. On this subject Jefferson said:

"The judiciary of the United States is a subtle corps of sappers and miners constantly working underground to undermine the foundations of our confederated fabric. They are construing our Constitution from a coordination of general and special governments to a general and supreme one alone. * * * Having found from experience that impeachment is an impractical thing, a mere scarecrow, they consider themselves secure for life; they skulk from responsibility to public opinion * * * an opinion is huddled up in a conclave, perhaps by a majority of one, delivered as if unanimous, and with the silent acquiescence of lazy or timid associates, by a crafty Chief Judge, who

sophisticates the law to his mind, by the turn of his own reasoning."

Jefferson, that stanch believer in individual liberty, that fine advocate of States rights and local self-government said this about the provisions in the 10th amendment:

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground: that 'all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people.' To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition."

Today our free Government is face to face with the danger of destruction which George Washington and Thomas Jefferson feared, and against which they warned us in the words I have just repeated. That Court, with a brazeness and boldness almost unbelievable is undertaking to amend the Constitution and make statutory law through so-called judicial decisions and court opinions. In the school segregation cases the Court has arrogated unto itself, first, the functions of Congress and the States to change the Constitution; second, the function of Congress to make enforcement law, and third, the functions of the Executive Department to carry out such enforcement. This is rank usurpation of authority the Court does not possess.

In the structure of our Government there is no fact more certain than this; the nine Justices of the Supreme Court cannot change our Constitution.

The Congress with its 531 Members of the House and Senate cannot change it.

The President of the United States, with all his power, cannot change it.

Neither one of these alone can amend the Constitution. All three together cannot amend it.

It can be changed only by an amendment voted for by two-thirds of the House and Senate, and by three-fourths of the sovereign States of the Union.

Any attempt to change our Constitution in any other manner is a fraud—a gross fraud which it is the duty of all patriotic citizens to expose and to prevent. Again I am reminded of the philosophy of Jefferson and Franklin, that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.

The principle involved here goes far beyond our right to operate our schools, although that in itself is a valued right, and a right we are not called upon to surrender merely because the Supreme Court undertakes to usurp power it does not possess.

The real issue is: Shall we permit the Supreme Court, one Department of Government, whose powers are defined and limited by the Constitution, to successfully assert the power to change that precious document, by reading into it language it does not contain, and which those who wrote the Constitution and its amendments, never intended it should contain?

The question is, if changing conditions require a change in the Constitution, shall it be changed as the Constitution says, by drawing an amendment with definite and specific language which shall receive the people's overwhelming stamp of approval through a vote of two-thirds of the Congress, plus three-fourths of the States? This is the legal way.

Or, shall it be amended by the arbitrary act of nine men, to whom this authority has not been given, who are not elected, and who can in no sense of the word be said to represent the will and wishes of the people regarding amendments to the Constitution?

We have amended the Constitution 22 times in the past by following legal and regular procedure. The 22d amendment was proposed in 1947 and certified in 1951. What has happened that we no longer must submit amendments to the Congress for a two-thirds vote and to the States for a three-fourths vote?

We have not yet lost this right to have a voice in adopting amendments to the Constitution, or in rejecting them. But this Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is a brazen effort to destroy this right.

Can the Court today strike down the accepted and declared meaning of the Constitution? Can it nullify a construction on the exact point involved, which has been followed and approved in dozens of instances, by the Supreme Court itself and courts of many other jurisdictions, and in doing so rely upon nothing but its own arbitrary will, to support the decision, and read into the Constitution language which is not there? If it can do this today, then it can tomorrow or next month strike down any other provision which does not conform to its sociological beliefs. While it may be Georgia or Tennessee which suffers today from such wrongful usurpation of authority, next year it may be Oregon, Maine, or Illinois.

While the subject today is schools, its next usurpation may involve taxes, or criminal law, or the right to own property. Once the precedent is established—once we have acknowledged the right of the Supreme Court to trifle with the Constitution, there is no limit to its possibilities.

Those of us who support local self-government and States rights have been slow to believe that we could lose these precious rights. We know now that we can lose them. We know now that if we are going to keep them we must arouse ourselves. We must throw off apathy and indifference.

The right to be segregated goes back for thousands of years before our Government was established. That right never was challenged until this present Supreme Court decided to make new law on the subject. Yet the Court is not a lawmaking body. Congress alone has the right to legislate and introduce new matter into the body of our law. Congress, in the proper exercise of its function, has time and time again refused to make new law on this subject. There is no question about the fact that Congress alone can change the law and that the Court cannot.

For the nine men who sit upon the Supreme Court to usurp these powers which do not belong to them, but which belong exclusively to Congress and to the States, is a monumental fraud which is shocking, outrageous, and reprehensible.

Such fraudulent conduct imposes no obligation upon the States to acquiesce, or upon the people to bow the neck to this new form of tyranny.

Let me say to you, as we counsel together, do not be concerned about what is said by the Communists, the pinkos, the radicals, the NAACP, the ADA, the one-worlders, and all that motley group of crackpots who are clamoring for desegregation and mongrelization. These groups of organized minorities are chanting a chorus that opposition to the fraudulent order of the Supreme Court is defiance of law. Of course that is not true. The decision of May 17, 1954, is not law. It is an attempt to make law where none existed before, by a nonlawmaking body. The defiance of law comes from the other side of this dispute. It is an arrogant defiance of law for the Supreme Court to usurp authority which it does not possess.

This claim that opposition to, and criticism of, the fraudulent Supreme Court decision is defiance of law is a sham. It is intended to draw attention away from the truth in this matter. That truth is that the Supreme Court is boldly and brazenly attempting to change the form of our Government.

A stock contention of the integrationists and mongrelizers is that a Court decision is the last word in the law, and must be accepted; that the Court's function is to expound the law.

As long as the Court sticks to the law its decisions will be accepted. When it flies in the face of the law, as the Court has done in this instance, it commits a wrong. It perpetrates a fraud upon the people. It commits as grievous a wrong as a tax collector commits when he demands more than just taxes from a taxpayer. It commits a wrong as grievous as a warden of a penitentiary commits who would seek to imprison a convict beyond the limits of his legal term. It commits as grievous a wrong as any other public official commits who seeks to assert authority which he does not possess, or to exceed the authority which he does possess. No right-thinking citizen can acquiesce in brazen usurpation of authority by any public official.

Free Americans are under no obligation whatever to permit any public official to take from them that which is theirs merely because that public official occupies a seat of authority, if he attempts either through ignorance or malfeasance to go beyond the bounds of that authority.

We owe allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. That instrument is the bedrock upon which our structure of government is built. It is our guaranty of liberty. But the allegiance we owe is to the Constitution itself, which was drafted by the Constitutional Convention and ratified by the sovereign States, and to such amendments thereto as have been legally proposed by two-thirds of the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States, and no one can dispute that solemn truth.

There are some who say that the Constitution means what the judges say it means. But that is not true. The Constitution itself proclaims its meaning. No court or judge possesses any authority to change the language or meaning of any phrase or word of the Constitution in the slightest degree. It is only when the wording of the Constitution is ambiguous or needs interpretation that the judicial department of the Government has authority to go into the question of what it means. And the judicial department never has had—it does not have now—authority to add anything new or take anything old from the instrument. That can only be done by amendment.

So the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, what the judges say it is. It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and again. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change that true meaning, the established and accepted meaning, of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

The members of the Supreme Court have also sworn to uphold the Constitution. They owe the same loyalty to the Constitution that every other citizen does. The Constitution does not mean one thing yesterday, another thing today and something else tomorrow, and they have no right to so hold.

If the logic or reasoning employed by the Supreme Court in order to reach this decision is allowed to become standard practice;

if the Constitution means one thing today and something entirely different tomorrow, then actually we have no Constitution at all.

And when anyone, whether he be President, legislator, or judge, deals with the Constitution unlawfully, it is the part of patriotism and in keeping with loyalty to the Constitution, to protest and oppose such unwarranted action. The preservation of our Government depends upon it. Our Government cannot survive in any different climate.

Now it is not only on the segregation issue that the Court is following this pattern of usurpation. In other fields also it is following a pattern of consistent and continuous usurpation of legislative functions—a pattern of stealthy erosion of the Constitution without resort to legal amendment as provided for in that document.

The segregation question is only a part of this pattern of usurpation.

In such recent decisions as the Steve Nelson and Slochower cases, the Court has rendered the States and our cities powerless to protect themselves against communism. On April 2, 1956, in the Steve Nelson case,[1] the Supreme Court said that the State of Pennsylvania cannot punish Communists for knowingly advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States. The flimsy excuse given by the Court was that Congress had passed a law on the subject and when the Federal Government occupies the field on this vital subject, no room is left for the States to act.

One week later on April 9, 1956, the same Court in the Slochower case[2] declared a section of the charter of the city of New York unconstitutional because it permitted the city to dismiss a teacher in a college operated by the city when the teacher refused to state whether or not he was a Communist.

In the Yates case,[3] the Smith Act was rendered useless. In this case, decided on June 17 of this year, the Supreme Court reversed 14 convictions of conspiracy (a) for advocating and teaching the duty and necessity of overthrowing the Government of the United States by force and violence, and (b) for organizing a society of persons who so advocated and taught—all with the intent of causing the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. In this decision, the Court was actually legislating by writing into the Smith Act the intent of Congress—an intent undreamed of by the Congress when passing the act.

Earlier, on April 30, 1956, in *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board*,[4] the Supreme Court had rendered useless the Subversive Activities Control Act and nullified the action of the Subversive Activities Control Board in its efforts to require known Communists to register.

In the Jencks case,[5] the Court put shackles and handcuffs on the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In the Mallory case,[6] by turning a self-confessed convicted rapist scot-free, the Court tied the hands of police, sheriffs, and law-enforcement agencies. In the cases of *Konigsberg* v. *the State Bar of California*[7] and *Schware* v. *the Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico*,[8] the Court told State courts and bar associations that they cannot make their own regulations on admission to the bar; that they had no power to protect themselves against Communists; and that it is unconstitutional to deny a Communist admission to the bar.

The Watkins[9] decision struck a mortal blow at effective machinery for exposing Communists through Congressional inquiry. Under this newly declared philosophy, Communists may now thumb their noses at Congressional and senatorial investigating committees. There are other similar decisions which time does not permit me to take up.

But I do not come tonight to discuss in detail these shocking and outrageous decisions which amount to the making of new laws to free Communists and criminals, to tie the hands of State legislatures, State courts, police officers, and Congressional investigating committees. I shall talk about these in other times and at other places and in due time I shall join with what I believe will be a great majority of my colleagues in Congress to enact laws to correct the evils of this pattern of usurpation, and to reestablish the security of our people and of this country, both nationally and locally. I want to give you tonight, from firsthand knowledge, some of the evils which follow this philosophy of integrated schools; this Court-made law which is being pushed and promoted so vigorously by the power-usurping Supreme Court of the United States and the radicals of this country.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court made public its opinion in the school segregation cases. On June 18, 1953, in the case of *District of Columbia* v. *Thompson's Restaurant*, the Court had already made some more new laws to the effect that it was illegal in the District of Columbia for the owner of a restaurant to operate it on a segregated basis.

Although the Court in its May 17, 1954 opinion deferred any further action on the school cases until the October term, so as to give the legal representatives of the States an opportunity to present further argument, the radicals and the social equality advocates were champing at the bit and straining at the leash. They could not wait. Following a statement by the President of the United States that the Washington schools should serve as a model of integrated schools to be copied by the rest of the country, they proceeded full speed ahead to transform an orderly, effective school system into what later proved to be a veritable nightmare by ordering the schools to be integrated at the September term that year. On May 25, 1954, just 8 days after the Supreme Court ruling, the District of Columbia Board of Education, by a 6-to-3 vote, ordered the schools opened on an integrated basis in September.

Boundaries for each school were established with compulsory attendance of each pupil required at such school. A rule was made that records should not be kept or information given out on the basis of race.

If there is any place in the United States where integration could be expected to succeed, that place is Washington, D. C. For many years Washington has had no segregation in transportation or residence. For many years it has had Negro policemen on an unsegregated basis. For many years it has had Negro firemen and by official order the Fire Department was placed on an unsegregated basis in 1954. Since 1953, segregation has been unlawful in restaurants and hotels. Long before that, segregation was abolished in theaters, ball parks, motion pictures, and so forth. For many years there have been Negro judges, prosecutors, and court officials there.

Thousands of Negroes work on an unsegregated basis in all of the Government agencies in Washington. The Negro per capita income in the District of Columbia is higher than the white income in some areas of the Nation. All publicly owned swimming pools have been open to Negroes for years, as well as tennis courts, playgrounds, and parks.

All the public facilities of the Nation's Capital are, and have been, available to them for years, such as libraries and auditoriums. Here is the Nation's Capital, the people of the District of Columbia enjoy more cultural advantages than the people of any other city of America. The District of Columbia Negroes have had school facilities superior to most other school districts in the Nation. Washington has been spending $307.80 per child per year in its public-school system, as compared with $269.70 in Baltimore, $260.80 in Montgomery County, Md., adjoining Washington, $240.73 in Prince Georges County, Md., and as compared with $138.60 per pupil per year in Memphis, Tenn.

In June 1956, after 2 years' experience with integrated schools in the District of Columbia, the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives created a subcommittee and ordered it to make an investigation of the public-school system in the District of Columbia. The subcommittee was strictly nonpartisan. It was composed of six members, three Democrats and three Republicans. I was named chairman of that subcommittee. For its counsel, the subcommittee selected, by unanimous vote, an able lawyer from your own State, Mr. William Gerber, of Memphis.

Those who had promoted the mixing of white and Negro children in schools uttered loud protests against this investigation. The radical organization, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held a mass meeting in Washington to protest it. They sent telegrams to President Eisenhower, to Presidential Candidate Adlai Stevenson, to Chairman Leonard Hall of the Republican National Committee, to Chairman Paul Butler of the Democratic National Committee, to Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, to Democratic Floor Leader John McCormack, to Republican Floor Leader Joe Martin, to Chairman John McMillan of the House District of Columbia Committee, and to each member of that committee, urging them to prevent the subcommittee from carrying out the function it was created to perform. The Washington Post, one of the most ardent advocates of mixing the races, began to carry editorials charging that the committee was stacked, that it was biased and prejudiced, and that its investigation would not result in a true picture of the school system. Frantic efforts were made to prevent the committee from beginning its work, and to prevent a continuance of the investigation after it began. In the 11 years I have served in Congress, I have never seen as much effort put forth to prevent a duly constituted committee of Congress from performing its work. When witnesses began to testify regarding the sordid facts and deplorable conditions of the schools, one of the Negro school board members issued a public statement containing a veiled threat to the effect that the school superintendent, Dr. Corning, "should reexamine the competency of some of the principals" who had testified at the hearings, and who, he said, had "made severe admissions of inadequacy." Our counsel and staff interviewed hundreds of teachers, principals, and school officials. Some of them were afraid to testify and told the staff they could not because they "had to live and eat."

Be it said to their credit, however, a majority of the witnesses, who were teachers, principals, or school officials, came voluntarily and testified. Not a subpena was issued by

---

[1] *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (1956) 350 U. S. 497).

[2] *Slochower* v. *Board of Education* ((1956) 350 U. S. 551).

[3] *Yates* v. *U. S.* ((1957) 25 Law Week 4475 on the Smith Act (18 U. S. C. 2385)).

[4] ((1956), 351 U. S. 15.)

[5] Decided June 3, 1957 (*Jencks* v. U. S. (25 Law Week 4365)).

[6] Decided June 24, 1957 (*Mallory* v. *U. S.* (25 Law Week 4560)).

[7] Decided May 6, 1957 (*Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of Cal. and the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of Cal.* (25 Law Week 4281)).

[8] Decided May 6, 1957 (*Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico* (25 Law Week 4277)).

[9] Decided June 17, 1957. *Watkins* v. *U. S.* (25 Law Week 4510).

the committee to compel a single witness to appear, and witnesses consisted of both white and Negro teachers, and those who favored integration as well as those who did not.

In spite of all the roadblocks thrown in its path, the subcommittee made a thorough investigation and the hearings consisted of 512 printed pages of testimony.

We learned in this investigation that Negroes are moving into Washington in increasing numbers, and the white people are moving out. This exodus of white people from the District of Columbia began when the first steps of race mixing began in public housing and other fields. It increased as the agitation for integration increased. When the Supreme Court decision was rendered resulting in the integration of the schools, there was a marked and noticeable increase in the number of white people moving from Washington into Maryland and Virginia. This movement continues. Many formerly all-white areas have changed into all-colored areas. Many all-white schools have changed almost completely.

Twelve of the elementary schools which were all white in 1953 now have 92 percent Negro and 8 percent white pupils. Typical of the change is Wheatley Elementary School which was all white in 1953. In 1954, it had 589 white pupils and 139 Negro pupils. By 1956, the whites had dwindled to 24 and the colored had increased to 576.

Just a few years ago the school population in Washington was two-thirds white and one-third Negro, but the school census showed that in October 1956 white students were 32 percent of the school population and Negro students 68 percent. The rate of decline of white pupils is rapidly increasing year by year. In 1953 this rate of decline was 2.7 percent; in 1954, 7.8 percent; in 1955, 6.3, and in 1956, 10.4 percent. The percentage decline of white pupils from 1949 to 1956 was 28.6 percent. This trend of whites moving out of Washington and Negroes moving in, and the rate of changeover, justifies the prediction that in just a few years the District of Columbia will be a predominately Negro community.

Before integration white and Negro pupils had equal opportunity in the schools. The same amount of money was spent per pupil. A white teachers college and a colored teachers college were provided. Although there were about twice as many white pupils as Negro pupils, there were 60 white elementary schools and 61 colored elementary schools. There were six white senior high schools and four colored. The same equipment was provided for each and the same amount per pupil was spent.

Prior to integration, the integrationists claimed that the maintenance of one school system instead of two would mean substantial economy in operating expenses. Yet no economy has resulted. On the contrary operating costs have increased greatly. Information furnished me on August 12 this year by the District of Columbia school department, shows that operating expenses jumped from $26,700,000 in 1953 to $35,600,000 in 1957, with an estimate of $37½ million for 1958.

The committee had testimony that so much extra time is required for coaching Negro pupils that the teachers are unable to devote proper attention to the white pupils, who consequently suffer under this new system.

The Supreme Court and the NAACP have created strife and turmoil where no strife and turmoil existed before. Their joint action has increased tension between the races, and has caused hatred and hostility where before there was good will and harmony. This strife is chargeable to, and responsibility for it must rest with, the Court and the radical NAACP, which has been encouraged by the Court's action to stir up hostility between the races.

I have been talking to you about the Constitution and the legal phase of this question. I want to say something now about the human side, and the moral justification we have for insisting upon segregation.

Much false propaganda has been spread within recent years, and much effort has been made to brainwash the public with the utterly false doctrine that there is no difference between whites and blacks. It is time to look behind this brainwashing propaganda, and have a straight look at the facts.

There are obvious and well-known differences between whites and blacks which no amount of glossing over and covering up by subversive so-called anthropologists and pseudoscientists can hide.

Let's look at some facts from the record which have a direct bearing on the question of desirability or undesirability of integrated schools, aside from the legal aspect of the problem.

Among the many other reasons why the white people object to their children having this close association with Negro children are health, the Negroes' high crime rate, and disrespect for law, the lower mentality level, and the high rate of illegitimacy among Negroes.

It is well-known that the crime rate among Negroes far exceeds that of whites. This is true in Washington, D. C., although Negroes have every advantage they could ask for. The schools and colleges are open to them; also hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, swimming pools, tennis courts. They buy property and live in any section they choose. The President and his appointed city commissioners apparently want to make a second Harlem out of Washington, and they boast that Washington is a model example of a nonsegregated city.

But Washington is noted for the great number of serious crimes committed in its limits. Its crimes of violence are more than twice those committed in Boston, a city of comparable size, more than twice those of Milwaukee, and nearly twice as many as New Orleans, La.

Negroes are responsible for this high crime rate. Crime statistics show that throughout the years the Negroes in Washington have committed the bulk of the crimes of violence, although until recently they have constituted about one-third of the population. In 1955, out of 11,072 crimes of violence, 9,056 were by Negroes. This is 82 percent of the total, and the percentage for the last 3 months of 1955 was 88 percent of the total.

Let's look at the District of Columbia health records. A report for the year 1955 made by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health of venereal diseases in children of school age and under, showed 834 Negro children, 17 years and under, treated for gonorrhea, as compared with 20 white children. Of the 834 Negro children, 10 were under 6 years of age. The total cases of gonorrhea of all ages, children and adults, for 1955 were Negro, 10,243, or 97.5 percent of the total; white, 271, or 2.5 percent.

These are repulsive statistics, but they show some of the impelling reasons for segregated schools, and what a tragedy it is for white children to have integration forced upon them.

From the standpoint of mentality, the Negroes have not been able to keep pace with the white children of the District of Columbia. This has resulted in lowering of educational standards.

The tragic consequences of throwing white and Negro children together in the public schools of Washington, D. C., were brought to light by the subcommittee investigation conducted by us of the integrated school system in the Nation's Capital which was supposed to be a model for the entire Nation to follow in setting up integrated schools.

One of the first steps taken when white and Negro children were thrown together in the Washington schools was the adoption of the rule which prohibits the keeping of records according to race. Failure to keep records by race prevents comparison of scholastic achievements, and mental capacity between white and Negro pupils.

The subcommittee was able, however, by careful and detailed investigation of the school records, to gather sufficient information to make comparisons in a number of schools of the scholastic achievements, mental capacity and intelligence quotient between the white and Negro students.

At the time of the hearings, there were still some schools in Washington which were nearly 100 percent colored; some still 100 percent white, and some nearly 100 percent white.

Accurate comparisons based upon recognized achievement tests, known as the Iowa achievement test, Stanford achievement tests, and I. Q. tests, showed that there was a very wide difference in scholastic achievement and mental ability between white and Negro pupils.

To illustrate, we found that in Cardoza High School, which had only six white pupils and 1,694 colored pupils, there were 512 pupils in the 10th grade; of the 512, 230 were able to read only from fourth grade to seventh grade level; more than 300 were able to work arithmetic only at seventh grade level or below, and 283 of the 512, which is 55 percent, were classified as being in a category which would never be able to achieve beyond the sixth grade level.

One teacher in Roosevelt High School, with a class about 75 percent colored, said she had more failures in 1 year on integrated teaching than she had in 10 years of teaching in a segregated school.

The assistant superintendent in charge of all senior high schools testified that in four high schools, having a total of eight white students and 5,011 colored students, these four colored high schools, tested under the Iowa achievement test, rated or scored in the lowest 5 percent in the Nation of schools taking this test. He testified that in three high schools having a total of 3,030 white students and 99 colored, these three predominantly white schools, under the same test, rated or scored in the top 5 percent of the Nation.

In a group of 11 junior high schools with a total of 10,304 Negro students and only 205 whites, 2,991 were given a test on "reading and paragraph meaning"; 2,161 achieved at the level of sixth grade or lower. Of these, 676 were at fourth grade level and 385 at third grade level.

Testimony of many of the teachers showed that the Negro pupils, because of low achievement and mental ability, required so much time and attention that the white pupils had to be neglected, and failed to receive the time and attention they would have had otherwise.

All of these facts had been concealed behind an iron curtain in Washington. The NAACP and the other sponsors of integrated schools wanted desperately to keep the facts concealed, and they were concealed until our investigation brought them to light.

I have given you a few examples of testimony concerning scholastic achievement and mental ability of Negro pupils in the Washington schools. This testimony is typical of the bulk of testimony we took for 9 days from school officials, principals, and teachers.

We asked about personal relations between white and colored pupils both as to pupils of the same sex and pupils of the opposite sex.

Practically without exception, the testimony was that dances, plays, senior proms, picnics, and similar social functions were discontinued when the schools were integrated.

At Roosevelt High School, where white and colored were about equally divided, it was necessary to discontinue girl cheerleaders and use only male cheerleaders because of remarks and incidents which occurred at the basketball games.

Negro girls were antagonistic to white girls, and did such things as stepping on their heels in the halls, sticking pins in them; a Negro girl will stand in the aisle and dare a white girl to pass her. A group of Negro girls will attack a white girl on the way home from school and inflict personal injuries upon her.

Similar personal antagonism exists between Negro boys and white boys. At McKinley High School a group of Negro boys attacked two white boys who had been circulating a petition opposing an integrated prom. They beat them and left one of the boys unconscious on the sidewalk. Fourteen stitches were required to sew the wounds inflicted inside this boy's mouth. His father brought him to the Capitol so that I could see the serious injuries he received.

There were numerous fights, beatings, stabbings, and so forth. The principal of McFarland Junior High School testified that, although it was never necessary to call for police assistance when operating segregated schools in the last year in his integrated school, he had to call for police assistance approximately 50 times to prevent fights and keep order.

Many of the witnesses testified as to obscene remarks, obscene literature, indecent proposals, indecent handling and indecent approaches of Negro boys to white girls.

The principal of Roosevelt High School testified that she had two cases of Negro boys approaching white girls in her school the same week she was testifying as a witness. She said she had this trouble last year and the year before, which was the entire period of integrated schools.

The former principal of Eastern High School swore that he retired last year because of ill health brought on by conditions resulting from integrating the schools. He stated it was necessary to require last year that all teachers leave their desks when the bells rang to keep order in the corridors.

He said he heard colored girls at times use language that was far worse than any he had ever heard, even in the Marine Corps.

He said that fighting, including several knifings, went on continuously—that such incidents became more or less commonplace following integration; that there were more thefts in his school in 2 years of integration than he had known in all his 30-odd years of experience before; that there were many sex problems following integration; that colored boys wrote notes to white girls giving their telephone numbers and asking for the girls' telephone numbers; that colored boys touched white girls in a suggestive manner when passing them in the halls, and made obscene remarks about them.

He stated that one white girl was surrounded by a group of colored students after leaving school one afternoon; that a colored boy put a knife to her back, forcing her down an alley and against a wall, and while they were debating making her take her clothes off, she broke away and ran home.

This principal stated that a dozen or more colored girl students became pregnant at his school during his last school year.

The principal of Jefferson Junior High School testified to 27 pregnancies in his school during last year, two white and 25 colored.

The number of pregnancies among the Negro girl pupils has created a serious problem in the high schools and junior high schools.

Mr. Howard West of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health testified that in 1955 there were 996 illegitimate babies born to girls of school age in Washington—that is, ages 18 and under. Of these 926 were colored and 70 whites; 86 of them were born to girls under 15 years of age, five white and 81 colored.

There were 3,533 illegitimate births of all ages in Washington in 1955, of which 382 were white and 3,151 colored.

All white births in Washington in 1955 totaled 8,556, of which 382 were illegitimate. The illegitimate white births were approximately 4.4 percent. All colored births in Washington in 1955 totaled 11,404, of which 3,151 or 27 percent were illegitimate.

He testified that it is a close estimate to say that one out of every four colored schoolchildren in the District of Columbia public schools is an illegitimate child, and this statement is based on the birth records in his department.

So, if you were the parent of a school-age daughter in Washington, D. C., and sent her to one of the model integrated schools, these are the surroundings and this is the atmosphere in which she would be educated and trained, and in which her life's philosophy would be formed.

We thought the testimony regarding illegitimate children before our committee was shocking almost beyond comprehension. However, it has grown much worse since this testimony was given. Illegitimate pregnancies have increased to such an alarming degree in the junior high schools of Washington that on June 21 Dr. John R. Pate, of the Southwest Health Center, made public a report on this disgraceful condition. In his report Dr. Pate said that Washington faces an "enormous moral and economic catastrophe," and that the District could no longer ignore the problem. His report was based on detailed records of children from 13 of the city's 23 junior high schools, who reported to the Southwest Health Center for confirmation of their pregnancies, in order to be excused from school. I have with me Dr. Pate's report, which consists of 25 mimeographed pages. I cannot begin to give you in the time allotted to me tonight but a small part of the shocking facts contained in this report, which for want of a better name was entitled "Junior Mothers."

Dr. Pate reported that a rise of over 1,000 percent in the number of pregnancies among this early teen-age group had occurred in comparison with the 1948–49 school year. He stated that in 1948–49 there were only seven illegitimate pregnancies in this junior high school group that came to the attention of the health center clinic.

In the first paragraph of his report he states that during the current school year there has been an alarming increase in the number of pregnant girls in the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades of the junior high schools of Washington coming to the Southwest Health Center to have completed and properly signed physician's certificates of pupils inability to attend school. It gives the details of a number of these cases in his report. It is full of such cases as that of a girl 14 years of age, herself one of six illegitimate children, having the second child by the same 17-year-old boy. A typical case is that of a 14-year-old girl, one of eight illegitimate children whose twin sister is also pregnant, both of them being on public assistance.

Dr. Pate says in the same paragraph that this problem has been increasing over the last 2 to 3 years (which is the period of integrated schools) more than was noted in several years prior to 1954. His report says:

"The fact is that during the current school year our records show an increase of approximately 1,000 percent in the number of illegitimate pregnancies as compared to the 1948–49 school year in this age group."

He also says that:

"In practically every school the report is not completely accurate, falling short of the total number of pregnancies for several reasons."

He also says:

"Further, many of these children being born out of wedlock are dependent solely upon public assistance funds for their support. This economic burden merely adds another complication to the emotional and moral one in the community."

He also says:

"On the question of public assistance to these children, it might be assumed that it will be the responsibility of the taxpayer for many years."

A shocking feature of this report is that the age of these school girls range from 11 to 15 years, one of them having become pregnant when she was 10 years old.

This report shows that in the elementary schools of a total of eight such cases all were colored, in the junior high schools of a total of 129, 119 were colored, 10 white. In the high schools of a total of 44, 43 were colored and 1 white. In a total of 190 such cases throughout the school system 178 were colored and 12 white.

Dr. Pate says in his report regarding one of these mothers of illegitimates, that their support and hers is from funds provided by the Department of Welfare. He says, "she readily admits the more children she has, the more income she expects to receive from this course and does not anticipate changing her pattern of living." He says that this pattern is repeated time and time again.

Dr. Pate's report compares conditions in Washington with those in Baltimore, a city which integrated its public schools at the same time Washington did. He states that in Baltimore of the total illegitimate babies, 50 percent occur among girls 18 years of age and lower, and that in 1954, the first year of integration, 36 percent of the total number of live births among the nonwhite were illegitimate, which was an increase of 6 percent over 1953 figures. He said that there was no noticeable increase in illegitimacy among white teen-agers in Baltimore during that same period.

One of the Washington cases was an eighth grade girl who was a close personal friend of another girl who had a baby. The junior mother kept showing pictures of her offspring to the eighth grade student, which created a strong desire in the eighth grader to duplicate the feat of her friend. After having intercourse with a number of young males and not getting pregnant, she has developed a definite psychosis.

Another portion of the report states that in the early part of the 1956–57 school year one southwest Washington school reported that more than one-half of the children enrolled were illegitimate.

Getting back to our investigation, Mr. Howard West, of the District of Columbia Department of Health told the committee that in 1955 the total number of cases of venereal disease reported to the Department age 17 and under was 854. Of that number, 20 were whites, seven male and 13 female; 834 were colored, 263 male and 571 female. There were 11 cases under six years of age, one white and 10 colored.

In the short time I have to talk to you tonight, I can only give you a few of the specific facts which our investigation has uncovered and brought out into the light. We held hearings for 9 days, and the testimony fills 512 printed pages.

The hearings show that instead of being a model integrated school system, the District of Columbia schools have been turned into a nightmare of chaos, indecency, lack of discipline, and inability to learn. It is causing white people to move out of Washington so rapidly that the school population which before integration was approximately two-

thirds white and one-third colored, is now, according to the latest estimate, approximately 68 percent colored and 32 percent white, with the percentage of colored pupils constantly increasing and white pupils decreasing in a corresponding degree.

These are some of the many valid reasons why white people are justified in the position taken regarding segregation.

I have given you these facts about the situation in Washington because in the wake of the Supreme Court decision to integrate schools, the President declared that Washington would be an example of how good integration would be. The present sickening conditions of the Washington schools are mute testimony to this example.

Not only have mixed schools been a scholastic failure but as an experiment in human relations it has been a nightmare.

In December 1955, principals in high schools and junior high schools found it necessary to hold "shake-down" inspections of their students in compliance with numerous complaints that students were carrying knives.

Two cases of attempted assault by Negro boys on white girls were reported in 1 day at one junior high school. These cases involved language and action so vile and so sordid that it staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to subject our children to such a malignant experiment. The same integrationists and mongrelizers have stated that they only want equal rights and opportunities for the Negro. Yet the radical NAACP has repeatedly declared that their ultimate goal is intermarriage and complete mongrelization of the American people. The fact that this is also the identical aim of the Communist Party of the United States is more than just coincidental. If they are successful in cramming this school decision down our throats, they will follow it with a decision invalidating our marriage laws, and that will be the end.

The time to end this judicial usurpation is now. The time to restore the Constitution to the people is now.

I have given you tonight, in brief, a picture of the deplorable situation in Washington. I have seen there the tragic results which come from the breakdown of segregation and substitution of an integrated public-school system.

This same thing can happen here and will happen to you if the people meekly accept wrongful usurpation of power, and a Supreme Court dictatorship, as they did in Washington.

It is not inevitable. It does not have to happen. The attitude that we cannot prevent it and that we must accept it is unworthy of a people with our heritage. There are many legal ways in which we can prevent such a catastrophe. The one thing which is needed is a determined attitude and a willingness to do whatever may be found necessary to preserve these precious rights.

I can say to you that we in Georgia are determined, and will not accept these fraudulent efforts to take from us our constitutional rights.

It need not happen here or elsewhere, and it will not happen, if we as free, liberty-loving Americans band together to retain our constitutional rights.

By organization at home, you can give inspiration to your public officials who must lead in this fight—to your governor, legislators, public-school officials, all those who must lead in this fight here at home, and to your Senators and Representatives in Washington. We must signify our determination to fight this battle to a successful conclusion. You have a most important part to play. It is your individual struggle, and your neighbor's individual struggle. Let me urge you to accept your responsibility, and to do your part. Urge your neighbor to do his part. This is a time when it is true, as never before, that "united we stand, divided we fall." This is a fight which can be won, and I pray that it is the will of Almighty God that it will be won. But it will not be won by default.

Shakespeare said, "He is thrice armed who hath his quarrel just." Never was there any people with more just reason to prevail than we in this struggle.

Let us not lose sight of this truth in these critical times. Let us remember that the fight is ahead of us—not behind us.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23, 1957

Legislative day of Thursday, August 22, 1955

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the fierce heat and burden of these testing days, save us from being embittered by the ingratitude and pettiness of those who comprehend not the vastness of issues free men are now facing. Deliver us from all cowardly expediency. May the voice of the past warn us of paths which lead to national disaster. May the voice of the present call us to be inspiring prophets of good will. May the voice of the future challenge us to march on to a golden day when earth's dismal deserts shall blossom into gladsome gardens. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 22, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has an order previously been entered for the transaction of routine business, during the morning hour, at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order was made yesterday.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the mutual security bill.

My position on the mutual security bill is that it is very important to the country to obtain the best measure we can. As the Members of the Senate are aware, we passed the authorization bill, and we passed it in an amount substantially higher than that which was finally resolved in the conference. I voted for the measure when it originally passed the Senate. I voted for the conference report which provided authorizations of $3,300,000,000. That meant that I thought that sum was a reasonable one. I have not changed my position.

In my opinion, not enough votes are available to obtain the full amount. But I am going to vote for a substantial increase, and I am going to do everything possible to strengthen the measure to the fullest possible extent.

This year the mutual security bill has assumed what I believe to be a new and very promising direction. I believe that the Members of the Senate should do everything possible to give it a chance.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it seems to me that before the Congress adjourns, we should be able to complete action on an adequate civil-rights bill—a right-to-vote bill—at this session. The Senate voted by a substantial majority for the jury-trial amendment, after careful consideration and thorough debate. Now the distinguished Republican leader of the House of Representatives appears to have accepted the principle. The remaining question appears to be one of degree.

In my opinion, the amendment adopted by the Senate is by far the best one yet proposed. It maintains the principle of jury trial, and at the same time offers the maximum possibility of enforcement.

Mr. President, the Senate is composed of reasonable Members; and we are willing to accept reasonable proposals. We never took the position, when the House version of the bill was before us, that it was untouchable. We will not take the position, after the House acts, that what the House does must be destroyed. I think that if all of us work together in the spirit of mutual trust and in the spirit of good faith, rather than bad politics, we can achieve a reasonable, workable, meaningful bill, and that this will truly be a year of advancement for America.

Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

ACHIEVEMENTS AND DISAPPOINTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 2 days ago the President of the United States said that the record of this Congress is tremendously disappointing to him. I do not know how he anticipated it completely, because the Congress is still in session; and has not concluded its work.

There is no point in taking the time of the Senate to engage in an argument which may properly belong in the campaign year 1958. The majority leader does not intend to do so.

The record of this Congress will speak for itself; and I have no disposition to have the Congress start passing on the President's performance in the first 6 months of this term, either.