

James Henry Curtis Ballard  
Robert Thomas Barker  
Walter James Barnes  
Richard Swinney Beyea, Jr.  
William Nourse Bicher  
Henry Edmund Bielski, Jr.  
James Clarence Bishop, Jr.  
Charles Wilson Bond  
Olen Aubry Brown, Jr.  
William Farnham Brown  
Richard John Buckalew  
Jack Peter Bujalski  
Charles Pearre Cabell, Jr.  
Bernard Rogers Card  
Sammy Howard Cardwell  
Nicholas Thomas Carlson  
Daniel Edward Carter  
Thomas Francis Cartwright  
James William Chapman II  
Alan Carleton Chase  
Theodore Eugene Childress  
Thomas Hall Claffey  
Kenneth Woodyard Clark II  
Richard Keith Clements  
Thomas Arthur Francis Conti  
John Bailey Cook  
James Franklin Corcoran  
Francis Brian Crowley III  
Bruce Bradley Davenport  
Harold Augustus Davenport III  
Thomas Hayden Davies, Jr.  
Charles Hamilton Davis IV  
Arvid Spencer Doucette  
Michael Joseph Dugan  
Jerome Dunn  
William Harrison Dunning  
Gary Gene Durkee  
Robert Francis Durkin  
Donald Raymond Edwards  
Bradfield Fellowes Elliot  
George Edward Ellis  
Leland Gilbert Fay  
John Charles Galen  
Henry Pratt Gardner  
Donald Richard Garrett  
Lee Arthur Gaughan  
Ernest Frank Geipel  
Roger Charles Gietzen  
Robert Lawrence Grete  
Frank Joseph Guenther  
Wayne Donald Hagberg  
Jack Lloyd Halsey  
Raymond Francis Hanson  
Charles Clark Hansult  
Ernest Frederick Hasselbrink  
David Alan Hettinger  
Jerry Noel Hoblit  
Gross Edwin Jenison  
Daniel Leon Johnson  
Richard Sherwin Johnson  
Michael Stratton Jones  
William John Kelley  
Hugh David Kevin  
Robert Leroy Kirtley  
George Octave Klotzbach  
Josef Conrad Krankel  
John Michael Kubiak  
Ernest Robert Lenart, Jr.  
David William Livingston  
Lawrence Lonero  
Edward John Lucci  
William Preble Marshall  
Robert Ignatius McCann  
Donald Joseph McCullough  
Joseph Daniel McElroy  
John Hancock McKillop  
Richard Henry McManigell  
Robert Wolcott Meals, Jr.  
William Christopher Melnik  
Arthur Wilbur Meyer  
Burton Tenney Miller, Jr.  
Charles Wesley Mitchell  
George Bernard Mitchell  
Norman Herbert Monson  
Merwin Lamphrey Morrill  
Robert Lewis Tony Munger  
Charles August Normington  
Robert Eugene Olson  
Richard Duane Osborn  
Walter Mead Patterson III

Franklin Palmer Phillips  
Glenn Kennon Phillips  
Charles Bernard Porciello  
Richard Reese Price  
Louis Joseph Prime, Jr.  
Jerome Francis Prochaska  
Charles William Profflet  
Robert William Puff  
Phillip Harry Raign  
Robert Edward Regut  
Paul Gordon Rice, Jr.  
George Sadtler Robertson III  
James Lawrence Rossetto  
Gerald Thomas Rudolph  
Paul Gordon Ruud  
James Martin Ryan  
John Frederic Schaefer  
Frederick John Schluter  
John Gaspard Schroeder  
Reginald Frederick Seller, Jr.  
Dennis Paul Sharon  
Leo Edward Sheehan, Jr.  
Robert Theodore Shellenberger, Jr.  
William Walter Shely, Jr.  
Stanley Allen Slater  
Frank Mathias Smith  
Leo Weber Smith II  
Willis Aaron Smith, Jr.  
Terry Dale Snyder  
W. John Soper  
William Scott Stambaugh  
Larry Wendell Sutherland  
Lawrence Robert Tharp  
John Francis Tierney  
Robert Edward Tierney  
Edward Julius Timberlake III  
Stanley Clarence Toney  
Peter Burns Trainor, Jr.  
Clifford Bruce Trott  
David Campbell Turner  
William Keppel Votruba  
James Richard Wade  
Richard Eugene Warner  
Wayne Arthur Weiss  
Donald Joseph Welch  
Harold Jerry MacWilliams  
Francis Milton Wright, Jr.  
Daniel Joseph Yarr  
Peter James Young  
William Maxwell Young

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1958

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

*Joel 2: 3: Turn unto the Lord, your God; for He is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness.*

Almighty God, thou art acquainted with our many needs and able to do for us exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask and hope for.

Thou knowest the question which frequently haunts us, the longings which make us lonely and pensive, and the problems for which we have no satisfactory solution.

We beseech Thee to search our souls, cleansing us of all that is sinful and unworthy, and inspiring us to reach out to loftier fields of endeavor.

Grant that we may open widely the door of our hearts to receive Thy divine strength and guidance as we struggle to perform our daily tasks, faithfully and well.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Master. Amen.

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

## DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

## PAY RAISE FOR CLASSIFIED FEDERAL WORKERS

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, by affixing his signature to the postal pay bill, the President apparently has signified his approval of the work being done by the Congress for a pay raise for classified Federal workers as well. I believe the facts are fully clear in this matter. The costs of living have steadily increased. No real effort has been made anywhere along the line by the Government to hold down this increase in costs of living. Therefore, it appears that we have a clear obligation to give to the Government's employees an increase in pay to help compensate them. Quite possibly, there are areas in which there are too many employees or in which unnecessary work is being done. This is a field which merits continuing study. This, however, is not a reason for failing to adequately pay those who are doing good work and whose services are needed.

I am particularly glad that our own employees in the House of Representatives and in the Congressional offices are to be included in the pay raises that are proposed. Here is a group of dedicated and hardworking employees most of whom put in far more hours and do much more work than they are paid for.

It is my understanding that the pay raise measure will be considered by the House on Monday. I shall have to be away from Congress on Monday and I have already requested leave of absence to attend to official business in my district. My proposed absence does not in any way reflect any lack of interest in the proposals for a pay raise, for I have voted for these proposals on previous occasions and I support them under the present circumstances.

I am glad to note also that support appears almost unanimous and that there is little if any likelihood that the measure will be in difficulty.

## ALASKA STATEHOOD

Mr. NORBLAD. 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. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will today pass the Alaska statehood bill by a very substantial margin. There has been an implied promise to Alaskans for statehood ever since the original treaty by which we acquired it and under which we agreed to give Alaskans all of the rights and privileges of American citizenship. In the 13 years that I have been here the Alaska statehood bill has been kicked around a great deal and I feel that today we can finally resolve the issue.

In Oregon and other Pacific Northwest States people are very anxious to have this legislation passed as there is a great deal of mutual interest in our lumber, fishing, and other industries between the two areas. We feel that enactment of this legislation would be very beneficial to not only the Pacific Northwest, but all of our now existing 48 States.

#### HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6908) to authorize modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, to restore eligibility for hospital and medical care to certain veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States residing in the Philippines, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 and disagree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 2 on page 6 and insert "That—"

Page 6, line 3, strike out "(b)" and insert "(a)".

Page 6, line 23, after "war" insert "who was domiciled in the Philippines on July 4, 1946, and who continues to be so domiciled".

Page 7, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 7, line 4, strike out "521" and insert "522".

Page 7, line 8, strike out "4" and insert "2".

Page 7, line 23, strike out "plant" and insert "plan".

Page 11, line 8, strike out "5" and insert "3".

Page 11, line 15, strike out "6" and insert "4".

Page 11, lines 19 and 20, strike out "heretofore".

Page 11, line 21, strike out "60" and insert "62".

Page 11, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 4 on page 12 and insert:

"Sec. 5. The act of July 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 1210; 50 App. U. S. C., secs. 1991-1996), is hereby repealed."

Page 12, line 5, strike out "8" and insert "6".

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

There was no objection.

The amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were concurred in.

The amendment of the Senate numbered 3 was disagreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight Saturday night to file a report including any supplemental or minority views on the bill (H. R. 12695) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, reported by the committee this morning.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 578) providing for the consideration of H. R. 12591, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12591) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means or an amendment proposing to strike out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the bill H. R. 12676, and said amendments shall be in order any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the bill H. R. 12591. It provides for 8 hours of general debate. It provides for committee amendments, and also provides that the bill H. R. 12676, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], may be in order as an amendment. All Members who appeared before the Committee on Rules on this matter favored the rule as granted.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has explained the rule. We all know that this is a very controversial bill. I know of no one who is opposed to the rule. I say it is controversial because I am certain that many of you, like myself, have received letters from executives of companies or corporations, some in favor of the bill and some opposed to it. Many of our national associations have not taken any definite stand in regard to this bill. So, while I repeat it is controversial, I do not know anyone who is opposed to the rule itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which this rule makes in order, is of such great importance, and so controversial in nature, that I believe it worth while to take a few minutes to discuss the legislative problem which confronts us.

First of all, let me say that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which the Mills bill, H. R. 12591, would extend for 5 years, was originally passed back in 1934 and has been reenacted, or extended for different periods of time anywhere from 1 to 3 years, on several occasions in the past. The last time the act was extended was by a single vote. The Mills bill also contains other provisions in addition to the 5-year extension. It provides, for instance, that the President will be granted authority to further reduce tariff and import duties on foreign goods coming into this country, under certain circumstances, by as much as 25 percent.

As I said in the beginning, this is a controversial measure. Many people throughout the country are for the bill. Some industries have benefited from the workings of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act but other industries certainly have also suffered from it. I think each and every one of us, all Americans, want to have good international trade. We want to see foreign trade flourish between this country and other countries. We want to see imports coming in, when we need goods or can use the products of other nations, and we certainly want to export our goods. Some of our farm organizations seem to be very much concerned about this legislation, and feel that if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is not extended "as is" then agricultural exports will suffer. That seems



to be questionable, because most of the exportation of our farm products come under Public Law 480, as you know.

However, we were informed in the Rules Committee, and this is something very important, and which every Member ought to keep in mind in the consideration of this legislation, that if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is not extended, then the reciprocal-trade agreements which have been entered into by the President with other nations in the past will remain in effect from now on unless he, the President, negotiates new trade agreements, of his own volition, to replace them.

Let me go a little further on this matter, if I may take the time: The Constitution of the United States places upon the Congress the responsibility to fix tariffs and import duties; that is the direct responsibility of the Congress of the United States under the Constitution.

The Congress in its wisdom, back a number of years ago, provided there should be set up as an arm of the Congress, or as an agency of the Congress, a Tariff Commission to represent it in passing upon tariff and import duty matters. That Tariff Commission is still in existence. It has certain rights and privileges. It has authority under the Trade Agreements Act to pass upon applications for relief by injured industries, that is, industries which have been injured by unfair foreign competition—relief that can be given through the fixing of higher tariffs or establishment of quotas so as to protect the injured industry from such unfair competition.

Then the decisions and the rulings of the Tariff Commission—and I wish the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] would correct me if I am wrong—are subject to review by the President.

Mr. MASON. That is correct, and when we passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 we automatically turned over the Tariff Commission as an arm of the Congress to be an arm of the Executive, to report to the Executive, to be responsible to the Executive and not to the Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. As I understand the situation, when final decision is made upon these appeals the Tariff Commission is not permitted to vote thereon. That is done by a commission or committee representing the President, made up of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and other Cabinet officials and executive officers of the Government.

The great complaint which has been made against the present act, as I understand it, at least the one regarding which I have received the largest number of petitions and letters, is that there is no really worthwhile or effective method or means to obtain prompt relief when a concern is being greatly damaged, or put out of business, as many industries and concerns have been throughout the country, with labor losing their jobs. The present method of appeal is too slow and has not been effective.

There was great division of opinion on this whole subject within the great Com-

mittee on Ways and Means, and so the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] introduced a separate bill, H. R. 12676, which would extend for 2 years only the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and would provide an easier and better method by which relief could be obtained by those industries and workers' organizations damaged or injured as a result of unfair foreign competition.

The Rules Committee in its wisdom has seen fit, upon the request of the Committee on Ways and Means, as both sides agreed this would be the only fair way to discuss this situation, to grant the rule that is now before you which makes in order the consideration of the Mills committee bill, H. R. 12591, waiving all points of order thereon, providing 8 hours of general debate, and then also making in order the offering of the Simpson bill, H. R. 12676, as an amendment or substitute for the Mills bill; so an opportunity will be given for the House to decide, in its own wisdom, whether it wants to have the act extended for a shorter time than 5 years, and for 2 years only, and to have an easier and more effective method by which American industries may obtain relief from unfair foreign competition.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman left out the most important part of the Simpson bill, and that is the language that would return to the Congress the final say-so and approval of the Tariff Commission's recommendation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It restores the authority of the Tariff Commission, I wish to add, and it also restores to the Congress a great deal of the power and control which it has given away in the past, the constitutionality of which, I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, many good lawyers question.

As an example—and I present it up here just to give an example of the kind of problem we face, for I get letters both ways on this—we had in my home county, of which Wilmington, Ohio, is the county seat, a little town about 4 miles away, with a population of about 50, a blacksmith, who, just after the Civil War, invented the first auger or bit to bore holes in wood. He hammered it out on his anvil and he went to the county seat of Wilmington and obtained the interest of a man named Irwin, and also of General Denver, after whom Denver, Colo., is named, and also of his son Matt Denver, who for many years was a distinguished Democratic Member of this House. They formed a little corporation and obtained patents, the first patents issued in the United States on bits or augers to bore holes. The Irwin Auger Bit Co. became the first company or plant in the world making these bits. For a great many years it did business all over the world. It still does business all over the world, but to a lesser degree than a few short years ago. The patents have expired. I had a letter from the company just a day or two ago, along with two sets of bits. You can see them here. They are in these plastic containers.

This set of bits which I hold in my hand was made in West Germany, and was purchased by the Irwin Auger Bit Co. from the Montgomery Ward Co. in Chicago for \$1.88. They are speed bits to use in electric drills to drill holes in wood.

Then here is the other set. It is made by the Irwin Auger Bit Co., by American labor. By the way, Irwin has laid off a great many men out there recently. It has been forced to do so by foreign competition in American markets. Now, the people who invented this, who pioneered the use of these bits all over the world, sell these for \$4.50 a set. As I understand, it costs about \$3.65 to manufacture them before they are shipped out to the distributors. Yet, they bought the German set of bits for \$1.88, and that included the profit of Montgomery Ward. Tests show the German bits selling for \$1.88 are every bit as good as are the bits manufactured in my own district by the Irwin Auger Bit Co.

The difference, however, rests in some other things. First of all, the Irwin Auger Bit Co. pays anywhere from \$1.80 per hour for ordinary labor, to as high as \$3.50 or \$4 an hour for skilled labor. They have an 8-hour day and a 40-hour week. They are required to pay time and a half for overtime, and do all the other things required by our laws. In West Germany the labor cost is much cheaper, and the hours are much longer. The West Germans are fine people, I have no quarrel with them, but they find it possible to manufacture these bits with cheaper labor, and by working longer hours, on machine tools that, by the way, we have given them under some of our foreign-aid programs and to ship them clear over here and sell them at a price which will permit Montgomery Ward to make a profit on them when they retail them for \$1.88. As a result, I have good people in my district, workers at the Irwin Auger Bit Co., good mechanics who have labored there for years, and helped to develop these tools, now out of work. The company is operating on part time and on low production schedule. That is one of the problems brought up by the legislation which we will soon have before us. So I think it is well that we have brought out a rule that will give to this House the opportunity to consider a substitute bill which will make it easier for concerns like Irwin Auger Bit Co., or many other concerns that I could name, to obtain some relief and some protection from what most of us, I believe you and I will agree, is unfair foreign competition.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. The examples which the gentleman has brought to us indicating a doubling of cost to produce here, while the imported articles are sold for less than half, can be duplicated hundreds of times. I have seen dozens of such examples. How in the world we can compete against that under our present system of reciprocal trade agreements I do not know.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. Many of us could bring numerous examples such as I have given from their own districts. I know of the pottery industry in Ohio and from the district represented so ably by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] which have been virtually destroyed by unfair foreign competition. The plants are down; some of them have quit almost entirely and only a very few of them operating at all. For instance, the Crooksville Pottery Co., which has been in operation 138 years, was forced out of business last month.

I hope this rule will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has stated, that the pottery industry in the 15th District of Ohio has had a rough time of it in recent years. One pottery in Crooksville has closed its doors for all time, after many years of operation. Another pottery in a county adjoining my district has more recently closed. A large and well-known pottery in Cambridge has seriously felt the effects of foreign competition, and many men and women of Guernsey County have found themselves working only part time or not at all.

But more than the pottery industry is at stake here. Glass, ceramic tile, coal, oil, stainless-steel flatware, tools, and many others are being crowded and harmed by our trade policy. Mr. Speaker, if there is harm, then we need to try to correct the situation. It is sheer madness to continue the same policies where manifest harm to certain industries is so convincingly present. Therefore, I believe this House has a duty to adopt a rule which will permit the Members to express themselves upon this vital issue.

The rule being considered by the House will permit the amendment of the basic bill by the substitution of the Simpson bill. The Simpson amendment will reduce the extension of the act from 5 to 2 years, and in many other ways will provide a marked improvement over the Mills bill. I have introduced H. R. 12703, a bill similar to that of the Simpson bill, and I heartily endorse the principles embodied in the Simpson bill as a substitute for the committee bill, H. R. 12591.

The modified closed rule recommended by the Rules Committee will permit the introduction of the substitute, and for that reason I will support the rule, though I would prefer an open rule under which additional amendments would be in order.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma

[Mr. EDMONDSON] wishes to ask some questions and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are some of us who are disturbed by the parliamentary situation which does not permit the House to work its will with regard to this legislation. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri in the first place if my understanding is correct that the only amendment specifically provided to be considered by the House under this rule is the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] which may be otherwise identified as H. R. 12676?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct, except that committee amendments are also in order under the rule.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if my understanding is correct that this rule does not permit, specifically at least, a vote of the House upon the so-called Ikard amendment which received, I understand, 10 votes in the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. BOLLING. The only amendments which will be in order under the rule are committee amendments and the amendment in the form of the bill, H. R. 12676, the so-called Simpson bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is possible that the Ikard amendment may be offered as a committee amendment in the course of the consideration of this bill?

Mr. BOLLING. That is a matter beyond my ability to answer, because that would be entirely in the control of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, June 5, 1958, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11767) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "": *Provided further*, That hereafter no conservation reserve contract shall be entered into which provides for (1) payments for conservation practices in excess of the average rate for comparable practices under the agricultural conservation program, or (2) annual rental payments in excess of 20 percent of the value of the land placed under contract, such value to be determined without regard to physical improvements thereon or geographic location thereof. In determining the value of the land for this purpose, the county committee shall take into consideration the estimate of the landowner or operator as to the value of such land as well as his certificate as to the production history and productivity of such land."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the bill (S. 2448) to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENTLEY moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for further study and revision.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, on which a motion to recommit is pending.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I respectfully demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 199, answered "present" 4, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—174

Abbt	Frazier	Philbin
Abernethy	Gary	Pilcher
Adair	Gathings	Pillion
Alexander	Gavin	Poage
Alger	George	Poff
Allen, Ill.	Grant	Preston
Andrews	Gwinn	Rains
Arends	Haley	Ray
Ashmore	Halleck	Reed
Avery	Hardy	Riley
Ayres	Harris	Rivers
Ball	Harrison, Va.	Roberts
Barden	Harvey	Robeson, Va.
Bates	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Fla.
Baumhart	Hemphill	Rogers, Mass.
Beamer	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Becker	Herlong	Rutherford
Belcher	Hess	Sadlak
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	St. George
Betts	Hill	Schenck
Blitch	Hoeven	Scherer
Bolton	Hoffman	Schwengel
Bonner	Holt	Scrivner
Bosch	Hosmer	Scudder
Boykin	Huddleston	Selden
Brooks, Tex.	Hyde	Sikes
Brown, Ga.	Ikard	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Johansen	Simpson, Pa.
Broyhill	Jonas	Smith, Miss.
Budge	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Kean	Springer
Bush	Kilday	Stauffer
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilgore	Taber
Cannon	Kitchin	Talle
Cederberg	Laird	Taylor
Chipfield	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Clevenger	Latham	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	LeCompte	Thomas
Coudert	McCulloch	Thornberry
Cramer	McGregor	Tuck
Cunningham,	McIntire	Utt
Nebr.	McMillan	Van Pelt
Dague	McVey	Vursell
Davis, Ga.	Mahon	Walter
Delaney	Martin	Wharton
Deounian	Mason	Whitener
Devereux	Matthews	Whitten
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, Md.	Wigglesworth
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	Mills	Williams, N. Y.
Durham	Mitchell	Willis
Elliot	Moore	Wilson, Ind.
Everett	Mumma	Winstead
Fenton	Murray	Withrow
Fino	Nicholson	Wolverton
Fisher	O'Neill	Young
Flynt	Ostertag	Younger
Forrester	Patman	
Fountain	Patterson	

NAYS—199

Addonizio	Byrne, Pa.	Dwyer
Albert	Canfield	Eberharter
Allen, Calif.	Carrigg	Edmondson
Anderson,	Celler	Evins
Mont.	Chamberlain	Fallon
Anfuso	Chenoweth	Farbstein
Ashley	Christopher	Fascell
Aspinall	Church	Feighan
Baker	Clark	Flood
Baldwin	Coad	Fogarty
Baring	Coffin	Ford
Barrett	Collier	Frelinghuysen
Bass, N. H.	Corbett	Friedel
Bass, Tenn.	Cretella	Fulton
Beckworth	Cunningham,	Garmatz
Bennett, Fla.	Iowa	Glenn
Berry	Curtin	Gordon
Blatnik	Curtis, Mo.	Granahan
Boggs	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Boland	Dawson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.
Boiling	Dawson, Utah	Green, Pa.
Bow	DeLay	Griffin
Boyle	Dennison	Griffiths
Bray	Dent	Hagen
Breeding	Denton	Hale
Broomfield	Dingell	Harden
Brown, Mo.	Dixon	Harrison, Nebr.
Brownson	Dollinger	Haskell
Byrd	Donohue	Hays, Ohio
Byrne, Ill.	Dooley	Healey

Heseltun	Madden	Rhodes, Pa.
Hollifield	Magnuson	Riehlman
Holland	Mailliard	Robison, N. Y.
Holmes	May	Robison, Ky.
Holtzman	Meador	Rodino
Horan	Morrow	Rogers, Colo.
Jarman	Metcalf	Rooney
Jennings	Michel	Roosevelt
Jensen	Miller, Nebr.	Santangelo
Johnson	Minshall	Saylor
Jones, Mo.	Montoya	Seely-Brown
Judd	Morano	Sheehan
Karsten	Morgan	Shelley
Kearns	Moss	Sisk
Keating	Moulder	Smith, Calif.
Kee	Multer	Staggers
Kelly, N. Y.	Natcher	Sullivan
Keogh	Nimtz	Teller
King	Norblad	Tewes
Kirwan	Norrell	Thompson, N. J.
Kluczyński	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomson, Wyo.
Knutson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tollefson
Krueger	O'Hara, Ill.	Udall
Lafore	O'Konski	Ullman
Lane	Osmer	Vanik
Lankford	Passman	Van Zandt
Lesinski	Pelly	Wainwright
Libonati	Perkins	Weaver
Lipcomb	Pfost	Westland
McCormack	Polk	Widnall
McDonough	Porter	Wier
McFall	Price	Wright
McGovern	Prouty	Yates
McIntosh	Quie	Zablocki
Macdonald	Rabaut	Zelenko
Machrowicz	Rees, Kans.	
Mack, Ill.	Reuss	
Mack, Wash.	Rhodes, Ariz.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Bentley	Scott, Pa.	Steed
Hébert		

NOT VOTING—52

Andersen,	Hillings	Radwan
H. Carl	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Auchincloss	Jackson	Saund
Brooks, La.	James	Scott, N. C.
Buckley	Jenkins	Sheppard
Burdick	Kearney	Shuford
Carnahan	Kilburn	Slerninski
Chelf	Knox	Siler
Colmer	Lennon	Smith, Kans.
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Spence
Dies	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Marshall	Thompson, Tex.
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Engle	Morris	Vinson
Forand	Morrison	Vorys
Gregory	Neal	Watts
Gross	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.
Gubser	Powell	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Steed against.	
Mr. Shuford for, with Mr. Hébert against.	
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Bentley against.	
Mr. James for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.	
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Kilburn against.	
Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.	
Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Knox against.	
Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Hillings against.	
Mr. Neal for, with Mr. Kearney against.	
Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Buckley against.	
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana for, with Mr. McCarthy against.	
Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. Engle against.	
Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Carnahan against.	
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.	
Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Loser against.	
Mr. Andersen, H. Carl, for, with Mr. Marshall against.	
Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Forand against.	
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Miller of California against.	
Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Doyle against.	
Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Morris against.	

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Burdick.  
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Gross.  
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Gubser.  
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. MACDONALD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The recommendation was rejected.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7999, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments that were pending in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union when the Committee rose on yesterday.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Utah: On page 4, line 13, strike the word "fifty" and insert the word "twenty-five."

On page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike the words "one hundred and eighty-two million" and insert "one hundred and two million five hundred and fifty thousand."

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas to the amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Utah: Strike out "102,000,000" and insert "21,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas) there were—ayes 46, noes 74.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAWSON of Utah) there were ayes 91, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. Upon enactment of this act, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States, not later than July 3, 1958, to certify such fact to the Governor of Alaska. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 3, 1958, and not later than August 1, 1958, shall issue his proclamation for the elections as herein-after provided, for officers of all elective offices and in the manner provided for by the constitution of the proposed State of Alaska, but the officers so elected shall in any event include 2 Senators and 1 Representative in Congress.

SEC. 8. (a) The proclamation of the Governor of Alaska required by section 7 shall provide for holding of a primary election and a general election on dates to be fixed by the Governor of Alaska: *Provided*, That the general election shall not be held later than December 1, 1958, and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 7 shall be, and officers for other elective offices provided for in the constitution of the proposed State of Alaska may be, chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by the constitution of the proposed State of Alaska for the election of members of the proposed State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution of the proposed State of Alaska may prescribe. The Governor of Alaska shall certify the results of said elections to the President of the United States.

(b) At an election designated by proclamation of the Governor of Alaska, which may be the general election held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, or a Territorial general election, or a special election, there shall be submitted to the electors qualified to vote in said election, for adoption or rejection, the following propositions:

"(1) The boundaries of the State of Alaska shall be as prescribed in the act of Congress approved — (date of approval of this act) and all claims of this State to any areas of land or sea outside the boundaries so prescribed are hereby irrevocably relinquished to the United States.

"(2) All provisions of the act of Congress approved — (date of approval of this act) reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property therein made to the State of Alaska, are consented to fully by said State and its people."

In the event the foregoing propositions are adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Alaska, ratified by the people at the election held on April 24, 1956, shall be deemed amended accordingly. In the event the foregoing propositions are not adopted at said election by a majority of the legal votes cast on said submission, the provisions of this act shall thereupon cease to be effective.

The Governor of Alaska is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary or appropriate to insure the submission of said propositions to the people. The return of the votes cast on said propositions shall be made by the election officers directly to the secretary of Alaska, who shall certify the results of the submission to the Governor. The Governor shall certify the re-

sults of said submission, as so ascertained, to the President of the United States.

(c) If the President shall find that the propositions set forth in the preceding subsection have been duly adopted by the people of Alaska, the President, upon certification of the returns of the election of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 7 of this act, shall thereupon issue his proclamation announcing the results of said election as so ascertained. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President, the State of Alaska shall be deemed admitted into the Union as provided in section 1 of this act.

Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, all of the officers of said Territory, including the Delegate in Congress from said Territory, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective office. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representative in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representative shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

(d) Upon admission of the State of Alaska into the Union as herein provided, all of the Territorial laws then in force in the Territory of Alaska shall be and continue in full force and effect throughout said State except as modified or changed by this act, or by the constitution of the State, or as thereafter modified or changed by the legislature of the State. All of the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this paragraph, the term "Territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Alaska) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Alaska prior to the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Alaska at the time of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, (2) are not "Territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The State of Alaska upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to one Representative until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representative shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership shall not operate to either increase or decrease the permanent membership of the House of Representatives as prescribed in the act of August 8, 1911 (37 Stat. 13) nor shall such temporary increase affect the basis of apportionment established by the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U. S. C., sec. 2a), for the 83d Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 10. (a) The President of the United States is hereby authorized to establish, by Executive order or proclamation, one or more special national defense withdrawals within the exterior boundaries of Alaska, which withdrawal or withdrawals may thereafter

be terminated in whole or in part by the President.

(b) Special national defense withdrawals established under subsection (a) of this section shall be confined to those portions of Alaska that are situated to the north or west of the following line: Beginning at the point where the Porcupine River crosses the international boundary between Alaska and Canada; thence along a line parallel to, and five miles from, the right bank of the main channel of the Porcupine River to its confluence with the Yukon River; thence along a line parallel to, and five miles from, the right bank of the main channel of the Yukon River to its most southerly point of intersection with the meridian of longitude 160 degrees west of Greenwich; thence south to the intersection of said meridian with the Kuskokwim River; thence along a line parallel to, and five miles from the right bank of the Kuskokwim River to the mouth of said river; thence along the shoreline of Kuskokwim Bay to its intersection with the meridian of longitude 162 degrees 30 minutes west of Greenwich; thence south to the intersection of said meridian with the parallel of latitude 57 degrees 30 minutes north; thence east to the intersection of said parallel with the meridian of longitude 156 degrees west of Greenwich; thence south to the intersection of said meridian with the parallel of latitude 50 degrees north.

(c) Effective upon the issuance of such Executive order or proclamation, exclusive jurisdiction over all special national defense withdrawals established under this section is hereby reserved to the United States, which shall have sole legislative, judicial, and executive power within such withdrawals, except as provided hereinafter. The exclusive jurisdiction so established shall extend to all lands within the exterior boundaries of each such withdrawal, and shall remain in effect with respect to any particular tract or parcel of land only so long as such tract or parcel remains within the exterior boundaries of such a withdrawal. The laws of the State of Alaska shall not apply to areas within any special national defense withdrawal established under this section while such areas remain subject to the exclusive jurisdiction hereby authorized: *Provided, however*, That such exclusive jurisdiction shall not prevent the execution of any process, civil or criminal, of the State of Alaska, upon any person found within said withdrawals: *And provided further*, That such exclusive jurisdiction shall not prohibit the State of Alaska from enacting and enforcing all laws necessary to establish voting districts, and the qualification and procedures for voting in all elections.

(d) During the continuance in effect of any special national defense withdrawal established under this section, or until the Congress otherwise provides, such exclusive jurisdiction shall be exercised within each such withdrawal in accordance with the following provisions of law:

(1) All laws enacted by the Congress that are of general application to areas under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, those provisions of title 18, United States Code, that are applicable within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States as defined in section 7 of said title, shall apply to all areas within such withdrawals.

(2) In addition, any areas within the withdrawals that are reserved by act of Congress or by Executive action for a particular military or civilian use of the United States shall be subject to all laws enacted by the Congress that have application to lands withdrawn for that particular use, and any other areas within the withdrawals shall be subject to all laws enacted by the Congress that are of general application to lands



withdrawn for defense purposes of the United States.

(3) To the extent consistent with the laws described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection and with regulations made or other actions taken under their authority, all laws in force within such withdrawals immediately prior to the creation thereof by Executive order or proclamation shall apply within the withdrawals and, for this purpose, are adopted as laws of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the laws of the State or Territory relating to the organization or powers of municipalities or local political subdivisions, and the laws or ordinances of such municipalities or political subdivisions shall not be adopted as laws of the United States.

(4) All functions vested in the United States commissioners by the laws described in this subsection shall continue to be performed within the withdrawals by such commissioners.

(5) All functions vested in any municipal corporation, school district, or other local political subdivision by the laws described in this subsection shall continue to be performed within the withdrawals by such corporations, district, or other subdivision, and the laws of the State or the laws or ordinances of such municipalities or local political subdivision shall remain in full force and effect notwithstanding any withdrawal made under this section.

(6) All other functions vested in the government of Alaska or in any officer or agency thereof, except judicial functions over which the United States District Court for the District of Alaska is given jurisdiction by this act or other provisions of law, shall be performed within the withdrawals by such civilian individuals or civilian agencies and in such manner as the President shall from time to time, by Executive order, direct or authorize.

(7) The United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall have original jurisdiction, without regard to the sum or value of any matter in controversy, over all civil actions arising within such withdrawals under the laws made applicable thereto by this subsection, as well as over all offenses committed within the withdrawals.

(e) Nothing contained in subsection (d) of this section shall be construed as limiting the exclusive jurisdiction established in the United States by subsection (c) of this section or the authority of the Congress to implement such exclusive jurisdiction by appropriate legislation, or as denying to persons now or hereafter residing within any portion of the areas described in subsection (b) of this section the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions as prescribed by the State of Alaska where they respectively reside, or as limiting the jurisdiction conferred on the United States District Court for the District of Alaska by any other provision of law, or as continuing in effect laws relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as limiting any authority otherwise vested in the Congress or the President.

Sec. 11. (a) Nothing in this act shall affect the establishment, or the right, ownership, and authority of the United States in Mount McKinley National Park, as now or hereafter constituted; but exclusive jurisdiction, in all cases, shall be exercised by the United States for the national park, as now or hereafter constituted; saving, however, to the State of Alaska the right to serve civil or criminal process within the limits of the aforesaid park in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in said State, but outside of said park; and saving further to the said State the right to tax persons and corporations, their franchises and prop-

erty on the lands included in said park; and saving also to the persons residing now or hereafter in such area the right to vote at all elections held within the respective political subdivisions of their residence in which the park is situated.

(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as, immediately prior to the admission of said State, are owned by the United States and held for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes, including naval petroleum reserve No. 4, whether such lands were acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by Russia and set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Alaska for the use of the United States, or were acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided,* (i) That the State of Alaska shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being a part of the State of Alaska, or to prevent the said State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction whatsoever which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by the Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority; and (iii) that such power of exclusive legislation shall rest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is owned by the United States and used for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to lands within such special national defense withdrawal or withdrawals as may be established pursuant to section 10 of this act until such lands cease to be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction reserved to the United States by that section.

Sec. 12. Effective upon the admission of Alaska into the Union—

(a) The analysis of chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 81 of such title, is amended by inserting immediately after and underneath item 81 of such analysis, a new item to be designated as item 81A and to read as follows:

"§ 81A. Alaska.

(b) Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 81 thereof a new section, to be designated as section 81A, and to read as follows:

"§ 81A. Alaska.

"Alaska constitutes one judicial district. "Court shall be held at Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Nome."

(c) Section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting in the table of districts and judges in such section immediately above the item: "Arizona \* \* \* 2", a new item as follows: "Alaska \* \* \* 1";

(d) The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out the words: "the District Court for the Territory of Alaska": *Provided,* That the amendment made by this subsection shall not af-

fect the rights of any judge who may have retired before it takes effect;

(e) The words "the District Court for the Territory of Alaska," are stricken out wherever they appear in sections 333, 460, 610, 753, 1252, 1291, 1292, and 1346 of title 28, United States Code;

(f) The first paragraph of section 1252 of title 28, United States Code, is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska," from the clause relating to courts of record;

(g) Subsection (2) of section 1294 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed and the later subsections of such section are renumbered accordingly;

(h) Subsection (a) of section 2410 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words: "including the District Court for the Territory of Alaska";

(i) Section 3241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words: "District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the";

(j) Subsection (e) of section 3401 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words: "for Alaska or";

(k) Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words: "the Territory of Alaska";

(l) Section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words: "the Territory of Alaska";

(m) Section 2072 of title 28, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words: "and of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska";

(n) Subsection (q) of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words: "the District Court for the Territory of Alaska": *Provided,* That the amendment made by this subsection shall not affect the rights under such section 376 of any present or former judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska or his survivors;

(o) The last paragraph of section 1963 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(p) Section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words: "and the District Court for the Territory of Alaska"; and

(q) Section 4 of the act of July 28, 1950 (64 Stat. 380; 5 U. S. C., sec. 341b) is amended by striking out the word: "Alaska".

Sec. 13. No writ, action, indictment, cause, or proceeding pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska on the date when said Territory shall become a State, and no case pending in an appellate court upon appeal from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory shall become a State, shall abate by the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, but the same shall be transferred and proceeded with as hereinafter provided.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of said causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska.

SEC. 14. All appeals taken from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, previous to the admission of Alaska as a State, shall be prosecuted to final determination as though this act had not been passed. All cases in which final judgment has been rendered in such district court, and in which appeals might be had except for the admission of such State, may still be sued out, taken, and prosecuted to the Supreme Court of the United States or the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit under the provisions of then existing law, and there held and determined in like manner; and in either case, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the United States Court of Appeals, in the event of reversal, shall remand the said cause to either the State supreme court or other final appellate court of said State, or the United States district court for said district, as the case may require: *Provided*, That the time allowed by existing law for appeals from the district court for said Territory shall not be enlarged thereby.

SEC. 15. All causes pending or determined in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State which are of such nature as to be within the jurisdiction of a district court of the United States shall be transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska for final disposition and enforcement in the same manner as is now provided by law with reference to the judgments and decrees in existing United States district courts. All other causes pending or determined in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time of the admission of Alaska as a State shall be transferred to the appropriate State court of Alaska. All final judgments and decrees rendered upon such transferred cases in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States or by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the same manner as is now provided by law with reference to the judgments and decrees in existing United States district courts.

SEC. 16. Jurisdiction of all cases pending or determined in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall devolve upon and be exercised by the courts of original jurisdiction created by said State, which shall be deemed to be the successor of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska with respect to cases not so transferred and, as such, shall take and retain custody of all records, dockets, journals, and files of such court pertaining to such cases. The files and papers in all cases so transferred to the United States district court, together with a transcript of all book entries to complete the record in such particular cases so transferred, shall be in like manner transferred to said district court.

SEC. 17. All cases pending in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska at the time said Territory becomes a State not transferred to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska shall be proceeded with and determined by the courts created by said State with the right to prosecute appeals to the appellate courts created by said State, and also with the same right to prosecute appeals or writs of certiorari from the final determination in said causes made by the court of last resort created by such State to the Supreme Court of the United States, as now provided by law for appeals and writs of certiorari from the court of last resort of a State to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SEC. 18. The provisions of the preceding sections with respect to the termination of the jurisdiction of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the continuation of suits, the succession of courts, and the satisfac-

tion of rights of litigants in suits before such courts shall not be effective until 3 years after the effective date of this act, unless the President, by Executive order, shall sooner proclaim that the United States District Court for the District of Alaska, established in accordance with the provisions of this act, is prepared to assume the functions imposed upon it. During such period of 3 years or until such Executive order is issued, the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall continue to function as heretofore. The tenure of the judges, the United States attorneys, marshals, and other officers of the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska shall terminate at such time as that court shall cease to function as provided in this section.

SEC. 19. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "When the State of Alaska or any State is hereafter admitted to the Union, the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within 90 days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

SEC. 20. Section 2 of the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 742; 48 U. S. C., sec. 433), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 21. Nothing contained in this act shall operate to confer United States nationality, nor to terminate nationality heretofore lawfully acquired, nor restore nationality heretofore lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States may have been a party.

SEC. 22. Section 101 (a) (36) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 170, 8 U. S. C., sec. 1101 (a) (36)) is amended by deleting the word "Alaska."

SEC. 23. The first sentence of section 212 (d) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 188, 8 U. S. C., sec. 1182 (d) (7)) is amended by deleting the word "Alaska."

SEC. 24. Nothing contained in this act shall be held to repeal, amend, or modify the provisions of section 304 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (63 Stat. 237, 8 U. S. C., sec. 1404).

SEC. 25. The first sentence of section 310 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 239, 8 U. S. C., sec. 1421 (a)) is amended by deleting the words "District Courts of the United States for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska" and substituting therefor the words "District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii."

SEC. 26. Section 344 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 265, 8 U. S. C., sec. 1455 (d)) is amended by deleting the words "in Alaska and."

SEC. 27. The third proviso in section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883), is further amended by striking out the word "excluding" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "including."

SEC. 28. (a) The last sentence of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (48 U. S. C. 439), is hereby amended to read as follows: "All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all bonuses, royalties, and rentals under leases as herein provided and all other pay-

ments received under this act shall be distributed as follows as soon as practicable after December 31 and June 30 of each year: (1) 90 percent thereof shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State of Alaska for disposition by the legislature thereof; and (2) 10 percent shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(b) Section 35 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C. 191), is hereby amended by inserting immediately before the colon preceding the first proviso thereof the following: ", and of those from Alaska 52½ percent thereof shall be paid to the State of Alaska for disposition by the legislature thereof."

SEC. 29. If any provision of this act, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 30. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be considered as read and be opened for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 15, line 2, after the comma following the word "rejection" add the following: "by separate ballot on each."

On page 15, line 3, add the following language: "(1) Shall Alaska immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?"

On page 15, lines 3 and 8, respectively, change the figures "1" to "2" and "2" to "3."

On page 15, line 14, after the word "event" add the words "each of" and change the word "are" to "is."

On page 15, line 19, after the word "event" add the words "any one of" and change the word "are" to "is."

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WESTLAND: On page 6, line 18, after "Federal agency" insert "Provided, That the administration and



management of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska shall be retained by the Federal Government under existing laws until the first day of the first calendar year following the expiration of 90 legislative days after the Secretary of the Interior certifies to the Congress that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of said resources in the broad national interest."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], is recognized.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I submit this amendment not as an opponent of statehood for Alaska but rather because it deals with the important matter—conservation—a matter of national concern and particularly to me as a westerner. The conservation of natural resources—in this instance fish and wildlife—is important to every citizen of this country. I am firmly convinced that present conditions require the administration of the fish and wildlife resources of Alaska be retained by the Federal Government until it can clearly be shown that the Alaska State Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of these resources in the broad national interest. Let me emphasize that this amendment sets up no bar to future control of these resources by the State of Alaska. But because of existing conditions, some of which are inherent and others of which are of the making of the present Territorial legislature, I feel it is essential that for the present fish and wildlife resources administration and management remain in the Federal Government.

The most important single resource in Alaska has been and continues to be the salmon fishery. The Alaskan fishery is now under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Both Fish and Wildlife and the salmon industry are engaged in a program of research in an effort to rehabilitate the Alaskan salmon run which has been severely reduced in recent years. This program has been made doubly difficult by the activities of the Japanese high seas fishing fleet. Scientific evidence shows that the Japanese fleet, although it remains outside territorial waters and, by the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty, west of the 175th west meridian, has been netting millions of immature salmon spawned in Alaskan streams. Although recent negotiations between the United States and Japan in an effort to solve this problem have broken down, this is a matter which must be settled whether by negotiation or other means at the disposal of the Federal Government. This is a national resource and since the depredation of this resource is being done by a foreign power, it would be foolhardy to turn over the fisheries to Alaska so long as this serious international problem remains to be settled.

Furthermore, there is at the present time no competent fisheries organization which can cope with these problems other than Fish and Wildlife. Given time, as a State, Alaska could doubtless develop an effective fish and wildlife organization. But the over 200 Federal Fish and

Wildlife employees in Alaska are under United States civil service rule and the civil service retirement program. There is considerable likelihood they would prefer to remain with Fish and Wildlife Service rather than become a part of the State program.

Going further, the 1958 Federal budget for Fish and Wildlife for Alaska totaled \$1,594,000. To carry on a program in the way the Federal Government has done would mean a considerable financial burden to Alaska. Not only that, but there is, as the Wildlife Management Federation stressed at its 1957 convention, the need for more funds for fish and wildlife management in Alaska. Under these circumstances, an immediate transfer would be unwise.

But what frightens all conservation-minded people and causes serious doubt as to the advisability of turning over control of fish and wildlife to Alaska has been the Territorial Legislature's record in the field of conservation. It is most certainly in the public interest that no commercial fishing interests—be they resident or nonresident—be allowed to gain control of Alaska's fisheries. Yet the terms of senate bill 30, passed last year by the Territorial legislature, would do precisely that. Fortunately, with Alaska in a Territorial status, the management of fish and wildlife resources remains under the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and not the new fish and game commission set up by senate bill 30. But should this statehood bill pass without protective language such as is contained in this amendment, the provisions of senate bill 30 would become a reality.

In my remarks during the general debate on this bill, I quoted extensively from the message of the Acting Governor to the Territorial Legislature. Although he declined to veto the bill since its overwhelming legislative support would have made a veto a useless act, he sent a stinging message to the legislature. I will not read from the Governor's message at this time other than his statement which pretty well summarizes the objections to senate bill 30 that "every protection is given to the commercial interests in senate bill 30; the recreational interests are assured of no protection whatever."

In view of the expressed attitude of the Territorial Legislature, this House should insist on language which would assure continued Federal jurisdiction over Alaskan fish and wildlife resources to protect the public interest until the Alaska Legislature makes adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of these resources in the public interest. There are resources which belong not only to the people of Alaska but to all the people of the United States. While welcoming Alaska to membership in the Union, we should take care to discharge our responsibilities and protect these national resources.

I might say at this point that this proposal has the support of the Wildlife Management Institute, the American Nature Association, the Izaak Walton League, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation of Nature Conservancy, and the Wilderness Society.

I want to discuss one further facet of this problem. In the past 20 to 25 years the Territorial Legislature has on at least five different occasions enacted laws discriminating against nonresident fishermen and imposing a higher tax on the right to work and fish in Alaskan fisheries as to nonresidents than as to residents. Such discriminatory legislation heretofore has been struck down by the courts, not on constitution grounds, but on grounds of limitations or inhibitions placed on the Territorial Legislature. With statehood, such limitations would be removed and the discriminatory legislation would, under present indications, be enacted by an Alaskan State Legislature. The discriminatory tendencies of the Territorial Legislature are well documented by past history up to and including senate bill 30. To allow the Alaska Legislature to exercise authority over fish and wildlife without adequate provisions for the administration, management, and conservation of these resources would not only give rise to the previously mentioned objections, but would also serve to put thousands of fishery workers from the States—many hundreds of whom reside in my District—out of work. Adoption of this amendment would not only prevent usurping of Alaska's fisheries by commercial interests, but also offer some hope of protection of nonresidents dependent on Alaska fisheries for their livelihood.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat, I support this amendment not as an opponent of statehood for Alaska. I am for statehood and I am for statehood now. But we must make certain that in admitting another State to this Federal Union we save for all the people of the United States this national resource. The amendment should be approved.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am bound to oppose this proposed amendment, because it would make Alaska a State of the Union on terms of less than full equality with the other States. Very frankly I do not think it is constitutional for that very reason. At the same time I apprehend that it would take some time for the courts to make a final determination.

One of the principal reasons, of course, that Alaska desires control of her wildlife and fisheries resources is because the Federal Government has not done a very good job of conservation in those fields. The Alaska salmon fisheries are the most important in the world. Last year the take of salmon in Alaska was the smallest since 1907.

Every year the conservation organizations and all the rest of us complain that not enough money is appropriated by the Federal Government to conserve properly these game, fur, and fish resources. We Alaskans have said time after time that we are willing to do the job and able to do the job.

In connection with senate bill 30 I want to say that it is distinctly to the credit of the Territory of Alaska that they created this commission, because it is appropriating its own funds, especially in the field of fisheries, without any authority whatsoever to regulate those resources. It has spent millions of dollars

in the last few years supplementing the inadequate Federal appropriation for that purpose.

I inquired of the chairman of the commission, set up under Alaska Senate bill 30, Mr. Art Hayr, of Fairbanks, Alaska, as to the attitude of commercial fishermen, and he sent this reply:

Reurtel board's controversies voting record of both sessions I attended as hunter make very clear that so-called commercial fishing representatives are fairminded resident Alaskans same as other members. Differences have been minor, understandable, and easily reconcilable.

I rest my case, Mr. Chairman, upon a reiteration of the declaration that we should come into the Union completely equal in this field.

Mr. Chairman, only this morning I received from Alaska two radiograms from two different church groups in support of statehood. One was from the Reverend Fred P. McGinnis, superintendent of the Methodist Church in Alaska, and I understand that identical wires were sent by him to the Speaker of the House and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The text of the message is as follows:

The Alaska Mission Conference of the Methodist Church in session tonight at Juneau unanimously adopted a strong resolution supporting statehood and urged the Congress to act. This conference represents approximately 5,000 members and constituents within Alaska. Resolution calls for transmittal this action to you. I respectfully urge that the Congress give us favorable vote.

The second radiogram came from several Baptist ministers in Anchorage who wired:

We Southern Baptist ministers of Anchorage believe self-government for Alaskans under statehood is right and overdue, would benefit the Nation as well as Alaska and would enable Alaskans to build a fine God-fearing civilization. We pray Members of House will apply the principles of brotherly love and justice by passing statehood bill.

The message was signed by the Reverend Felton H. Griffin, First Baptist Church; the Reverend James Rose, Immanuel Baptist Church; the Reverend Robert Gingrich, Fairview Baptist Church; the Reverend Jack Turner, Calvary Baptist Church; and the Reverend James Dotson, Faith Baptist Church.

Mr. Chairman, I should not like my participation in this debate to be concluded without expressing my thanks to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS]. During all these long months the Alaska statehood bill has been considered his has been the course of statesmanship. Men in his position less practical and less discerning might have publicly resented the fact that the statehood aspirations of Hawaii were being subordinated to those of Alaska during the 85th Congress. Had he so reacted I can readily imagine a situation arising by which once more the statehood goals of both these Territories might have been farther away than ever, instead of closer. The Delegate from Hawaii, acting as I and so many others are convinced in the very best interests of the Territory he so ably represents, chose another course. From the outset, I have believed it to be

the course best calculated for the welfare of his constituents and I say that most objectively even though I had an understandable desire to move Alaska statehood along as promptly as possible.

My personal conclusion—and it is one wholly shared with many of our colleagues with whom I have talked—is that the Delegate from Hawaii adopted the very best means to carry out his legislative program. It is my pleasure to congratulate him now on the fine service he is giving the people of Hawaii and to thank him for the valuable assistance he has rendered to Alaska.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I can see a great deal of justice to the position taken by the Delegate from Alaska. On the other hand, it seems that inasmuch as all legislation must be a matter of compromise, here is one place where we can compromise without defeating the purpose of this bill. With that thought in mind, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will say this in conclusion, that the amendment is so worded that the Secretary of the Interior will be in control in respect to certification, and I am sure that he will be fair-minded about this, and I am sure, too, that the Alaska State Legislature will pass what he considers to be adequate laws.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to join the chairman of the subcommittee in supporting the Westland amendment. I think it improves the bill. It does not take anything away from the commission in Alaska. I support the amendment.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to join the gentleman in support of this amendment. The question that has been raised is a serious one, and in view of the fact that the Wildlife Management Institute, the American Nature Association, the Isaak Walton League, the National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation of Nature Conservancy, and the Wilderness Society have all joined in support of this amendment, I think it is only fitting that these conservation groups wish to be accredited so that this matter can be worked out by the Secretary.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman. I would like to add that while I agree most heartily with the Delegate from Alaska that we should preserve home rule down to the last period and comma, we have a situation here where it is left to the Secretary of the Interior to determine when Alaska is ready to handle this matter. I am very sure that no Secretary of the Interior, the present

one or anyone who succeeds him, would keep Alaska away from the control of its own resources 1 day longer than necessary. I think his approval will come very quickly, and it will allow a reasonable, brief period in which the officials of Alaska can get ready for the handling of this very important industry. For that reason I am supporting the amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is introduced to meet the objections raised during the committee hearings by the Wildlife Management Institute and since then by other conservation groups, including the American Nature Association, Isaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy, and the Wilderness Society.

These organizations have asked for safeguards for the future welfare of the Territory's fish and wildlife resources and have felt lack of a clarifying amendment would jeopardize the invaluable resources upon which a major part of the new State's economy would be based. Let me emphasize that the opposition to this bill of national conservation groups would be removed by inclusion of this amendment. In this connection, I have here a copy of a letter signed by C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, dated March 24, 1958. It reads:

The national conservation organizations are not opposing statehood, and their opposition to the pending legislation could be removed entirely by the adoption of this amendment.

Since previous bills to grant statehood to Alaska have been considered by the Congress, the Alaska Territorial Legislature passed a law under which the commercial fish interests of Alaska would gain complete control over Alaska's fish and wildlife resources. And the purpose of this amendment is to require certification to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior that the Alaska Legislature has made adequate provision for the administration, management, and conservation of these resources in the broad public interest.

The concern of conservationists came with the passage in 1957 by the Territorial Legislature of senate bill 30.

As the Acting Governor of Alaska at the time said, opposition to senate bill 30 as expressed in communications to him was widespread and voluminous and came from individuals, organizations of sportsmen, and other groups, while support for the bill was limited and localized.

Let me quote as to the Governor's own objections as expressed to the president of the Alaska Senate regarding the Alaska Fish and Game Commission:

The commission is authorized by senate bill 30 to promulgate and issue regulations which shall have the force and effect of law,



but guidelines for and limitations on these regulatory powers are almost entirely lacking. For example, the rights and privileges of a large and important part of Alaska's population, our native peoples, which are safeguarded under existing legislation, have apparently been either overlooked or disregarded in senate bill 30.

Senate bill 30 provides no policy or guides for commission responsibility for proper harvest or use of fur, game, or fish; for esthetic or other values to be safeguarded in the public interest in contrast to the interest of hunters, trappers, or fishermen.

The May 1958 issue of *Outdoor America*, a publication of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., has an article in it entitled "Will Statehood Help Alaskan Wildlife?" by Burton H. Atwood, the league's national secretary. I quote from this article as follows:

The Territorial commission for fish and game, as established by the last legislature, is basically unsound. It could be controlled by commercial fishing interests whose objectives are often at odds with those of sportsmen.

I want to say that I have never seen any statement that denied the Alaska fisheries would be controlled by the commercial Alaska fishermen if we fail to pass this safeguard amendment. And, may I say, too, this amendment is intended to oppose any domination by fishing interests either resident or absentee.

How can anyone justify transfer of the fishery to the Alaska Fish and Game Commission as presently constituted with 4 out of 7 members representing commercial fishing? How can anyone oppose an assurance that safeguards in the national interest be provided?

As a quorum, the four commercial fish representatives on that Alaska commission would establish all rules, regulations, and policies for an \$80 million a year industry employing seasonally 25,000 workers.

Read the testimony before the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Read Governor Hendrickson's message to the president of the senate of the 23d Alaska Legislature. If any Members will read the printed hearings starting at page 418 the picture will be clear.

Otherwise, the door is left wide open for the greatest scandal in the history of Alaska—which is something.

Without this amendment, in all conscience, I would have to vote against the statehood bill because as one witness said:

This law certainly sets the stage for looking after everything but the public's interest.

If what I say is not true about the Alaska Fish and Game Commission being weighted in favor of the commercial users, then the Secretary of the Interior tomorrow could certify to the Congress as to the Alaska Legislature having made adequate provisions for administration in the national interest.

The only valid opposition to this amendment that I could possibly contemplate would come from those who are supporting special selfish interests. The amendment simply would assure State management and regulation that will uphold and conform to the new proposed constitution of the State of Alaska which

provides for common use of natural resources and reads:

No exclusive right or special privilege of fishery shall be created or authorized in the natural waters of the State.

To conservation-minded Members of Congress who desire to protect the wildlife resources of Alaska, let me repeat adoption of this safeguarding amendment as far as this statehood bill is concerned will satisfy the conservation groups and remove their objection to this bill.

I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the President of the United States will be glad to hear of the vote just taken in the House. I have in my hand a dispatch taken from the ticker which reads as follows:

The President today reaffirmed his support of pending legislation that would grant statehood to Alaska. Both political parties advocated statehood in their 1956 campaign platforms, and those pledges should be carried out.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 7, line 11, delete the figure "70" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "25."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is proper to have the amendment read "25 percent." These seals are handled by treaty, an international treaty, as the Delegate from Alaska well knows. I have read the bill and the report and I cannot find where there have been any negotiations with those who are parties to the treaty to divide up the profit from the harvest of these seals.

The United States Government, as all of us know, has the responsibility of protecting the seals and other animals, under this international treaty. Apparently the committee has not gone into the complications involved in the provisions of the treaty. It is proposed to give the State of Alaska 70 percent of the profits from these seals. My amendment would reduce that to 25 percent, but I do not think the matter should be dealt with in this bill at all.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he has had anybody in to consider the treaty provisions when it is proposed to give 70 percent of the profits of the seals to the State of Alaska.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Specifically on that question we had a representative of the Department of State testify before our committee. He did not regard this as a point of possible international disagreement. I might point out to the gentleman that the bill itself provides that all of the expenses for administering the islands must be deducted before there are any profits taken.

Mr. BONNER. That is a provision in the treaty at the present time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes. We are dividing up our own money.

Mr. BONNER. Does the gentleman know whether or not they are going to take the Pribilof Islands into the State of Alaska?

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. They are included; they are part of Alaska. They are included within the State boundaries.

Mr. BONNER. They are included in the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. They are.

Mr. BONNER. As I understand the bill, Alaska has a number of years in which to select what areas of Alaska will be taken into the State?

Mr. BARTLETT. No; that is not the case, if the gentleman will permit me to say so. All of that which we now know as Alaska will become the State of Alaska. The provisions of the bill relate only to sections of land which are to be taken.

Mr. BONNER. This is a section of land that we are talking about now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Whether the State or the Federal Government owns the land, it will all be incorporated within the State of Alaska.

Mr. BONNER. I think the Delegate from Alaska realizes that this is a serious matter, though probably to Alaska and the citizens of Alaska it is a trivial matter. But the gentleman will remember that the citizens of Alaska almost depleted these seal herds and it was only through this international treaty and the supervision provided under the treaty, under the responsibility of the United States Government, that we brought them back to a semblance of what they were at one time. That is the history of it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot admit that the citizens of Alaska depleted the seal herd. It was depleted, but that is because so much sealing was done on the open ocean by nationals of other countries. That is why this treaty was entered into.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 19 of the report the gentleman will find the following in the analysis of this particular section. It says this:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the rights of the United States under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1944, as amended, and the act of June 28, 1937, as amended.

That relates to the seals.

Mr. BONNER. I understand; I have read that. But we have entered into a treaty to protect these seals and divide up the profits from their sale. The seals are sent down to St. Louis, the pelts are then treated, and the United States Government conducts the sales; all expenses are taken out. That is in the treaty which provides for dividing up the profits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to tamper with the bill, but I think you have not given proper consideration to a subject that certainly deserves it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman is agitated about something that is not in the bill.

Mr. BONNER. I am not agitated at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The treaty entered into about the handling of these seals is not affected one whit.

Mr. BONNER. I understand, but you are dealing with something here, and I am asking you whether or not you have the right to deal with it. This is an international treaty.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. All we are dealing with is something we have a right to deal with, and that is a certain percentage of the proceeds.

Mr. BONNER. Your part of this is 70 percent, but the property is divided among the signatories of the treaty. Do you take part from the other signatories, or does it come wholly from the United States?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. What we turn over to Alaska comes from the net amounts turned in to the United States Treasury.

Mr. BONNER. The United States Treasury has to pay a certain part of that to those who are signatories to the treaty.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. This would be after we fulfilled any international obligations we have.

Mr. BONNER. You do not say that.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. At the present time the amount appropriated for the maintenance of these seals is 60 percent of the net receipts for the previous fiscal year, in addition to which we pay 25 percent of the net receipts into conservation work in Alaska. Actually, Alaska, taking over these problems to a great degree, and getting 75 percent, will have 5 percent additional for conservation work.

Mr. BONNER. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that you are going to put these seals under the protection of the State of Alaska? The gentleman says Alaska is taking them over. Those are his own words.

I hope the chairman will accept this amendment, because I do think it is fair.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. It seems to me it would definitely be beyond the power of the Congress to deal with any pro-

ceeds from these seals that our treaty obligations require us to deliver to other countries. Obviously all we could be concerned with here would be the net proceeds after the other countries have received their proportion of the receipts.

Mr. BONNER. I realize that, but you have not said it.

I certainly hope the chairman will accept this amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise very reluctantly in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know very well the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina is most sincere in this. I think he is concerned about the international aspects, and so forth. But the bill, we believe, firmly protects all our treaty obligations and deals only with money which would be net in the United States Treasury. A rather substantial part of that goes back now in the Federal administration of conservation.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Somebody on the committee just told me this was a question of Alaska's taking over its own wildlife, but here is a question of wildlife that does not stay continuously in the area of Alaska.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I was the one to whom the gentleman referred. This is a question here of the State of Alaska taking care of its own wildlife in the Alaskan area itself and not on the Pribilof Islands. Because they take this additional duty and this extra burden that goes with it, they should have some money to take care of that responsibility which is being carried by the National Government at the present time.

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. You are just simply breaking the treaty then, if that is the case.

Mr. ASPINALL. No; it has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BONNER. Of course, it has.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, we are not breaking any treaty. The question was never raised at all by the representatives of the Department of State before our committee. I think it boils down to this, Mr. Chairman. By approving this, we are sending a great Territory off on a difficult journey to statehood. It has been difficult for practically every Territory, which has come into the Union. Here is one of the small assists that we give them—not a great deal, but it is an assist and if we strip away these little aids to the new State, we not only deny our own hope of it becoming a great State, but we are somewhat in the position of a man who sends another man out on a journey across the desert and instead of giving him a bottle of water and some food, he gives him a box of salt.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would especially like to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that years and years ago this question was very carefully considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Originally, it was proposed that the Pribilof Islands and everything on them be turned over to the State of Alaska. But, further reflection convinced the members of the committee that in view of the fact that these seals move about that that would not be wise, and in view of the fact that there are treaty considerations here, there was written into the bill the provision which we find in it now maintaining the supervision of the Federal Government of the seal herd, but recognizing that since this primarily is an Alaskan resource and since the seals spend all their time on land in the Pribilof Islands that the State of Alaska surely should be entitled to some money from what, after all, is one of its possessions. That is why the bill was written in its present form. Some very liberal provisions are made in the law for the administrative expenses of the Federal Government. They have to be paid first. As the gentleman knows, before Alaska will get a dollar, I do not think we are asking too much when we ask for 70 percent of the net proceeds from this vital resource which is so important. I might point this out: That during all these years although this is an Alaska resource, the treasury of Alaska has not had one thin dime from it.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman, of course, realizes the fact that this subject comes before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries time after time. The question of the Alaska fisheries and other matters are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries who have shown a great interest in trying to preserve your natural resources and the resources of other areas of the west coast that are interested, not only in this but in the fisheries and so on. It is only because of that interest that I am asking for a change in the provision as to the division of the profit because you know as well as I know that if the Federal Government ever stops protecting this resource and some of the other of your natural resources, you just simply will not have them in the future, and that includes your wildlife resources. The gentleman realizes that as well as I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot agree with that for a moment because our salmon pack is almost gone and it has been under Federal supervision. But, what I do say in this particular case is that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs followed the precedent set by the gentleman's committee and continued Federal control and only asked for a fair share of the proceeds.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.



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

## [Roll No. 79]

Andersen,	Gross	Neal
H. Carl	Gubser	Norrell
Auchincloss	Harris	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Hillings	Osmers
Barrett	Horan	Powell
Blatnik	Hull	Radwan
Boland	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks, La.	James	Saund
Buckley	Jenkins	Scott, N. C.
Burdick	Kearney	Sheppard
Carnahan	Kearns	Shuford
Celler	Kilburn	Sieminski
Chelf	Kirwan	Siler
Christopher	Kluczynski	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Knox	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mass.	LeCompte	Spence
Dies	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	Loser	Thompson, Tex.
Doyle	McCarthy	Trimble
Engle	Machrowicz	Vinson
Evins	Magnuson	Vorys
Farbstein	Marshall	Vursell
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Grant	Morris	Wilson, Calif.
Gregory	Morrison	Winstead

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On page 35, after line 13, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Alaska and other ports in the United States, its Territories or possessions, or as conferring upon the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports."

Page 35, line 10, after "Sec. 27" insert "(a)."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. R. 7999. I do so without any feeling of malice toward the good people of Alaska nor in any way detracting from their ambitious efforts in behalf of statehood for the Territory.

I feel very strongly, however, that this is a matter which transcends sentiment and goes beyond the immediate question of whether attachment to the United States in the relationship of statehood is in itself a good thing. None of us questions the fact that advantages would

come to the Territory by virtue of a change in its status to that of a State. The important thing, it seems to me, is to determine what is the best thing for our country as a whole.

I am firmly convinced that, even though this issue has been aired many times over the years, many people have not seriously considered what is involved. Adding a State to the Union is an important matter and one which can have, and probably will have, great effect upon the future of the Nation. It is true that in a sense we have faced this each time a State has been added, but never before has the issue been so forcefully presented to the American people as in the case before us today.

In 1912, when Arizona came into the Union as the last of the 48 States, we completed the formal alinement of the United States. Throughout our history, up to that point, it had been more or less our goal to eventually take in all the vast territory in the West and complete the formation of the Union by the addition of all the land stretching to the Pacific coast. Had this not been our objective, untold difficulty would have come to the Nation because of an incompleteness of our continental structure. Once this was done, however, the need for further expansion, for expansion's sake, was at an end.

The Territories added to this country had come in various ways—removed from the normal colonization procedure. Alaska had come to us by purchase in 1867 and Hawaii as a result of the war with Spain. It is true that our people welcomed the addition of these areas as Territories of the United States, but the very fact that they are far removed from the continental United States is in itself a valid reason for considering them in another category from the continental areas which become States.

Alaska is separated from the continental United States by many hundreds of miles. It has little direct relation to the other States and by virtue of its separation would always be aloof from the other States. What is more, its location—though admittedly strategic—would render it foreign in relation to the other States. There would never be, in my opinion, the same attitude toward Alaska as there has been toward the other States. The very fact that it is not contiguous to the United States raises a host of problems.

Our country has grown as it has, as much as anything else, because of the compactness with which it is constituted. Though more than 3,000 miles separate New York and San Francisco, there is still that feeling of direct relationship which provides a common understanding and mutuality of interests. This is not to say that there is not a common understanding between the people of Alaska and the people of the United States. On the contrary, I think definitely there is. Our interests too are similar and our objectives are closely related. But there is a great deal of difference in the two areas because of the lack of proximity.

But distance from the mainland, important as it is, is not the only reason for opposition to statehood. I believe

that to bring Alaska in would set a bad precedent—and one which would plague us for years on end. If Alaska were admitted, what is to stop other areas from eventually seeking statehood and eventual alinement with the United States? The matter is not as remote as it may appear today.

If it were admitted to the Union, Alaska would become our biggest State, and it would be possessed with immeasurable resources; but most of those resources now belong to all the people of the United States. Provisions of this bill would turn over to the State vast areas of lands and vast amounts of resources—and this in itself demands close study and consideration. Ninety-nine percent of the land in Alaska is owned now by the Federal Government. Are the people of the United States fully aware of all the implications of the give-aways involved in this bill?

The proposed admission of Alaska, as provided for in H. R. 7999, is vastly different in procedure than the method employed in the admission of most of our other Territories in years gone by. H. R. 7999 provides for turning over to the State of Alaska 182,800,000 acres including all mineral resources. This is by far the largest amount of land ever turned over to any State. In the last 10 statehood acts passed since 1889 only 58,139,611 acres were given to the States and of this total 50,010,000 were specifically reserved for the support of public schools. This giveaway to the State of Alaska would, therefore, be more than 3 times the total land area given to 10 States in the vast reaches of our West. What is more, by the admission of everyone concerned, the resources of Alaska are such that the value of these lands is immeasurable.

It has been pointed out that on page 8, line 14 of the bill, Alaska is given the right for a period of 25 years to make its own selections of lands in blocks of not less than 5,760 acres. This is a most important provision because of the simple fact that it gives to Alaska 25 years in which to determine which of the lands are of the most value and obviously the State would choose those lands which are most valuable. The number of resources found in Alaska is inexhaustible and it is little less than a crime to deprive the entire country of the right to these resources by turning them over in this manner. Geologists have indicated that the exploration of the resources of Alaska is just now getting underway and already they have discovered numerous strategic minerals and metals in various parts of the Territory. The list includes such items as coal, copper, lead, gas, oil, zinc, iron ores, coal, tin, mercury, antimony, chromite, nickel, tungsten, jade, and sulphur.

In my opinion, despite whatever merits there may be for or against statehood for Alaska, the provisions of this bill which provide for the giveaway of these vast resources are unnecessary.

We live in a time when the United States is hard pressed for many strategic minerals and metals. We found during World War II that even though our country is blessed beyond measure in having many resources we still were

put to a disadvantage by the Japanese capture of many of our foreign sources of supply. I believe that it is vitally important for the United States to retain control of the vast resources available in the Territory of Alaska and the provisions of this bill are such that make this difficult.

Statehood would mean that the people of Alaska—now largely dependent upon the United States Government for their Territorial budget—would have to assume these obligations themselves. This is a big step and the question of their own ability to assume these obligations on the basis of the present population is a pertinent one.

The report of the committee indicates that Alaska is dependent upon the Federal Government now for about two-thirds of its economic stability. Its tax rate is now higher per capita than any of the States and an even higher bid would be necessary in order to assume the State functions which would accompany statehood. The total income from all private industries in Alaska is about \$160 million annually, while the 1958 Federal budget lists \$122 million in Federal expenditures plus \$350 million for Armed Forces construction.

This is an important factor because when you turn over to 160,000 people the support of a State totaling 365 million acres this is a tremendous responsibility. The cost of the burden will be the same whether it is assumed by the Federal Government or by the State government. The difference is that the money comes a great deal easier when it is coming from the Federal Treasury than when it is being extracted from the people in the form of State taxes. Admittedly, if some of the provisions of this bill remained intact, the resources of Alaska might well take care of the cost but I believe it is also important for the people to realize the tremendous immediate burden which would be theirs.

Alaska is three times as large as any of the Territories which have been admitted as States. The Federal ownership of land in Alaska—99 percent—is the largest percentage of any of the Territories which have come in as States. The Federal Government is said to own 365 million acres and 500,000 acres is privately owned. This is far and away the largest land acreage owned by the Federal Government in any other Territory at the time it was admitted as a State. The biggest previous Territory was California, which had 100,400,000 acres of which 46 million acres were owned by the Federal Government. Percentage-wise, the largest Federal ownership was in Nevada, where 59 million of the 70,300,000 acres, or 84 percent, was owned by the Government.

The important thing to realize is that the Federal Government still owns tremendous areas of most of the Western States. All one needs to do is to look at a map provided by the Interior Department to see just how much of these States is owned by the Federal Government. Yet, under the provisions of H. R. 7999 half of the Territory of Alaska would be turned over to the State at one time. This, I repeat, has never been done

in this proportion for any of the other territories.

Much has been said during this debate about the fact that other Territories were admitted to the Union with less development than Alaska and with far less promise as to their future. This is, of course, true, but we have no basis of comparison in talking about the conditions which existed in the 19th century in relation to most of these territories or even to those additions which occurred in this century. So much has happened in the meantime to change the course of the entire world that it is little less than ridiculous to make the same sort of comparison. The mere fact that a table of statistics will show an area today possessing relatively the same population as one had 50 years ago counts for nothing. Granted, that Alaska today has far more in the way of development than did any of the territories which were admitted. But the entire country—and the world—has grown tremendously by comparison. The prerequisites for statehood should then be gaged accordingly.

Personally, I do not count a great deal on the question of population alone. Time will come when the population will increase and whatever objections are voiced now will be outdated because of it. The principle, it seems to me, is vastly more important in our consideration. What the population question does raise is the question of whether the 160,000 or more people will be able to finance the needs of such a vast area when they assume the role of statehood.

The possibility of eventual growth of population does not help the situation now. The obligations which they will encounter will be immediate. They will not wait this anticipated growth.

Fundamentally, the issue boils down to the fact that by our action we would be giving to a vast territory, with a very small population, the same status as States with far greater development, vastly more population and historic heritage as an integral part of the Nation. Most of the proponents seem to view the proposed admission of Alaska on the same basis as the admission of any of the other 35 States which have been added to the Union, since the original 13 formed it. I cannot agree that this should be. The action with respect to Alaska is vastly different.

We would be saying by admitting this area as a State that our borders—for 46 years compact and contiguous—are now broken by a vast stretch of area and that our 49th State is far distant from our border, yet is a part of it. This is a precedent which should be seriously considered in light of experience. True, as a Territory, Alaska would be defended in time of war as much as any State, yet the potential dangers, rendered possible by this separation, are many.

Only 13 miles separate Alaska from the Asian continent and Russia. No more strategic area could be found in time of war—and yet, the very fact of Alaska's admission as a State would not in itself make this area any more easily defended nor change this distance. In

my opinion, the arguments given regarding the strategicness of Alaska are as broad as they are long. Certainly Alaska is strategic and certainly we can afford to do nothing except defend it just as we would defend any other part of the United States but the mere fact that Alaska would become a State would make it no more or no less strategic in my opinion. The vast resources of Alaska would still be there. The proximity to Russia would still be there. Our bases would still be there—whether it was a State or Territory.

In addition to all of the above reasons against statehood there is of course the compelling reason that statehood for Alaska would vitally affect our entire electoral system. In my opinion, few people have really considered the importance of this point. Many people do not realize that acceptance of Alaska as a State would automatically give to that State, with a population of about 161,000 people, two Senators and a Member of the House of Representatives. In addition, it would give to these people three electoral votes in determining who should be elected President of the United States. This population is less than any of the 435 Congressional Districts in the United States. In fact, it is not more than half the population of the most of the Congressional Districts.

In the 1956 Alaskan general election 28,767 votes were cast and yet H. R. 7999 proposes that we would turn over to this small voting population the tremendous electoral advantage of equality with many of our States. This would make a highly disproportionate share of the electoral vote and have serious consequences for the other States.

It would mean that Alaska would have one Senator for each 80,500 of its population—far more than any other State. The area would have 1 presidential elector for each 54,000 inhabitants, while the rest of the States have 1 for each 320,000 population. And, I might add, that proportion of the electors given to Alaska would be taken from the other States, since there is a constitutional limit of 531 electors for the Nation as a whole. Alaska thus would have a 6 to 1 advantage over the other States in the citizens' vote for President.

Such reasons as these are, naturally, not always considered by those who are actively interested in promoting statehood. Obviously, the people of Alaska want to have all of the advantages possible and no one can blame them for doing what they can to promote statehood. Some of the proponents of the bill in this country are not so much interested in the welfare of the people of Alaska as they are in the promotion of political advantages which would come by way of realignment of membership in the Senate and in the electoral college.

I feel that the American people should fully understand the implications involved. As meritorious as may be the campaign for statehood I feel that in 1958 it is ridiculous for us to compare the population of Alaska with that of some of our States at the time they were admitted. In the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th



century the Territories which were admitted to States were, in their relation to the existing States, far more populous than is Alaska today in relation to the 48 States. Yet, Alaska would be given immediately three electoral votes and two Senators with which to bargain politically for standing in relation to the other States.

In many issues before the Congress and in a number of presidential elections over the years this voting power would have been important. We cannot escape the fact that in our system of government where equality in voting in the Senate is given to all States, the addition of a State has tremendous effect upon all of the other States.

Much more could be said on the matter but I am confident that the admission of Alaska to statehood is not feasible at this time, from the standpoint of the several points made heretofore. We are at a crossroads in the history of our country in my opinion. I feel that what the United States as a nation does today and in the years ahead has such tremendous effect upon the rest of the world that it is vitally important that the United States remain strong in every respect. I feel that to separate our borders at this time by the vast area between the northern part of the State of Washington and the southern part of Alaska—free though the intervening territory may be—would set a precedent which we may very well regret.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the issue of Alaskan statehood which is now before the House will doubtless prove to be the most historic decision that we are called upon to make in the 85th Congress. As one who believes Alaska's admission to the Union as a State has been too long delayed, I earnestly hope that we shall not postpone this important step any longer.

My interest in the vast Territory of Alaska was first kindled a decade ago when I heard a speech at Libertyville, Ill., by the distinguished Governor of Alaska, Ernest Gruening. I am indebted to him and to the dedicated articulate Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for much of my personal convictions as to the necessity of statehood for this great northern Territory.

There are several compelling reasons for the admission of Alaska to statehood. First of all, to grant statehood to this Territory would be to affirm the principle of representative government that has been so basic to the American tradition. This is the birthright that has been claimed by the several States who comprise the existing union of States. It is difficult to justify any permanent arrangement whereby the Federal Government has the power to levy taxes on a people and draft their sons for service in time of war without any representation in the Congress. The citizens of Alaska have fought bravely for the defense of us all; they have accepted the tax burdens assigned by the Congress. The time has come for us to reaffirm the principle that gave birth to this Nation—the right of Americans to freely elected, voting representatives in the legislative process.

Alaskan statehood is important, too, because it symbolizes America's capacity for growth. American history has been a dynamic, vital process of expansion and fulfillment. There has never been a time when we have assumed that all frontiers were conquered, that we had reached our peak. Any such assumption could only mean that America had become a tired and self-satisfied nation content to rest on the achievements of the past. That assumption had been made by more than one great nation in history, but in each instance it has signaled decline, decay, and sometimes, death. No society can stand still. We must either move ahead, or prepare for a future of retrenchment and retreat.

I recognize, of course, that acquisition of new member States is not the whole story of American growth in the past or in the future. But we are confronted now with an opportunity to demonstrate to the people of the world, not least to ourselves, and to the citizens of Alaska, that this Nation still has the imagination and sense of responsibility to make good on a longstanding promise of statehood to a Territory filled with rich potentiality.

Aside from any philosophical or political considerations involved in the issue of Alaskan statehood, we are confronted by the moral obligation that is contained in the treaty which our Government signed at the time Alaska was annexed. In 1867 our Government pledged that—

The inhabitants of the ceded Territory (Alaska) \* \* \* shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States.

The time is long overdue for us to make good on that pledge to the people of Alaska. Certainly after nearly a century, there can be no claim made that we are acting with haste in granting statehood in 1958.

Mr. Chairman, when Alaska was first purchased by the United States, there were those who regarded this action as a folly. They so stated in ringing speeches. Those words seem humorous and unreal in the light of history. I cannot escape the thought, as I listen to some of those who now object to statehood for Alaska, that their words of alarm will one day seem equally as strange as the charges of folly that were thrown at Secretary Seward.

I firmly believe that both the citizens of Alaska and the people of the 48 States will profit richly from the creation of this 49th State.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, today is a day of triumph for the principles on which this country of ours has become great.

Today, as we vote to add the 49th star to the Stars and Stripes, we Americans once again dedicate ourselves to the ideals of democracy and once again pledge ourselves to remain faithful to those ideals.

The arguments against statehood have been strongly pressed and earnestly advocated, and I have no quarrel with statehood opponents who have questioned the timeliness of this legislation. They have fought a good fight, and this

debate has been conducted upon a high plane that does credit to this body.

As an American, however, I am prouder of this vote we cast today than I am of any which we have cast since I came to the House, in 1953.

Today we proclaim to all the world that the United States is still a country of expanding frontiers and unlimited opportunity.

Today we proclaim to all the world that democracy is not a special property of the 48 States, but rather something of deep significance to free people everywhere.

Today we proclaim to all the world that this Government honors and keeps its commitments, even to the residents of territories that do not have a vote in these halls.

Today we proclaim to all the world that American citizenship and participation in American Government—the most precious rights in all the free world—are not the selfishly held possessions of a provincial people, but rather something we are ready to share freely with our territorial people who are ready for statehood.

Today we proclaim to all the world that the people of the United States still do not believe in taxation without representation and refuse to practice a narrow colonial policy, even when that policy brings economic benefit to ourselves.

In short, Mr. Chairman, by extending statehood to Alaska, we breathe new life into the spirit of 1776 and open a new frontier to the American people. If the other body and the President will join us in this action, I predict that 1975 will see a thriving State of more than 1 million Americans in Alaska—the bright and shining 49th star in America's beloved Stars and Stripes.

ALASKA NEEDS STATEHOOD: THE UNITED STATES NEEDS THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, Alaska is a vast area with rich natural resources of undetermined extent. To induce private exploratory capital to enter Alaska in sufficiently large quantities to explore, locate, and later bring into production such natural resources, a stable local government at the State level is needed.

Large amounts of Federal Government money have been and are being expended in Alaska for military and defense purposes; however, private investment capital is available in only limited amounts for short periods at high interest rates.

Private capital in large quantities is loath to enter an area where, by the actions of a Federal Government, not elected from its people, and sitting over 4,000 miles away in Washington, D. C., can upset and, by failure to appropriate adequate funds, can overturn Alaska's economy in the course of 1 fiscal year.

In contrast to Alaska, governed and controlled as a Territory by the United States Federal Government, Canadian Provinces in the same latitudes, with local provincial governments similar to our State governments, are prospering and developing their natural resources rapidly under the impetus of private

capital investments. Alaska, as a Territory under the United States Federal Government, with equal or even greater resources, is lagging far behind in this respect.

The Dominion Government of Canada states that in 1957 \$3 million of American private capital was invested in Canada every 24 hours, a large percentage of which was invested in exploration and development of natural resources and needed minerals. Alaska is lagging behind in economic development because of its cumbersome, nonrepresentative, relatively inefficient and unstable territorial form of government.

#### THE UNITED STATES NEEDS ALASKA AS A STATE

In the course of the military and defense program in Alaska some highly intelligent and well informed United States military leaders have recognized the need for a representative State form of government. They have based their reasoning on the facts that a State would have a more rapid economic development and a more rapid increase of population, and that a well developed economy functioning normally is more easily converted to a military and defense program than a barren, undeveloped land. They further reasoned that an economy with supply, communications, and transportation facilities developed and supported by, and for, everyday civilian needs was more economical to convert and use for military and defense purposes than a complete parallel military development constructed through the exclusive use of Federal military funds.

Under statehood, Alaska's economy would prosper and offer added opportunities and employment for American citizens and American capital.

The population of the United States is increasing rapidly. The United States Census Bureau estimates that at the present time the United States has a population of 172 million people. They estimate that by 1975 the population of the United States will approach 200 million people. At the present time there are an estimated 600,000 added employable people annually seeking employment in the United States labor market. If encouraged and allowed to develop under statehood and with private investment capital, Alaska's vast resources could assist in offering employment to and absorbing substantial numbers of these employables.

With the United States economy at its present level, those States that have substantial production of natural resources are showing the least unemployment and suffering. The most notable example is the State of Texas; however, States with similar natural resources in the Rocky Mountain group indicate like economic health in comparison with the greater unemployment in the industrial and industrial-processing States. Alaska's economy under statehood would be that of a natural resource State and could be expected to induce investment and the development of its resources by private capital and the subsequent employment of greater numbers of United States citizens.

At the present time Alaska contains known commercial deposits of oil, gas, coal, iron, nickel, lead, tin, tungstenite ores, mercury, sulfur, magnesium, manganese, copper, cobalt, silver, gold, and radioactive ores, including uranium. Under the added impetus of State government, the exploration, development, and bringing into commercial production of these and other natural resources of Alaska would be accelerated. For rough processing of our natural resource materials into a form that would permit their shipment to the United States and world markets, Alaska has the greatest untapped reserve of potential hydroelectric power remaining on the North American Continent. Water-power development would make more rapid progress under statehood.

#### THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SHOW THE WORLD

In the field of foreign affairs at this time, when the United States is seeking by many means to insure the support and confidence of other nations, and at a time when confidence and respect for the American democratic ideals and principles are threatened, the granting of statehood and self-determination to Alaska would most effectively show the world that the United States practices the principles and ideals upon which it was founded.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 33, line 14, strike out "or any State."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to make a speech.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If the gentleman will yield, that is what I was afraid of.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to hear the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. He took all the wind out of me then.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, had directed him to report the

bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PILLION. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PILLION moves to recommit the bill H. R. 7999 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. PILLION. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 202, answered "present" 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—172

Abbott	Dowdy	Landrum
Abernethy	Durham	Latham
Adair	Elliott	LeCompte
Alexander	Everett	McCulloch
Alger	Feighan	McGregor
Allen, Ill.	Fenton	McIntire
Andrews	Fino	McMillan
Arends	Fisher	McVey
Ashmore	Flynt	Mahon
Avery	Forrester	Martin
Ayres	Fountain	Mason
Bailey	Patman	Matthews
Bates	Frazier	Miller, Md.
Baumhart	Gary	Miller, N. Y.
Beamer	Gathings	Mills
Becker	Gavin	Mitchell
Belcher	George	Moore
Bennett, Mich.	Grant	Mumma
Betts	Gwinn	Murray
Bilch	Haley	Nicholson
Bolton	Halleck	Norrell
Bonner	Hardy	O'Neill
Bosch	Harris	Patman
Boykin	Harrison, Va.	Philbin
Brooks, Tex.	Harvey	Pilcher
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ark.	Pillion
Brown, Ohio	Hemphill	Poage
Broyhill	Henderson	Poff
Burleson	Herlong	Preston
Bush	Hess	Rains
Byrnes, Wis.	Hiestand	Ray
Cannon	Hill	Reed
Cederberg	Hoeven	Riley
Chiperfield	Hoffman	Rivers
Clevenger	Holt	Roberts
Cooley	Hosmer	Robeson, Va.
Coudert	Huddleston	Rogers, Fla.
Cramer	Hull	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham,	Icard	Rogers, Tex.
Nebr.	Johansen	Rutherford
Dague	Jonas	Sadlak
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	St. George
Delaney	Kean	Schenck
Deronian	Kilday	Scherer
Devereux	Kilgore	Schwengel
Dorn, N. Y.	Kitchin	Scrivner
Dorn, S. C.	Laird	Souder



Selden  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Springer  
Stauffer  
Taber  
Talle

Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Vursell  
Walter  
Wharton

Whitener  
Whitten  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolverton  
Young  
Younger

# NAYS—202

Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Anderson,  
Mont.  
Anfuso  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bass, N. H.  
Bass, Tenn.  
Beckworth  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bentley  
Berry  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bow  
Boyle  
Bray  
Breeding  
Broomfield  
Brown, Mo.  
Brownson  
Burdick  
Byrd  
Byrne, Ill.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Canfield  
Carrigg  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Chenoweth  
Christopher  
Church  
Clark  
Coad  
Coffin  
Collier  
Corbett  
Cretella  
Cunningham,  
Iowa  
Curtin  
Curtis, Mo.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson, Ill.  
Dawson, Utah  
Dellay  
Dennison  
Dent  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dollinger  
Donohue  
Dooley  
Dwyer  
Eberharther  
Edmondson  
Fallon  
Farbstein

Fascell  
Flood  
Fogarty  
Ford  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz  
Glenn  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Hagen  
Hale  
Harden  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Haskell  
Hays, Ohio  
Healey  
Hébert  
Heselt  
Hollifield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holtzman  
Horan  
Hyde  
Jarman  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Keogh  
King  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Knutson  
Lafore  
Lane  
Lankford  
Lesinski  
Libonati  
Lipscomb  
McCormack  
McDonough  
McFall  
McGovern  
McIntosh  
Macdonald  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mailliard  
May  
Meader  
Morrow

Metcalf  
Michel  
Miller, Nebr.  
Minshall  
Montoya  
Morano  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Natcher  
Nimtz  
Norblad  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
Osmer  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Polk  
Porter  
Price  
Prouty  
Quile  
Rabaut  
Rees, Kans.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riehlman  
Robison, N. Y.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Santangelo  
Saylor  
Scott, Pa.  
Seely-Brown  
Sheehan  
Shelley  
Sisk  
Staggers  
Sullivan  
Teller  
Tewes  
Thompson, N. J.  
Thompson, Wyo.  
Tollefson  
Udall  
Ullman  
Vanik  
Van Zandt  
Wainwright  
Weaver  
Westland  
Widnall  
Wier  
Wright  
Yates  
Zablocki  
Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Steed against.  
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Siler for, with Mr. Knox against.  
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Lennon for, with Mr. McCarthy against.  
Mr. Trimble for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Shuford for, Mr. Marshall against.  
Mr. Vinson for, Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Doyle against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Budge for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Doyle against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Budge for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Doyle against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Budge for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Doyle against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Budge for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Radwan for, with Mr. Doyle against.  
Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Morris against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Morrison against.  
Mr. Barden for, with Mr. Vorys against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Sheppard against.  
Mr. Budge for, with Mr. Spence against.

Mr. Neal for with Mr. Kearney against.  
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Smith of Kansas for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Loser against.  
Mr. Scott of North Carolina for, with Mr. Forand against.

George  
Glenn  
Gordon  
Granahan  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Hagen  
Hale  
Harden  
Harrison, Nebr.  
Haskell  
Hays, Ohio  
Healey  
Hébert  
Heselt  
Hollifield  
Holland  
Holmes  
Holtzman  
Horan  
Hyde  
Jarman  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karsten  
Kearns  
Keating  
Kee  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Keogh  
King  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Knutson  
Krueger  
Lane  
Lankford  
Latham

Lesinski  
Libonati  
Lipscomb  
McCormack  
McDonough  
McFall  
McGovern  
McIntosh  
Machrowicz  
Mack, Ill.  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magnuson  
Mailliard  
May  
Meader  
Morrow  
Metcalf  
Michel  
Miller, Nebr.  
Miller, N. Y.  
Minshall  
Montoya  
Morano  
Morgan  
Moss  
Moulder  
Multer  
Natcher  
Nimtz  
Norblad  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
Osmer  
Ostertag  
Passman  
Patterson  
Pelly  
Perkins  
Pfost  
Polk  
Porter

Price  
Prouty  
Quile  
Rabaut  
Rees, Kans.  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Riehlman  
Robison, N. Y.  
Robison, Ky.  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Santangelo  
Saylor  
Scott, Pa.  
Seely-Brown  
Sheehan  
Shelley  
Sisk  
Staggers  
Steed  
Sullivan  
Teller  
Tewes  
Thompson, N. J.  
Thompson, Wyo.  
Tollefson  
Udall  
Ullman  
Vanik  
Van Zandt  
Wainwright  
Weaver  
Westland  
Widnall  
Wier  
Wright  
Yates  
Zablocki  
Zelenko

# NAYS—166

Abbitt  
Abernethy  
Adair  
Alexander  
Alger  
Allen, Ill.  
Andrews  
Arends  
Ashmore  
Avery  
Bates  
Baumhart  
Beamer  
Becker  
Belcher  
Bennett, Mich.  
Betts  
Blitch  
Bonner  
Boykin  
Brooks, Tex.  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill  
Budge  
Burleson  
Bush  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cannon  
Cederberg  
Chiperfield  
Clevenger  
Cooley  
Coudert  
Cunningham,  
Nebr.  
Dague  
Davis, Ga.  
Delaney  
Derounian  
Devereux  
Donohue  
Dorn, S. C.  
Dowdy  
Durham  
Elliott  
Everett  
Fenton  
Fisher  
Flynt  
Forrester  
Fountain  
Frazier  
Gary  
Gathings  
Gavin

Grant  
Gwinn  
Haley  
Halleck  
Hardy  
Harris  
Harrison, Va.  
Harvey  
Hays, Ark.  
Hemphill  
Henderson  
Herlong  
Hess  
Hiestand  
Hill  
Hoeven  
Hoffman  
Holt  
Hosmer  
Huddleston  
Hull  
Ikard  
Johansen  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Kean  
Kilday  
Kilgore  
Kitchin  
Lafore  
Laird  
Landrum  
LeCompte  
McCulloch  
McGregor  
McIntire  
McMillan  
McVey  
Macdonald  
Mahon  
Martin  
Mason  
Matthews  
Miller, Md.  
Mills  
Mitchell  
Moore  
Mumma  
Murray  
Nicholson  
Norrell  
O'Neill  
Patman  
Philbin  
Plicher  
Pillion

Poage  
Poff  
Preston  
Rains  
Ray  
Reed  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson, Va.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rutherford  
Sadlak  
St. George  
Schenck  
Scherer  
Schwengel  
Scrivener  
Scudder  
Selden  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Springer  
Stauffer  
Taber  
Talle  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tuck  
Utt  
Van Pelt  
Vursell  
Walter  
Wharton  
Whitener  
Whitten  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Willis  
Wilson, Ind.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolverton  
Young  
Younger

# ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Steed

# NOT VOTING—54

Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Auchincloss  
Barden  
Brooks, La.  
Buckley  
Budge  
Carnahan  
Chelf  
Colmer  
Curtis, Mass.  
Dies  
Doyle  
Engle  
Evins  
Forand  
Gregory  
Gross  
Gubser

Hillings  
Jackson  
James  
Jenkins  
Kearney  
Kilburn  
Knox  
Krueger  
Lennon  
Loser  
McCarthy  
Marshall  
Miller, Calif.  
Morris  
Morrison  
Neal  
O'Hara, Minn.  
Powell  
Radwan

Reece, Tenn.  
Saund  
Scott, N. C.  
Sheppard  
Shuford  
Sieminski  
Siler  
Smith, Kans.  
Spence  
Thompson, La.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Trimble  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Watts  
Willis  
Wilson, Calif.

Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Anderson,  
Mont.  
Anfuso  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Ayres  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bass, N. H.  
Bass, Tenn.  
Beckworth  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bentley  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Bolling  
Bolton  
Bosch  
Bow  
Boyle  
Bray

Breeding  
Broomfield  
Brown, Mo.  
Brownson  
Burdick  
Byrd  
Byrne, Ill.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Canfield  
Carrigg  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Chenoweth  
Christopher  
Church  
Clark  
Coad  
Coffin  
Collier  
Corbett  
Cramer  
Cretella  
Cunningham,  
Iowa  
Curtin  
Curtis, Mo.  
Davis, Tenn.

Dawson, Ill.  
Dawson, Utah  
Dellay  
Dennison  
Dent  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dollinger  
Dooley  
Dorn, N. Y.  
Dwyer  
Eberharther  
Edmondson  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Fino  
Flood  
Fogarty  
Ford  
Frelinghuysen  
Friedel  
Fulton  
Garmatz

# ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bailey

Berry

## NOT VOTING—51

Andersen,	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
H. Carl	Jackson	Saund
Auchincloss	James	Scott, N. C.
Barden	Jenkins	Sheppard
Brooks, La.	Kearney	Shuford
Buckley	Kilburn	Sieminski
Carnahan	Knox	Siler
Chelf	Lennon	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Loser	Spence
Curtis, Mass.	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Dies	Marshall	Thompson, Tex.
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Engle	Morris	Vinson
Evins	Morrison	Vorys
Forand	Neal	Watts
Gregory	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.
Gross	Powell	
Gubser	Radwan	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Bailey against.  
 Mr. Berry for, with Mr. Shuford against.  
 Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Colmer against.  
 Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.  
 Mr. Knox for, with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota against.  
 Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Siler against.  
 Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Brooks of Louisiana against.  
 Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Lennon against.  
 Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Trimble against.  
 Mr. Marshall for, with Mr. H. Carl Andersen against.  
 Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Vinson against.  
 Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. James against.  
 Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Neal against.  
 Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Jackson against.  
 Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.  
 Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Dies against.  
 Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Scott of North Carolina against.  
 Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts against.  
 Mr. Morris for, with Mr. Radwan against.  
 Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Gregory against.  
 Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Jenkins against.  
 Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Barden against.

Until further notice:  
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Gross.  
 Mr. Spence with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would vote "nay" on this bill, but I have a live pair with the gentleman from California, Mr. ENGLE. If he were here he would vote "yea." I therefore ask to be recorded "present."

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. SHUFORD, who if present would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

Mr. HARVEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DEFINING PARTS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF FOOTWEAR

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 9291, to define parts of certain types of footwear,

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:

Page 2, line 22, strike out "July 1" and insert "September 1."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as may be recalled, the purpose of H. R. 9291 in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives was to close certain loopholes in the existing tariff structure contained in paragraph 1530 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, regarding rubber-soled footwear. The House bill provided that the amendment was to enter into force, as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as might be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than July 1, 1958.

The Senate amended the bill in only one respect: The effective date should not be later than September 1, 1958, in lieu of July 1, 1958. This Senate amendment will afford the President an additional period of time within which to enter into such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment made by the bill might conflict.

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, I have concurred in the request of my distinguished chairman and colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, in asking that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H. R. 9291.

It will be recalled that this legislation as it passed the House affected the tariff status of certain rubber-soled footwear by closing a loophole that existed, whereby foreign producers avoided the application of customs duties on such articles. As this legislation passed the House a date of July 1, 1958, was set forth as the final effective date for implementing the intent of the amendment. The Senate has substituted for the full effective date a new effective date of September 1, 1958. It would seem that this change is an appropriate one in

view of the time that has passed between the House consideration of this legislation and the final Senate action thereon.

#### SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 10015, to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes, 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:

Page 2, after line 4, insert:

"Sec. 3. Section 1 (b) of the act of March 13, 1942 (Ch. 180, 56 Stat. 171), as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'but does not include such nonferrous materials and articles in pig, ingot, or billet form which have passed through a smelting process and which can be commercially used without remanufacture.'"

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 10015, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives, was to continue until the close of June 30, 1959, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap.

The Senate amendment, which originated in the Committee on Finance of the Senate, added an additional section to the bill which amends section 1 (b) of the act of March 13, 1942. That section of the act of March 13, 1942, presently provides that the word "scrap," as used in that act, shall mean all ferrous and nonferrous materials and articles, of which ferrous or nonferrous material is the component material of chief value, which are secondhand, or waste or refuse, or are obsolete, defective or damaged, and which are fit only to be remanufactured.

The Senate amendment would add to this section language to provide that, according to the Senate report on the bill, "primary or virgin nonferrous material in pig, ingot, or billet form which is commercially usable in the direct manufacture of articles without sweetening or other modification of its constituents would not be included in the duty-free provisions of the bill." It was explained on the Senate floor that this amendment was to tighten up the law with respect to nonferrous scrap—mainly aluminum. It was also stated on the Senate floor that importers of scrap did not object to the Senate amendment.



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, this legislation as it passed the House of Representatives provided for the continuation until July 1, 1959, of the suspension of duties in import taxes on metal scrap. The Senate in acting on this legislation has added an amendment to the bill providing that primary or virgin nonferrous material in certain forms which is commercially usable in the direct manufacture of articles without modification would not come within the scope of the duty-free provisions of the bill.

#### ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS IN THE DOCUMENT ROOM

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution—House Resolution 565—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective June 1, 1958, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of two additional assistants in the document room, Office of the Doorkeeper, at the basic per annum salary of \$2,200 each.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Gladly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman explain this resolution to the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution provides for two additional clerks in the document room. They have not had an increase in personnel since 1928. At that time they had about 5,000 bills introduced a year, and at this session there have been over 12,000 bills introduced. The work has accumulated, and they need additional help.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It appears it is badly needed.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Very much so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADDITIONAL CLERK HIRE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution—House Resolution 571—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That (a) the title of the positions "1. Telephone Page" and "26. Page" under the Office of the Doorkeeper are changed to "Telephone Clerk (Majority)" and "Telephone Clerk (Minority)," respectively, and the basic salary of each such position shall be at the rate of \$2,100 per annum.

(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House of Representa-

tives, until otherwise provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

(c) As used in this resolution a reference to an existing title and a number is a reference to the position having that title and that number on the payroll of the Office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, as prepared by the Clerk of the House of Representatives for the month of April 1958.

(d) This resolution shall take effect June 1, 1958.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As I understand it, this resolution provides for a change of title of two employees, but does not provide for any additional employees?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. One of the employees is to be charged to the minority and one to the majority; is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And the appointments are to be filled through patronage channels?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is there an increase in salary?

Mr. FRIEDEL. There is an increase in salary of \$300 each for these two employees.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution came out of the Committee on House Administration by a unanimous vote. I know of no opposition on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WITHHOLDING CERTAIN AMOUNTS DUE EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the bill H. R. 12521 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this is a very important bill, in my opinion, the most important of the series of matters the gentleman from Maryland has brought before the House today. This provides simply that there will be a withholding of funds to take care of obligations of employees, all employees of the legislative branch of the Government. I think perhaps it will save the Government considerable time in bookkeeping and in the matter of undertaking to collect certain obligations.

Mr. FRIEDEL. To explain the matter more thoroughly, there is authority now to withhold funds of Members of Congress.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But not of employees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct. This will make it legal to withhold those funds.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In other words, this will give the same authority over employees as the Members?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the bill on this side and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That whenever an employee of the House of Representatives becomes indebted to the House of Representatives, or to the trust fund account in the office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and such employee fails to pay such indebtedness, the chairman of the committee, or the elected officer, of the House of Representatives having jurisdiction of the activity under which such indebtedness arose, is authorized to certify to the Clerk of the House of Representatives the amount of such indebtedness. The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized to withhold the amount so certified from any amount which is disbursed by him and which is due to, or on behalf of, such employee. Whenever an amount is withheld under this act, the appropriate account shall be credited in an amount equal to the amount so withheld. As used in this act, the term "employee of the House of Representatives" means any person in the legislative branch of the Government whose salary, wages, or other compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 7999.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### FLOODED COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 12602.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this involves relief to relatively small quantities of cotton acreage and is intended to apply to all States including California; is that right?

Mr. GATHINGS. To all States, including California; yes.

Mr. HAGEN. It covers a situation where the transferor might own another suitable farm, or where he might rent one, buy one or rent the use of acreages already planted to cotton but available to him because of unintended or deliberate overplanting on the part of the owner or some similar circumstance.

Mr. GATHINGS. The intention of this legislation is to permit the man who owns an allotment where water has covered the particular land to acquire land

on higher ground, by whatever means, in order to plant that allotment of cotton for 1958.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition on this side.

Mr. HILL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is to be highly commended for its dispatch in reporting to the House Committee on Agriculture their recommendations for the transfer of cotton-acreage allotments for 1958 only to aid those cottongrowers who have been flooded out by excessive rains this year.

It will be recalled that as late as May 16, Members of this body called on the Department to recommend some temporary action to alleviate this tragic situation. They pointed out correctly that these rains in 1958, coupled with the disaster in 1957 resulting from excessive rainfall, threatened the economy of the Midsouth and endangered this Nation's ability to produce the quality cotton needed to supply our domestic and foreign markets.

The Department moved swiftly. General Counsel Robert L. Farrington and his office worked to put into proper language the proposal devised in the Cotton Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service by Deputy Administrator H. Laurence Manwaring and Mr. Marion Rhodes.

Policy agreement was secured by the expeditious work of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Marvin L. McLain, and on May 21 the recommendations of the Department to solve this situation were sent to Chairman Cooley by Secretary Benson.

This illustrates the deep concern and desire to alleviate the effects of this disaster condition in the Midsouth of the entire Department. It illustrates also the effective organization of the Department and its ability to move swiftly to take needed action.

H. R. 12602, reported by the Committee on Agriculture, is recommended by the Department of Agriculture. It is their solution to the problem, and I trust that the House will take immediate action. Briefly, the legislation provides that when the Secretary finds that the production of cotton in any county is threatened by a natural disaster, he may authorize the transferring of all or part of a cotton-acreage allotment from rained-out land to another location either in the county or in an adjoining county. In so doing, the flooded farm retains its cotton history as does the affected county, and no new history is created. This authority is given the Secretary only for this current year.

This legislation recognizes the depressed situation created in the cotton areas because of the 1957 floods and excessive rainfalls. It recognizes the economic conditions caused by this sub-

normal yield of cotton in those areas in 1957 and the threat that 1958 will see a repeat of that disaster. It seeks to alleviate and prevent such a disaster both to the local cotton-producing areas and to the potential shortages in quality cotton.

This legislation, temporary in nature though it is, is imperative to stabilize the cotton industry in America.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 344 of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (n) reading as follows:

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, if the Secretary determines that because of a natural disaster a substantial portion of the 1958 farm cotton acreage allotments in a county cannot be timely planted or replanted, he may authorize the transfer of all or a part of the cotton acreage allotment for any farm in the county so affected to another farm in the county or in an adjoining county on which one or more of the producers on the farm from which the transfer is to be made will be engaged in the production of cotton and will share in the proceeds thereof, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Acreage history credits for transferred acreage shall be governed by the provisions of subsection (m) (2) of this section pertaining to the release and re-portionment of acreage allotments. No transfer hereunder shall be made to a farm covered by a 1958 acreage reserve contract for cotton."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "it" and insert "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.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK—ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ARENDS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if he will provide us with the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to do so.

There is no further legislative business for this afternoon, and there will be no legislative business tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourns to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The legislative business for next week is as follows:

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, and there will be three suspensions, as follows:

First, the bill S. 734, the Federal Employees Salary Increase, a bill relating to classified employees.

Second, House Concurrent Resolution 332, known as the Space Control, Peaceful Exploration Resolution which I introduced with a unanimous vote at the request of the Select Committee on Outer Space, and which has been reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Third, the bill H. R. 7466, having to do with the Fort Pemberton National Monument.

Then there is the bill H. R. 12575, the national space control program. That is the bill that establishes the new agency recommended by the President and also urged by Senator JOHNSON of Texas, myself, and others, in connection with astronautics and outer space. It has the unanimous report of the select committee.

Then, if we can reach it, and I hope the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency are able to harmonize their differences so that it can be taken up and passed without much difficulty, House Joint Resolution 614, amending the National Housing Act.

If there are any rollcall votes on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday they will not be taken until Thursday because of primaries in California, Montana, and South Dakota. It would be rather hard to pull a Member back the next day after a primary, so any rollcalls on those 3 days will go over until Thursday.

As to the program for Tuesday and the rest of the week, the Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

Then the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1959 will come up for consideration.

Following the completion of the appropriation bill the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, H. R. 12591, will come up.

Thereafter, if there is time, we will take up the bill H. R. 12695, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958, a bill reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means extending certain excise taxes that expire on June 30.

On Thursday there will be a joint meeting of both Houses of the Congress to receive the President of the Federal Republic of Germany. Unanimous consent has already been granted for that.

I make the usual reservations, that conference reports may be called up at any time, and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the majority leader that I am glad he called attention to House Joint Resolution 614, to amend the National Housing Act. In the situation in which we find ourselves at this particular moment, unless there can be some agreement there is a question of whether a vote will be had on this particular legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend called that to my attention. I hope the Members can harmonize their



differences and we can dispose of that Monday. If they harmonize their differences, I am confident we can get it through. But if difficulty arises and we cannot bring it up, and there is reasonable urgency for the passage of other legislation, I cannot see that it can be programed again until the middle or latter part of the following week, with all this other legislation having priority. I have put it on the program for Monday in the hope that between now and Monday something can be worked out and that there will be a compromise for the time being so that we can get the bill through on Monday.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

**ADDRESS BY HON. SAM RAYBURN  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS  
CLUB OF WASHINGTON ON  
THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING  
THE NATIONAL CAPITOL  
THROUGH COMPLETION OF THE  
EAST FRONT EXTENSION PROJECT**

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, May 27, 1958, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, delivered before the National Press Club of Washington a splendid and effective address on the importance of preserving the National Capitol through the completion of the east front extension project.

Because I think the Members of the House should have the benefit of the facts and clear logic which the Speaker so ably presented in support of this project, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. RAYBURN's speech is as follows:

REMARKS OF SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 27, 1958

The most important purpose of the east front extension project is the preservation of the building itself. The facing of the central section of the east front is made of soft sandstone. By 1819 it had begun to deteriorate and the first coat of paint was applied. Today this sandstone wears 35 coats of paint.

At first the paint was successful, but now it cracks, peels, and pulls off the surface skin of the stone. Then water gets in the cracks, freezes, and chips off great flakes.

Time and weather have worn down and ruined many moldings and carved ornaments. Sections of the cornice have fallen, varying in size from that of a baseball to chunks weighing as much as 60 pounds.

The capital of one column is held together by wire rope, which is clearly visible from the ground.

Several columns are cracked, some cracks extending into the base moldings.

There are many cracks in the walls, some extending the full thickness of the wall. Some have opened up since the last painting 2 years ago.

There is a bad crack in the cornice of the portico which extends up through the pediment, and shows signs of movement.

In 1940 it was necessary to plaster the foundation walls with cement mortar to keep out the rats which were burrowing through the original lime mortar which had decomposed so far that the rodents could find their way through.

Some time ago the scroll of the Constitution in the hand of one of the figures fell on the steps and now is held up by a couple of bolts.

A lot of people have had various suggestions as to replacing some of the stones or all of the stones or adding new coats of paint. Some even insist that the same kind of sandstone be used.

But unless we remedy the cause of the cracks, they will reappear.

It boils down to this: The stones we can't save. The design we can. And we can save it better and more safely on a new wall 32½ feet to the east.

And let me point out something that many people have overlooked—even after the central portion has been extended 32½ feet, it still will be 40 feet back of the front line of the House and Senate wings. The present indented appearance of the east front will be preserved.

The second major purpose of this project is to correct the architectural defect caused by the overhanging dome.

Thomas U. Walter designed the House and Senate wings of the Capitol. Before he started his construction, he warned President Fillmore that when these wings were added, they would make the old dome built by Bulfinch look out of proportion. He was right. The dome looked ridiculous and unimpressive.

So Walter was commissioned to design a proper dome. The diameter of the rotunda was too small to hold it, so he very cleverly designed a cast-iron dome which could be supported by brackets fastened to the wall of the rotunda.

Thus the dome extended out over the rotunda walls and over the east portico. This was a grave architectural defect because the dome is without visual support.

Walter advised President Lincoln that to restore the equilibrium of the dome, to provide it with visual support and not detract from the elegance of the portico, it would be essential to extend the east front.

Walter's opinion has been shared by every architect of the Capitol since that time—a period of more than 100 years.

The overwhelming weight of expert professional opinion has been behind this project for generations.

Some of the greatest architects of the first half of this century approved the extension. This group included John Russell Pope, whose work included the Jefferson Memorial, the National Archives, and the National Gallery of Art; Henry Bacon, designer of the Lincoln Memorial; Carrere and Hastings, architects for the New York Public Library and the Old House and Senate Office Buildings, and Cass Gilbert, designer of the United States Supreme Court Building.

In recent weeks the plans for the extension have been carefully reviewed and fully approved by such great living architects as William Adams Delano, who was architectural consultant for the renovation of the White House; Otto R. Eggers, who worked on the National Art Gallery, the National Archives, and the Jefferson Memorial, and James K. Smith, whose firm designed the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

Recently the executive committee of the Washington Chapter of the Institute of Architects reviewed the plans, then passed a resolution approving them.

This work has been approved by dozens and dozens of the great names of the architectural world, and the committee of advisory architects on the project consists of men renowned the world over for their genius and their professional integrity.

By the adoption of the plan to extend the east front, which is the most practical and safest way to preserve the facade and design of the Capitol, and is the only practicable way to correct the grave architectural defect

of the overhanging dome, we obtain another advantage.

This plan will make available additional space which is desperately needed in the Capitol Building.

We must remember, as Congressman CLARENCE CANNON recently told the House, that the Capitol is a workshop not a museum. Almost all of the offices which serve the instantaneous needs of the Congress are badly overcrowded, thus reducing their efficiency.

And I don't need to tell the members of the press about the desperate need for more public facilities to serve the ever-increasing flood of visitors, both tourists and those on business. The need for additional restaurant space and restrooms is particularly acute.

For each of the last 2 years we have had more than 5 million visitors a year coming through the Capitol. You all know the loss of time suffered in trying to get a seat in one of the restaurants, even when you are alone, and if you have friends and constituents with you, the wait can be long indeed.

The completion of the east front extension will allow this situation to be corrected in large part.

Many people forget that the building, rebuilding, and remodeling of the Capitol has been almost continuous since it was built. Let us review a bit of the history of this building:

As early as 1803, Benjamin Latrobe, whom Jefferson selected as Architect of the Capitol, found the work done to date "so unfaithfully performed" that he tore out a large percentage of it, replacing wood floors and partitions with masonry. He also changed the original design for the Chamber of the House before the fire of 1814 and again after the fire. He moved the Senate Chamber from the ground floor to the principal floor and put the Supreme Court on the ground floor.

Latrobe also deleted the steps originally designed for the west front and put them on the east, increasing the width of the east portico thus completely changing the original design of the east front.

Years later, after the House and Senate wings were constructed the sloping floor of the old House Chamber—now Statuary Hall—was replaced by the level floor on which we walk today.

In 1898 a gas explosion in the basement ruined the law library and the Supreme Court Chamber above, and burned out the roof and cupola over the oval room just north of the rotunda, and these had to be restored.

Around the turn of the century (1901-3) the area previously occupied by the Library of Congress was remodeled for office space. New portions of the roof were installed, and electric lighting and elevators were added.

In 1915 the east front had its old central steps replaced by the present granite steps.

In 1937 air-conditioning was installed.

In 1949 and 1950 the present House and Senate Chambers were completely remodeled and the roof lines were changed. There was no hesitancy in removing deteriorated historic portions. The historic glass seals of the States were removed from the old skylight ceiling and sent to the State capitols for their museums.

The interior walls of the House Chamber were completely rebuilt from top to bottom, and the whole Chamber was given a new treatment.

So our Capitol was not a building constructed in its entirety at one date, to remain frozen and unchanged in any detail for all time to come. It has been added to, altered, and improved as commonsense and changing needs dictated.

## SMALL BUSINESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a constituent wrote me recently and asked, "Why all this fuss about small business? You seem to be preoccupied with small business." The first is certainly a fair question, and on the second, I stand guilty as charged. I am indeed intensely interested in small business.

Why? Primarily because about 27 million Americans make their living in small-business enterprises. That is more than one-half of our total non-agricultural working force. What could possibly be more important than the jobs of the largest group of working-people in our country?

Secondly, I am concerned about small business because I consider it to offer the last frontier of opportunity for the workingman. While we often hear of men rising to the top in great industries, tens of thousands more men and women achieve success in small business. I deem it a great privilege to know personally scores of such Americans; men and women who started at the bottom, worked a few years, and then, "went into business for themselves," and made a success of it. This is the all-American story; the sort of thing that makes us stand out as a nation among nations.

Mr. Speaker, small business is the backbone of our American civilization, and we want to keep it strong.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 21, made five recommendations for aiding small business. I bring them to your attention with the hope that every Member of this body will give them careful consideration.

The Secretary said he anticipated "that the economic picture will be much brighter this year and next if we do the right things now."

Four of the proposals made by Mr. Weeks would involve changes in tax regulations. The fifth involves Government encouragement for private investment companies to make additional loans to small business.

The proposed tax changes were:

First. Revision of the Internal Revenue Code to permit investors in small businesses to deduct in full any losses of up to \$50,000 in any one year.

Second. Authorize businesses to depreciate at faster-than-usual rates purchases of used equipment not exceeding \$50,000 in any one year.

Third. Allow small corporations the privilege of being taxed as partnerships in certain cases. This, Mr. Weeks said, would give them greater stability and would involve a relatively small revenue loss to the Government.

Fourth. Allow the payment of estate taxes over a period of up to 10 years by estates consisting of investments in

closely held business firms. This, Mr. Weeks stated, would avoid forced sales in order to pay taxes.

## THE TWO UNKNOWN AMERICANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great humility that we receive in the Capitol the remains of the two unknown Americans of World War II and of Korea.

I am reminded of the heavy hearts of loved ones whose kin not only did not return but of whom no trace or identification could be found. It is to this great sacrifice, this overwhelming human tragedy, that I am sure Julian Grenfell in *Into Battle* addressed his consoling lines:

The thundering line of battle stands,  
And in the air death moans and sings,  
But day shall clasp him with strong hands,  
And night shall fold him in soft wings.

The two unknowns in our midst will give us pause. For here is the symbol of tremendous faith and respect and dedication from which we may all take inspiration.

## INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a companion bill to S. 3898, introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Illinois, I am dropping in the hopper of the House a similar measure to authorize the acquisition of land for an Indiana Dunes National Monument.

The senior Senator from Illinois has alerted the Nation to the danger facing an area that as far back as 1913, a group of eminent scientists from several European nations described as 1 of the 4 most interesting spots in America. Already thousands of petitions signed by men and women in every State in the Union protesting against the threatened steal of this world-famous area from the people are pouring into Senator DOUGLAS' office. I earnestly hope that the bill I am introducing will receive prompt consideration by the committee to the end that this body will go forward, side by side with the other body, in protecting the dunes for all times, and for the enjoyment and education of succeeding generations, by encompassing them in a national monument.

## SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittee

No. 2 of the House Small Business Committee may sit next week during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

## THE UNKNOWN SERVICEMEN OF THE KOREAN WAR AND WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone of us, as we viewed this morning in the rotunda of the Capitol the flag-covered caskets of the two unknown soldiers, one from the Korean war and one from World War II, soldiers known only to God, was deeply moved. I believe every one of us who had lost anyone during the war where the death was unknown—every human being who lost a dear one—a mother or father, a widow or sister, brother, or relative of any kind—felt that our dear ones might be in those caskets. It was a beautiful and simple ceremony perfectly executed by the military. The placing of the exquisite great white wreaths by the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, and by the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, and the dean of the diplomats showed Washington's national and international reverence for the heroes' sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, our prayers, our love and devotion and undying gratitude will be with them always. They typify every soldier known only to God.

## WARNING NO. 10

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

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a chart and tabulations.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I notice from the RECORD of May 27 that our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] addressed the House, entitling his remarks "Democrat Demagogery on Unemployment." During the course of his remarks he extended a chart or table indicating the number of times various Members, particularly Members of the Democratic Party of both Houses, addressed Congress on this very important subject of doing something to cure the unemployment situation that is getting



worse in this country, and to do something about the economic crisis in which we now find ourselves. I dare to suggest that the Republican researcher who prepared the information for the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has probably understated the problem. He certainly has given no indication of how to meet the problem, and as far as I am concerned, if there is any blame to be attached to any of us for having addressed the Congress on this important subject, then I take that blame, but I suggest that instead of blame, it is credit that we are entitled to receive.

I want all the credit I have earned in that regard. While I have not checked all the times I have addressed the Congress on the subject, I note he indicates I did so on some 10 different occasions during this session. He has underestimated, no doubt unintentionally, my capacity because I know I addressed the House on this very important subject on at least six occasions other than those mentioned by him.

At the same time I must make this comment: It is high time that the battle of statistics came to an end and that we address ourselves to the important subject of doing something about this economic recession. While it may not be getting worse at the same fast rate that it was getting bad last month and the month before that, it is still getting bad. The fact that it is not getting any worse at the same pace does not stabilize the situation. The fact that we may be at the bottom is unimportant. The important question is, What are we going to do to climb back to the top point where this country must be and where the economy of the country must be if we are to continue to be the leaders of the world, not only insofar as security is concerned but in the important respect of improving the standard of living of our own people and of the entire world?

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The gentleman from New York made mention of the fact that my statistics were furnished by some "Republican researcher." The gentleman does not want to tell me who the gentleman was?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know. The gentleman should tell us who did the researching, if he cares to. I assume it was done by the Republican National Committee. I may be wrong. That is just an assumption on my part.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I am glad the gentleman is making that assumption, because he would be surprised to know that the researching was done by the Library of Congress. I wrote to them on February 8, 1954, and asked them to give me statistics on the material that appeared in the RECORD of 1950. They wrote me under date of February 8, 1954, and gave me a list of the things, which I put into the RECORD in my speech, yesterday. The same inquiry was made by telephone this year and the Library of Congress furnished me all of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS from January through April 1958, marked with their familiar blue markers and I now have in my office the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for January,

February, March, and April of both 1950 and 1958 as marked out by the Library of Congress and these are available for the gentleman from New York so that he can look them over and see that it was the Library of Congress that furnished me all of my material. I am sorry that they made some mistakes, because apparently they erred on the side of giving me a lesser number than they should have, which would have meant that the statistics would have been more favorable to the viewpoint I presented yesterday in my speech.

I thank the gentleman from New York for allowing me this time.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman emphasizes the point I make, that it is high time that the battle of statistics came to an end and that we started to war on the recession.

Incidentally, whether it was the Library of Congress or anybody else who prepared these statistics for the gentleman, they are still wrong.

I doubt whether the gentleman wants to give the Library of Congress credit for the facts about the administrative action which he referred to. For instance, he talked about the Federal Reserve Board changing the interest rate, that is, the action of the Federal Reserve Board reducing the discount rate, and changing the reserve requirements. But if the Republican administration wants the credit for what the Federal Reserve Board did, it must also take the blame for the several things the Reserve Board did during the months before we got into the recession, all of which contributed to it.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The policy of the Federal Reserve System and the present Republican administration in connection with high interest rates and tight money against which they were warned, coupled with the depression of our agricultural community brought about the recession. Those are the two main factors. So this is a manmade recession, the result of policies of the present Republican administration, and they cannot escape that fact and that responsibility.

Mr. MULTER. Let me emphasize the point that the distinguished majority leader so ably makes.

Our friend from Illinois took credit for his Republican Party for the fact that there was administrative action looking toward the acceleration of defense appropriations, but he overlooks entirely that this situation was brought about in the first instance, because the President ordered those funds not to be spent, funds which had been appropriated by the Congress. He did the same thing with the housing money that we appropriated. The President ordered his housing agency not to use it.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it was only after the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House introduced companion resolutions expressing the strong opinion of both branches that the appropriated money should be spent, that its spending should be accelerated, that the President followed it up. In other words, he again

followed the leadership of the Democrats.

Mr. MULTER. Again the distinguished majority leader is right, and that brings me to the point the gentleman from Illinois made about legislative recommendations. We recommend, we enact in this Congress, but we, the Congress, cannot compel the President and his appointees to act.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I just wanted to correct the gentleman's apparently false impression. The only thing I give credit to the Library of Congress for is the statistics on speeches on unemployment and not in the various things that were put into the RECORD regarding things the Republican Party has done to help end the recession. I do not want to blame the Library of Congress for anything they do not deserve. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed further, the gentleman remembers that in our Small Business Committee we had all of the members of the Federal Reserve Board before our committee recently, and one of the questions I kept asking each member, and I believe the gentleman from New York was there when I asked the question, was whether when they raised the interest rate, adopting the so-called hard money policy, whether they, an independent organization came to that judgment themselves or were they led by the administration. Three of the members of the Federal Reserve Board whom I cross-examined on that same point said they were an independent organization that made the judgment themselves, and they took credit or blame for what they did as well as take credit for the action of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MULTER. That is exactly what happened. The point, I make, however, is that the gentleman is taking credit for the Republican administration for the action of the Federal Reserve Board. No one can deny that the members of the Federal Reserve Board admitted during those hearings that they were in constant cooperation and consultation, as they should be, with the President and with the Secretary of the Treasury and other members of the Cabinet.

Mr. SHEEHAN. They further admitted that, but did they not tell us that although they would listen to the administration as well as any other department of the Government, the nine members of the Federal Reserve Board here reserved unto themselves the right to exercise their independent judgment, and they stated that they would have to take the blame or the credit.

Mr. MULTER. I take the same position today that I took during the days when President Truman was being attacked by the members of the Republican party, because he was then doing what President Eisenhower is now doing, consulting and conferring with the Federal Reserve Board. That is his duty, and he should do it. But, I suggest that the gentleman should not take credit for what the Federal Reserve Board has done unless he also takes the blame for what they did. They increased and increased and increased the interest rates.

They made money not harder, but harder to get.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I am sure that the Republican administration under President Eisenhower, when they saw the way the recession was going, or whatever you want to term it, did advise the Federal Reserve Board what they thought the policy should be, but in the final analysis it was up to the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. MULTER. In this instance I think we can properly criticize both Mr. Eisenhower and the Federal Reserve Board for too little and too late, if not for actually standing still.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am anxious to find out what this administration has done along the line of any antirecession measure. The accelerating resolutions were introduced by Democrats. Your emergency housing bill is a Democratic measure. Your emergency road bill is a Democratic measure. The President vetoed the rivers and harbors bill when he should not have done so. He did not have to send up a budget of estimates of the projects he did not like, when the Congress made appropriations he did not like, he could have frozen those appropriations. Here we have 135 or 140 other projects, on which we could be going ahead. So, I am wondering what has been done by this administration as an antirecession measure.

Now, the so-called unemployment bill is not going to help many. We all know that most States will probably not take advantage of it. In some States, instead of 26 weeks, they get not more than 13, or one-half of what they were getting, and if they were on part-time work they are getting less than the maximum of the State law, and some men might get as low as 3 or 4 weeks' extension, as I understand it. We know that if the State makes a loan, they are not going to pay it back, and I do not blame them. When the increased tax goes into effect, Congress is going to repeal it, projecting my mind ahead 4 years. So, they fought the grant. I wish I were running against some Republican in a reasonably close district who voted for the substitute. They would have a hard job getting elected when they couple section 1 and section 2 of the Democratic measure. Section 2 was designed to bring about justice and to prevent injustice to hundreds of thousands of workers, whose only offense was that they were not covered by the State unemployment law. But, they had work records. The President's bill is not going to help. At best its help is going to be negligible. It might have some little help but not have any impact as an antirecession measure. So, I see nothing except negligible results from what this administration has done to date along the line of antirecession legislation. It has been mostly inaction.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. In response to the majority leader's inquiry about what the Republican administration has done, rather than take the time of the House now to read a list of 50 things that the Republicans have done to increase employment and the business picture, if the gentleman will refer to page 9625 of the RECORD, in my speech yesterday under the heading "Administration Actions," he will find a list of 50 different acts taken by the Republican administration; either actions or recommendations to the Congress for action. I might say that this list was published by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] shortly after April 30.

Mr. MULTER. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois revise the list which has been put into the RECORD and delete from it those things which he surely does not want to claim credit for either for his party or for this administration, and possibly add some other things on the opposite side of the ledger for which this administration definitely must take the blame.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has not denied anything I have said. He cannot get away from the fact of high interest rates and tight money. It is a combination of responsibility of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board. You cannot get away from that. No matter how much you talk to the contrary, the facts are there.

I would not charge that they intended to have a recession, but the administration is responsible for the results of its policies. These are the results of the policies of your President and your party leaders. He is my President and your President and while I sharply disagreed with him when he did certain things, the results of the leadership and the policies of your President and your party have brought about a man-made recession, not a natural recession as a result of the normal disturbance of our economic system because of the operation of the law of supply and demand. This was deliberately done, because they were afraid of inflation. They took this course in an effort to control inflation and it got beyond control. Instead of trying to meet inflation by other methods, other steps which could have been taken, they tried to do it through credit control and high interest rates and dear money.

The result is that our business, which is very sensitive, got disturbed and we have deflationary forces operating and a recession that has gotten beyond control.

I hope that we are going to come back quickly. The best that I can see is a plateau for about another year. And if we remain on a plateau we will not be gaining, we will be losing. There will be 1 million to 1,200,000 young men and women each year coming onto the labor market, and our economy should expand at least 4 percent a year in order to serve the economic needs of our people and of our country.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished majority leader in again making the plea that the men who made this manmade recession get together and unmake it. Let us start climbing back to the top and beyond.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says manmade recession. Would he put in parentheses the word "Republican"?

Mr. MULTER. There should be no doubt that that is what I mean.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, of course I would violently disagree that this was a Republican-made depression. In my remarks yesterday I tried to bring that out, and I am very grateful that the gentleman read my remarks. I am referring to the fact that in the years 1950 and 1958 the unemployment percentages were about the same; and although I did not put it into the RECORD, the Federal Reserve Board index of production dropped just about the same percentage during approximately the same period of time, so that the economic circumstances were the same. So that regardless of who may have caused the economic setback and increased unemployment—and I do not like the word "deliberately," which the gentleman from Massachusetts used—I still think, and I agree with the gentleman from New York 100 percent, that everyone, Democrats and Republicans, should put their shoulder to the wheel and try to get the economy going, so that everybody who needs a job and everybody who wants a job will be able to work. As I pointed out in my speech yesterday, May 27, the first 4 months of 1950 and 1958 were very similar with reference to the economy and to unemployment. Yet the Democrats were relatively quiet in 1950 and very vociferous in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1958. Would not the gentleman from New York agree that both Democrats and Republicans get together to provide jobs.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman gets very close to my thinking and to what I have been saying. It does not matter what the statistics show during any prior administration. We, on our side, think we should learn from the mistakes, if any, that were made in the past. We are trying our utmost to get the Republicans to admit that we do not have to repeat the mistakes of the past. Let us learn from past experiences and prevent recurrences of bad situations. Instead of that, we have an administration that refuses to learn. It hears nothing. It sees nothing. It learns nothing. It does nothing. I hope we can get together and begin to move forward. Any mistake that was made that tended toward recession in the Democratic years we corrected. We made mistakes. We were not omniscient. We were not perfect. But we moved and we moved quickly. We did not hesitate to reverse our steps when necessary. Nothing has



been done along that line by this Republican administration.

Warning after warning after warning has been given as to where we are going and why. They ignore us and are going right on down the road of recession and we have not been able to reverse that trend.

To complete the record, let me add a few outside opinions to fortify my position.

First, a column from the Wall Street Journal of May 5, 1958:

**LAYOFF RATE IN MARCH SET POSTWAR HIGH; JOBLESS PAY TOTAL OFF IN WEEK—AGENCIES REPORT OUTLAYS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION ROSE SEASONALLY IN APRIL**

WASHINGTON.—The rate of layoffs in manufacturing rose in March to 31 for every 1,000 on the payroll—the highest rate for the month since World War II—the Labor Department said in its report on factory labor turnover. In February, the layoff rate was 29 for each 1,000 on the payroll.

The agency also reported the number of workers drawing jobless insurance benefits fell sharply in the week ended April 19.

Workers receiving unemployment insurance benefits dropped by 30,700 in the week, to a total of 3,332,600. This level is still high—second only to the 19-year record 3,363,344 set the week before. The rate was 8 percent of the total eligible to receive the insurance, down 0.1 percent from the week before.

In its report on factory turnover, the Labor Department said the hiring rate improved only slightly to 23 for each 1,000 workers but still was the lowest March rate since the war. In February, the hiring rate was 22 per 1,000.

#### POOR DURABLE-GOODS SITUATION

In durable goods, the seat of the recession, the relationship between hirings and layoffs was especially unfavorable, continuing the 7-month decline, the agency said. Layoffs rose from 44 to 47 per 1,000, which the Labor Department termed a substantial rise. Hirings rose from 22 to 24 per 1,000.

Electrical machinery showed an improving ratio, although layoffs still exceeded hirings. The separation rate declined from 37 per 1,000 in February to 34, while the hiring rate remained steady at 20.

In the transportation-equipment industry which includes the hard-hit auto companies, the separation rate was highest, 64 per 1,000. In February the figure was 54. Hirings increased from 27 in February to 34 per 1,000.

The Labor Department attributed much of the 30,700 decline in the number of workers drawing jobless insurance to seasonal pickup in construction and other outdoor activities. Thirty States shared in the decline, led by California, where increased activity in construction, lumber, and food processing permitted the total to drop by 22,400. Tennessee, Michigan, and Ohio also figured in the decline.

#### DROP MAY CONTINUE

There was an indication that the drop might continue, at least another week, in the fact that new claims for unemployment compensation fell off by 23,300 in the week ended April 26. A new claim does not appear in the total number of persons drawing benefits until a week later.

Thirty-one States had fewer new claims, sending the total down to 423,000. A year ago, a decline of 25,000 in the like week brought the total down to 224,300.

The Labor Department said New Jersey, with a pickup in construction and resort activity, led the decline in new claims, followed closely by Michigan, Ohio, and New York. Fewer layoffs in the auto industry in the week helped those three States.

In the 8 large cities which report weekly on the number of persons exhausting their payments, the total in the week ended April 26 was down by 800 to 24,500.

In a separate report, the Commerce and Labor Departments estimated that outlays for all types of new construction in April rose seasonally to \$3.7 billion—the same as in April last year and up from \$3.3 billion in March.

The joint report figured the total dollar volume of construction put in place for the first 4 months of this year at \$13.4 billion, up slightly from the \$13.2 billion in the comparable period of 1957. However, the report added, the physical volume of work put in place probably did not increase. The latest joint estimates, the Departments said, reflect a 5-percent rise in dollar volume of public construction for the first 4 months of this year over the like period of last year, due primarily to increased spending for public housing—mostly armed services projects—and highways.

For the first 4 months of this year, public construction was figured at \$3.8 billion, up from \$3.6 billion for the like period of 1957. Dollar volume of private construction for the first 4 months of this year, at \$9,590 million, showed little change from the \$9,560 million in the like period a year ago.

The departments cautioned, however, that construction figures not be assigned too great a weight as economic indicators. Other month-to-month measures of current activity that should be considered, they said, are employment, hours of work and unemployment.

The Government reports on employment and construction came out as Congress looked forward to a week in which anti-slump activity will be sparse. Neither Chamber has scheduled debate on major economic measures, and only a few committees will be working at recovery legislation. The House Banking Committee continues all week its general hearings on unemployment cures. And the Senate Finance Committee may get to unemployment compensation legislation by late in the week, although it is more likely this will not come up until early next week.

#### OTHER ECONOMIC STATEMENTS

In economic statements over the weekend: Commerce Secretary Weeks, speaking at Stratford, Va., continued a basic Administration approach to the current slump, talking of faith and confidence and predicting, "The best is yet to be."

If the rate of growth maintained in the past half century is sustained, he predicted, the value of all goods and services will rise in 10 years to "at least \$580 billion from last year's \$434 billion, and personal income will climb from \$343 billion to \$460 billion."

A Republican Senator, JACOB JAVITS of New York, yesterday criticized the confidence approach to the recession, saying the country is "very complacent."

"We feel that everything will come around all right if we just wait, because it always has," Mr. JAVITS said in a recorded radio interview. He said many antirecession measures have been bypassed, and criticized both the White House and Congress for not exercising initiative.

Mr. JAVITS accused private industry of "standing on the side line to wait and see what the Government was going to do instead of going out and vigorously driving itself."

Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who said the administration has moved too slowly to counter the recession, said he has not favored a tax cut because of its possible inflationary pressures "in another 6 or 7 months." Nevertheless, he argued a reduction "might be quite likely" if an upturn is not apparent in the economic

figures coming out "by the 10th or 15th of May."

The Massachusetts legislator said his own view is that there will not be much of an upturn in the second quarter, and predicted "it's more likely" recovery may come in the third quarter.

These columns from the New York Times of May 5, 1958, are illuminating:

**PURCHASE PLANS FOUND CURTAILED—FAMILY SURVEY SHOWS 20 PERCENT DROP ON NEW CARS, 10 PERCENT ON MAJOR HOUSEHOLD ITEMS**

Fewer consumers are planning to buy new automobiles and major household goods than were doing so 6 months ago. This is a finding in the first results from a sampling of 25,000 families in all parts of the country.

The survey was undertaken by Dr. F. Thomas Juster for the National Bureau of Economic Research. In making the results public over the weekend he noted that they reflected plans as of early April.

The number of persons planning to buy new cars within 6 months was more than 20 percent below the figure for last October, the survey found. Consumer intentions to buy used cars increased, so that automobile purchase plans on the whole declined by only 10 percent.

Regarding major household items—ranges, refrigerators, television receivers, food freezers and the like—the figure dropped slightly more than 10 percent.

The number planning to buy new cars a year hence was 30 percent lower than in October 1956, when the most recent comparable survey was made.

A 40-percent drop was shown in the number planning to purchase 15 major household items for a year ahead.

Households included in the survey were member-subscribers of Consumers Union of the United States, a nonprofit organization that tests and rates products and publishes its findings in consumer reports. Data on the buying intentions of this group are available for a 10-year period.

The plans of this group have generally shown a close relationship to purchases by the population as a whole, although these families are not representative. Their average incomes are considerably higher and more stable.

The National Bureau of Economic Research is a nonprofit agency devoted to the impartial gathering and interpretation of economic facts. Dr. Juster is assistant professor of economics at Amherst College.

**STARTS ON HOMES DECLINE IN STATE—DROP IS REGISTERED FOR 29TH MONTH—McMURRAY HOPES FOR EARLY IMPROVEMENT**

State Housing Commissioner Joseph P. McMurray reported to Governor Harriman yesterday that starts on houses throughout the State had declined in March for the 29th consecutive month.

The Commissioner stressed, however, that new State and Federal legislation gave him hope that his next monthly report "may contain better news for a change."

In March, he said, 4,035 privately financed dwelling units were started or authorized. This was a decline of 20 percent from the same month for 1957.

Both the number of new dwelling units started or authorized in March and the numbers started or authorized in the first quarter were lower than in any comparable period since 1950.

On a seasonally adjusted basis, the commissioner reported, the March survey indicated that private and public homebuilding was at a level of about 55,000 for the year, or the lowest rate in 11 years.

The only increase reported by Mr. McMurray was in the value of nonresidential con-

struction started or authorized in the first quarter of this year. That was 16 percent over 1957.

#### HOPES FOR BETTER NEWS

"I am tired of constantly having to report declines and am eager to welcome any indication of an upturn in the bleak record of homebuilding to date," the commissioner said.

"I look forward hopefully to increased construction resulting from new State and Federal legislation designed to stimulate increased private homebuilding."

As examples he mentioned a new amendment to New York banking laws permitting lower downpayments and longer term mortgages, a Federal housing bill making \$1,850,000,000 in new funds available, and steps by the Federal Reserve Board to lower interest rates.

The swing to an easier mortgage market, he said, should bring down the cost of home financing and stimulate the building industry to reduce both costs and prices.

"This," he concluded, "will not only help cut into the housing shortage but will also stimulate urgently needed employment."

An item by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 6, 1958 follows:

#### TIME TO DECIDE

(By Walter Lippmann)

With the recession more than 9 months old, the President is still undecided about taking stronger measures to overcome it. He is impressed with a few signs that the decline has begun to slow down, and he is hoping that after a while a recovery is somehow destined to take place. That is what seemed to happen in 1954, and if it happened then, why not now?

There is no proving that the President may not be right in his hopes. But it is quite possible that he may be wrong. For this recession is certainly more severe than the recession of 1953-54. And moreover, the measures have not been taken, namely a big tax cut, which preceded the recovery of 1954. Nor are there many convincing signs that there exists the kind of consumer demand for automobiles, houses and other durable goods which promoted the boom after 1954.

If the President is wrong in counting upon a recovery beginning this summer, he is taking a very great risk in not setting up stronger measures before the present session of Congress adjourns. It will be a long time from the mid-summer of 1958 to the mid-winter of 1959. Even supposing that the decline is arrested this summer, if unemployment continues at or near the present level, it may well be profoundly depressing to public confidence if strong measures—that is say a tax cut and the formation of a long-range spending program—have not been taken.

The situation is one where it is wiser to overinsure, rather than to underinsure, the economy against what may be at best, as Business Week puts it, "a sluggish unenthusiastic recovery."

The President might well compare what he is doing today with what was done in the recession of 1953-54. The contrast is striking. For while the earlier recession was much milder than is the present one, the remedial measures taken were much stronger.

It is enlightening at this point to read a chapter, entitled "No More 1929's" in Mr. Robert Donovan's authorized book "Eisenhower: The Inside Story." We find there that in the preceding recession, as in this second one, the signs of a decline were clearly evident at the end of the summer. By

September 1953, the Cabinet had been warned by the administration's economic advisors that a recession had begun. On September 22, Secretary Humphrey announced in a speech to the American Bankers Association that the administration would make no effort to prevent the tax reductions which, under the Korean war tax legislation, were scheduled to take effect 3 months later, on December 31, 1953. On that date the excess-profits tax was to expire; so too was the 10-percent emergency increase in personal taxes, and there were to be some reductions in excise taxes.

All in all, at the first sign of the recession, the taxpayers were assured of a large relief to begin within a few months. The tax reduction was in the order of \$7½ billion a year.

There are reasons for thinking that Secretary Humphrey's speech in September was not primarily meant to announce a policy to combat the recession. Then as now, he was a firm believer in balancing the budget at a lower rate of taxation and of expenditure. Without relation to the recession he may have been for the tax reduction of 1954, knowing that in the coming Eisenhower budget there would be a continuing cut in expenditures.

But the fact remains that President Eisenhower and Secretary Humphrey did in 1953 what a growing body of expert opinion today would have the administration do now. When the recession of 1953 was detected, a big tax reduction was announced, and this tax relief took effect in the months before the recession ended in June 1954.

The President might also take a look at what happened in the Truman recession of 1948-49. Then, before the recession got started, there was a tax cut. The President should find it entertaining to recall that this tax cut was enacted by the Republican Congress and that it was passed over the veto of Harry S. Truman. This tax cut, plus, of course, the big public spending which began in 1949 under the Marshall plan, are almost certainly why the Truman recession did not last very long.

Experience indicates, therefore, that in the postwar era the recessions have been short and mild because there has been early tax relief. Since the end of the World War the American economy has faltered three times. In the two earlier recessions, which proved to be mild and short, there were tax cuts before recovery. In the first there was also a big spending program, the Marshall plan.

In the second, there was a great private spending boom, activated by the pent-up demand after the austerity of the Korean war and financed by an enormous extension of consumer credit and a boom in capital investment.

This third postwar recession is plainly worse than its two predecessors. But this time there is no tax reduction. This time there is no public spending program to compensate for the decline in private investment. This time there are no signs, indeed quite the contrary, that there is a large pent-up consumer demand for the durable goods that are now depressed.

Is it, then, wise, is it safe, to ignore our experience and to put off from month to month the decision to take strong measures, hoping that something will happen to make them unnecessary?

This from the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1958, is most enlightening:

#### ECONOMIC WEATHER VANE

Steel: Operations in the steel industry last week were scheduled at 1,481,000 tons or 54.9 percent of capacity. This would be the highest rate since the week of January 20 and compares with the output of 1,412,000 tons or 52.3 percent the preceding week.

Food: Wholesale food prices, as measured by the Dun & Bradstreet index, rose slightly last week and were 9.2 percent above the year earlier price. The index stood at \$6.65 May 20 against \$6.62 a week earlier and \$6.09 a year ago. The index reflects the price per pound of 31 foods in general use. Higher were flour, beef and cocoa. Lower were lard, coffee and potatoes. Unchanged were jellies and butter.

Business activity: The New York Herald Tribune index of general business advanced for the second consecutive week, standing at 160.5 May 17 against 159.1 May 10 and 191.9 May 18, 1957.

Failures: More business firms failed last year than in any previous year since 1939 and the increase in casualties continued in the first 3 months of this year. There were 327 failures in the week of May 15 against 279 in the like 1957 week.

Up she goes: The cost of living climbed to a record high in April with the consumer price index rising two-tenths of 1 percent to 123.5 percent of the 1947-49 average. Prices have risen in eighteen of the last 20 months. The entire increase in April is attributable to rising food prices. Food prices should level off in the next few months, possibly peaking in June or July. About 500,000 workers will get pay increases as a result of the rise in the price index. Meanwhile, steel prices will be raised July 1 by Armco Corp. (seventh largest steel maker) in the wake of wage hikes estimated at 20 cents an hour which go into effect at mid-year under union contracts.

Let all those who will label me a prophet of gloom and doom keep in mind that I wrote none of these newspaper articles, neither those which were part of my comments referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois or in these remarks today.

Nor did I have anything to do with the Wall Street Journal's publication of the following front-page item of May 28, 1958:

Business activity moved lower in April, but the slide-off was less pronounced than in earlier months this year, the Commerce Department reported. In its latest survey, the Department said the business recession continues to be centered in durable goods fields "where little, if any, improvement was evident" last month.

Finally, the following compendium of facts from the Democratic Digest of June 1958 is most significant:

#### FACTS TO FILE—THE RISING COST OF LIVING

The continuing climb in the high cost of living is one of the strange paradoxes of the present recession. Every month the cost of living creeps upward. Every month the weekly paycheck is collapsing from the twin shrinkers—the Eisenhower-Nixon inflation and the Eisenhower-Nixon recession. The grocery dollar buys less groceries. The shorter workweek and the increasing layoffs shrink the pay check.

Unfortunately, too many observers of the 1958 inflation have looked at the rising retail cost of food and then taken broadside swipes at the farmer as a convenient whipping boy on whom to place sizable blame for the high cost of living.

Facts To File, this month, tries to put into perspective some of the facts concerning the whys of the housewife paying more while the farmer is actually getting less.

#### WHAT THE EISENHOWER-NIXON INFLATION TAKES OUT OF THE HOUSEWIFE'S GROCERY CART

For the family that spends \$25 a week on groceries, the GOP inflation has lifted from



the weekly family shopping basket food equivalent to \$2.25 every week.

Here's what is taken from Mrs. Average American's \$25 grocery bill every week by the GOP runaway inflation:

TABLE I

1 loaf bread, pound.....	\$0.19
1 can evaporated milk.....	.15
1 pound apples.....	.14
1 pound onions.....	.09
2 grapefruits at 0.117.....	.23
1 pound fresh carrots.....	.16
1 can cream style corn.....	.18
1 No. 303 can tomatoes.....	.16
2 11-ounce cans tomato soup.....	.25
2 cans baby food.....	.20
1 pound hamburger.....	.50
Total.....	2.25

Chart

(1952=0)

	1955	1958
Industrial prices.....	Up 3½	Up 10.
Cost of living.....	Up 1.	Up 7.
Retail cost of market basket.....	Down 2.	Up 2.
Farmers' share of market basket.....	do.	Down 2.
Farm value of market basket.....	Down 18.	Down 8.

## WHAT THE CHART SHOWS

From the beginning of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration in 1953 the amounts paid to the farmer for the food products bought by the American housewife have dropped sharply.

At the same time, while the retail price of food the housewife bought in the supermarkets and grocery stores showed some decline, it did not drop nearly as much as the prices being paid to the farmer.

The middlemen, the retailers, processors, packers, and the food companies, kept retail food prices high while helping to make the Eisenhower-Nixon farm policies which sharply reduced the prices farmers were receiving. As a result, the farm-retail price spread increased to its greatest point in 18 years. (During this period, many of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's closest agriculture and farm advisers were executives from food processing and retailing companies.)

The results of this policy were evident in tremendously increased profits for the middlemen, the processors, and the retail food chains. (See table V.)

During this same period, there was a general rise in the cost of living and in industrial prices, at the same time the prices being paid to farmers were forced down.

Following 1955, the cost of living, including the retail cost of food, began to rise sharply. But the middlemen, the retailers, and the packers were not willing to let the farm-price spread situation return to the 1952 ratio. The middlemen were determined to keep their disproportionate share of the so-called farm dollar.

While there has been some increase in the prices received by farmers for food produced since 1955, the middlemen have been unwilling to absorb any of the increase out of their profits, and have insisted on maintaining the wide spread between the retail cost of food and the price paid to the farmer that they achieved in 1955 under the planned farm depression of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson team.

## HOW TO READ THE CHART

## Industrial prices

These are the wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm commodities. Between 1952 and 1955 these prices rose 3 percent. Between 1955 and 1958 they rose 7 percent.

## Cost of living

This is determined by the prices consumers are paying for clothes, food, transportation, housing, medical and personal care, etc.

Retail cost of the market basket<sup>1</sup>

This represents the average retail price of food in cities bought by a city family over a period of a year. The price of the retail food market basket dropped 6 percent between 1952 and 1955, but has risen 8.7 percent between 1955 and first quarter 1958. (See table III.)

## Farm value of the market basket

This represents the amount of money the farmer receives for the food products that go into the market basket—it is the price the farmer gets for the tomatoes in catsup and the wheat in a loaf of bread. Between 1952 and 1955 there was a drastic drop of 18 percent. Between 1955 and first quarter 1958 the farm value rose 10 percent. (See table III.)

## Farmer's share of the market basket

In 1952, from every dollar spent on food in the market basket by the city housewife, the farmer received 47 cents. In 1955, the farmer's share had dropped to 41 cents and, despite a rise in almost all other costs, prices, and profits, the farmer's share of the food dollar in first quarter 1958 remained at 41 cents.

## THE GEOGRAPHY OF INFLATION

City after city across the Nation reports rising food costs. Consumers and farmers in every section of the country are suffering because of the excessive profits being taken by processors, packers, and retailers.

TABLE II

City	Percent rise in retail food cost, March 1955-March 1958	Dollars taken from \$25 weekly family grocery basket by GOP inflation
United States average.....	9.0	2.25
Atlanta.....	10.0	2.50
Baltimore.....	7.7	1.93
Boston.....	10.0	2.50
Chicago.....	8.7	2.18
Cincinnati.....	9.0	2.25
Cleveland.....	8.0	2.00
Detroit.....	8.0	2.00
Houston.....	5.0	1.25
Kansas City.....	8.9	2.23
Los Angeles.....	8.9	2.23
Minneapolis.....	6.9	1.73
New York.....	9.5	2.38
Philadelphia.....	8.0	2.00
Pittsburgh.....	10.5	2.63
Portland, Oreg.....	8.0	2.00
St. Louis.....	8.5	2.13
San Francisco.....	8.0	2.00
Scranton.....	9.8	2.45
Seattle.....	7.0	1.75
Washington, D. C.....	11.0	2.75

Source: Consumer Price Index for March 1955 and March 1958.

TABLE V.—The food industries and the big retail chain food stores have profited handsomely under the Eisenhower-Benson farm policies

	1955 over 1952	1957 over 1955
Grocery chains' profits:		
Safeway Stores.....	Up 85.8 percent.....	Up 126.9 percent.
Super Valu Stores, Inc.....	Up 49.4 percent.....	Up 26.2 percent.
Food Fair Stores, Inc.....	Up 89.7 percent.....	Up 11.2 percent (estimated).
Food packers' and processors' profits:		
Borden Co.....	Up 22.6 percent.....	Up 10.8 percent.
National Dairy Products Corp.....	Up 45.1 percent.....	Up 9.2 percent.
Beatrice Foods Co.....	Up 60.0 percent.....	(Not available).
Quaker Oats Co.....	Up 41.3 percent.....	Up 60.6 percent (estimated).
National Starch Products.....	Up 151.8 percent.....	Up 24.9 percent.
General Mills, Inc.....	Up 29.7 percent.....	Up 4.5 percent (estimated).
Fairmont Foods Co.....	Up 147.8 percent.....	Up 32.6 percent (estimated).

During the 1956 campaign, the President was asked at a news conference if he felt inflation had been stopped. The reply: "It's

<sup>1</sup> The market basket is a concept developed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture to represent what the average urban family spends on food in 1 year. For exam-

## FARM-RETAIL PRICE SPREAD

By March 1958 the farmer's share of the market basket remained substantially at the depressed 1955 level. The family market basket was costing the housewife more, the farmer was getting less and the middlemen and processors were taking a larger and larger share of the family food dollar. The farmer was squeezed as he received less of every dollar the housewife spent on the family's food. The housewife was being squeezed as her food dollar was buying less and less food:

TABLE III

Year	Farmer's share of food-dollar in percent	Annual retail cost paid by average urban family in dollars	Amount farmer received for his products in dollars	Amount to processor and retailer in dollars
1947.....	51	911	467	444
1951.....	49	1,024	497	527
1952.....	47	1,034	482	552
1953.....	44	1,003	445	558
1954.....	43	986	421	565
1955.....	41	909	395	574
1956.....	40	972	390	582
1957.....	41	1,007	400	607
1st quarter 1958.....	41	1,054	436	618

## WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO FARM INCOME?

Not only did the planned squeeze on farm income reduce the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar, it also has depressed overall net farm income. The effect has been evident in the seriousness which the resultant loss of purchasing power by farmers has had on the deepening recession. High farm income means purchasing power for industrial and consumer goods. Without sufficient purchasing power in the hands of American farm families, adverse effects are felt throughout the entire economy.

TABLE IV.—Net farm income drops steadily reducing farm's buying power

Year:	Farm income (billions)
1952.....	\$14.3
1953.....	13.9
1954.....	12.2
1955.....	11.6
1956.....	12.1
1957.....	11.5
1958 (1st quarter).....	13.0

## "DON'T WORRY" STATEMENTS FROM THE SUMMIT

"Inflation has been halted. The savings, the insurance policies, the pension rights of our people are no longer being washed away by diluting dollars. The dollar you saved in 1953 is still worth as much as it was then."—(Benson, April 10, 1956, Los Angeles, Calif.)

something, I must tell you, that is never really answered" (October 11, 1956).

ple, in 1958 it is estimated that the average urban family will spend \$1,049. This market basket does not include such nonfarm items as fish, or imported foods such as bananas, etc.

A few days later, the President did have an answer:

"In this last 3½ years we haven't been able to stop it (inflation), but we made it—the rise—so slow that it really becomes a—we can call it—a stable area." (President Eisenhower, (October 25, 1956).)

"Furthermore, we are not using rubber dollars as our measuring rods. \* \* \* This means that wages go up, the profits increase, there is a real gain, not merely money rise that is cancelled out by higher prices" (Nixon before Brand Names Day Dinner, New York City, April 18, 1956.)

"But what is more important to those who live on fixed incomes is that today they have real security rather than cut-rate security because we have a government which insists on a balanced budget and thereby ensures a sound dollar." (Nixon, Colorado Springs, September 23, 1956.)

#### FOOD COMPANY PROFITS STILL RISE IN MIDST OF RECESSION

As the recession took hold and reports on corporation profits for the first quarter of 1958 began to appear, the Wall Street Journal reported on May 5, 1958, that in the first quarter of 1958 profits for 20 major food product companies were up 2.6 percent over the first quarter of 1957. This rise came in spite of the fact that, in averaging out the profit picture for 552 companies in the first quarter of 1958, the Journal found an overall drop in profits of 35 percent over the first quarter of 1957.

The accompanying chart (table III) on the built-in processor-retailer spread in the Eisenhower-Benson food dollar indicates why food processors, packers, and retailers are still making profits at the expense of Mrs. Average Housewife and the American farmer.

NOTE.—All figures are United States Department of Agriculture, or from other official Government sources.

Further information on the rising cost of living and inflation can be obtained by writing the Research Division, Democratic National Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

#### THE LATE HENRY PARKMAN, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I read of the passing of my close and valued friend, Henry Parkman, Jr., of Boston. Henry Parkman was one of our great Americans of this trying period of the world's history. He was a dedicated man in the public service of the city of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of the United States of America. He served as a member of the Massachusetts State senate and of the city council of the city of Boston, and rendered outstanding service on the Federal level as former Assistant United States High Commissioner for Germany. During the administration of the late Maurice J. Tobin, when former Secretary of Labor Tobin was mayor of Boston, Mr. Parkman served as corporation counsel. He also served as the director of the office of price administration for Massachusetts. From 1943 to 1945 he served in World War II and saw service at the allied headquarters in Algiers. He was

chief civil affairs officer for the Seventh Army in the invasion of southern France, and was assistant chief of staff in charge of military government in areas of Germany occupied by the Seventh Army and the First French Army.

After terminating his military service with the rank of brigadier general in January of 1946, Mr. Parkman returned to Germany later that year as Director of the Civil Administration Division of the Office of Military Government.

In March and April of 1947 Mr. Parkman was a member of the State Department delegation at conferences in Moscow. He served later that year as governmental affairs adviser to Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commander of the United States forces in Germany. In 1954 he became assistant to Dr. James B. Conant, High Commissioner for Germany.

Among his many other public services, Mr. Parkman was a member of the President's Loyalty Review Board from 1947 to 1949; United States representative to the International Ruhr Authority from 1949 to 1950; chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration to France in 1950 and 1951, and Assistant Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization in 1953.

At the time of his death, Mr. Parkman was serving as deputy commissioner of savings bank life insurance in Massachusetts.

Many honors for outstanding and meritorious service during his lifetime were conferred upon Mr. Parkman, among which was the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and commander in the French Legion of Honor.

Possessed of a mind of nobility of character and an understanding mind, Henry Parkman commanded the respect and friendship of countless of thousands of persons. His whole life was dedicated to the public service of city, State, and Nation. He was always a leader in all good causes of a civil and charitable nature. We need men like Henry Parkman in the world of today.

While he has passed on, those fine qualities of life that he symbolized will live on forever. Mrs. McCormack joins with me in extending to Mrs. Parkman and her son and daughters our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is with profound sorrow that I learned of the passing of Henry Parkman. I am particularly shocked, as on Patriots' Day at the Watertown Arsenal, Colonel Hunt, the head of the arsenal, and I had a conference with him, Secretary Brucker, and various officers and workers in the arsenal in connection with national defense. Mr. Parkman and Secretary Brucker were making a tour of the installations with a view of improving our national defense.

Henry Parkman was great of physical stature and great of mind, and character. He was a great soldier. We need men like him desperately today. He had a remarkable career. He held many high offices both in this country and

abroad. He was constantly asked to fill positions of high quality and great importance. He started his career as a longshoreman, an unusual career, perhaps, for a man who intended to follow a studious career.

I cannot realize that he is gone, and that his illustrious career is ended. What he did will live on always. There was a great deal of Henry Parkman that never died. My deepest sympathy goes to his lovely widow and children and relatives. I mourn his passing with the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation and the world because he held many posts of international value.

[From the New York Times of May 28, 1958]

HENRY PARKMAN, JR., DEAD AT 64; FORMER UNITED STATES OFFICIAL IN GERMANY—ASSISTANT HIGH COMMISSIONER IN 1954—55 WAS EX-GENERAL—HELD FOREIGN-AID POST

BOSTON, May 27—Henry Parkman, Jr., former Assistant United States High Commissioner for Germany, died today in Massachusetts General Hospital. He suffered a heart attack last Tuesday at his home. His age was 64.

Mr. Parkman was a member of a noted Massachusetts family. He was related to Francis Parkman, the historian. His father was a Massachusetts State legislator and a Boston city councilman.

The son's career was noteworthy in public service. He graduated in 1915 from Harvard College, where he was a Phi Beta Kappa scholar and a roommate of Under Secretary of State Christian A. Herter. In 1916 he received a master of arts degree. After 2 years at Harvard Law School, Mr. Parkman entered the Army.

After returning as a captain, he finished his law studies at Northeastern University in 1924. Unlike many of his social contemporaries, he began his working career as a longshoreman on the docks in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Parkman, a Republican, was elected to the Boston city council in 1926. Later he served four terms in the Massachusetts State Senate. During the administration of Maurice J. Tobin as mayor of Boston, Mr. Parkman served as corporation counsel for the city. In 1940 he was his party's unsuccessful nominee for the United States Senate.

In 1942, Mr. Parkman was named Director of the Office of Price Administration for Massachusetts. He resigned the following year to become a lieutenant colonel in the office of the Under Secretary of War.

From 1943 to 1945 he saw service at allied headquarters in Algiers, was chief civil affairs officer for the Seventh Army in the invasion of southern France, and was assistant chief of staff in charge of military government in areas of Germany occupied by the Seventh Army and the First French Army.

After terminating his military service with the rank of brigadier general in January 1946, Mr. Parkman returned to Germany later that year as Director of the Civil Administration Division of the Office of Military Government.

In March and April 1947, Mr. Parkman was a member of the State Department delegation at conferences in Moscow. Later that year he served as governmental affairs adviser to Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commander of the United States forces in Germany. Mr. Parkman became assistant to James B. Conant, High Commissioner for Germany, in 1954. He headed the United States mission in Berlin.

He returned to this country in 1955.

Among his other services, Mr. Parkman was a member of the President's Loyalty Review Board from 1947 to 1949; United States representative to the International



Ruhr Authority from 1949 to 1950; chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration to France in 1950 and 1951 and assistant director of the Office of Defense Mobilization in 1953.

At his death, he was serving as deputy commissioner of savings bank life insurance in Massachusetts. He held such honors as Commander in the French Legion of Honor, the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Doris Montague Parkman, a son, James M., and three daughters, Mrs. Kenneth Hanlon and the Misses Penelope and Deborah Parkman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for Monday, June 2, 1958, 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. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, on Monday next and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN, to vacate the special order for 1 hour granted him for May 29.

Mr. MULTER, for 20 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PORTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Misosuri.

Mr. BARTLETT, his remarks during debate on H. R. 7999 and to include two telegrams.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

#### BILLS 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 of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7870. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1955, to authorize an additional \$10 million for the completion of the Inter-American Highway;

H. R. 10746. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12356. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954; and

H. R. 12377. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 29, 1958, 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:

1966. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1959 involving an increase in the amount of \$334 million for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 388); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1967. A letter from the Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1968. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1105 (b) of title XI (Federal ship mortgage insurance) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to implement the pledge-of-faith clause"; 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. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fourth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to the Morningside Hospital. (Rept. No. 1820.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fifth report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to the Alaska native loan program. (Rept. No. 1821.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 977. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1822). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 565. Reso-

lution providing for the employment of two additional assistants in the document room, Office of the Doorkeeper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 571. Resolution adjusting the titles and salaries of certain positions in the Office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1824). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 12521. A bill to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to withhold certain amounts due employees of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1825). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11861. A bill authorizing the city of Chester, Ill., to construct new approaches to and to reconstruct, repair, or improve the existing approaches to a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1826). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11936. A bill to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Brownville, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1827). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 582. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11102, a bill amending the jurisdiction of district courts in civil actions with regard to the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship; without amendment (Rept. No. 1828). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 583. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 614, joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1829). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 12738. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 803. An act for the relief of Claudio Guillen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 12716. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 12717. A bill to amend title 42 of the United States Code relating to disposal of war and veterans' housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 12718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief

for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 12719. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1956 to extend by 2 years the period during which military personnel will be given preference in the occupancy of the Passyunk housing projects in Philadelphia, and to waive all income requirements with respect to such projects during that period; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 12720. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), as amended, providing for the establishment of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 12721. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 12722. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 12723. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to provide that the Civil Rights Commission shall have until June 1, 1960, to submit its report, findings, and recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 12724. A bill to equalize postal rate increases with respect to the advertising and nonadvertising portions of certain second-class mail publications; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 12725. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 12726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that no documentary stamp tax shall be imposed with respect to conveyances to which a State or political subdivision is a party; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 12727. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 12728. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 12738. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. J. Res. 616. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of September 8 to 14 of each year as American Farmer Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 581. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on astronautics and space exploration; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 12729. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. De Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 12730. A bill for the relief of Hsing Fah Chow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 12731. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adoracion A. Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 12732. A bill for the relief of Mary V. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 12733. A bill for the relief of Luigi Addari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 12734. A bill for the relief of Yung Shang Joo (also known as Sing Yung Shang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12735. A bill for the relief of Ng Ruy Keen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12736. A bill for the relief of Anthony Menezes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 12737. A bill for the relief of Olivia Mary Galante; 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:

643. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 86 residents of Brazil, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

644. Also, petition of 78 residents of Princeton, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

645. Also, petition of 148 residents of Clay County, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

646. Also, petition of 29 residents of Brazil, Ind., in support of legislation to pro-

hibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

647. Also, petition of 249 residents of Gibson County, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

648. Also, petition of 11 residents of Pataka, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

649. Also, petition of 43 residents of Owensville, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

650. Also, petition of 129 members of the Bee Ridge Congregational Christian Church, Brazil, Ind., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

651. By Mr. BROWNSON: Petition of Albert Reeves, secretary, and 41 others of the Indianapolis Deaf Club, Indianapolis, Ind., requesting passage of S. 1889, relating to creation of a captioned film loan service for the deaf; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

652. By Mr. CARNAHAN: Resolution adopted by the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, U. S. A. Inc., at its State convention May 17-18, 1958, held in West Plains, Mo., that all national officers of the Veterans of World War I, U. S. A. Inc., are hereby urgently requested to promptly contact the leadership of other veterans' organizations, and ask that all attend a meeting to be promptly held in Washington, D. C., for the purpose of demanding that the Veterans' Affairs Committee pass bills to implement the mandates of the various veterans' organizations, at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

653. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, governors' conference, Chicago, Ill., transmitting a copy of a resolution pertaining to the preservation of the strength of the National Guard adopted Wednesday, May 21, 1958, by the governors' conference at its 50th annual meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

654. Also, petition of the secretary, governors' conference, Chicago, Ill., transmitting a copy of a resolution pertaining to the National Guard Bureau adopted Wednesday, May 21, 1958, by the governors' conference at its 50th annual meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

655. Also, petition of the governor, Ninth Annual Hi-Y Model Legislature, Territory of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., relative to requesting aid in granting the Territory of Hawaii immediate statehood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

656. Also, petition of the president, Guam Chamber of Commerce, Agana, Guam, relative to the local imposition of income taxes in the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Armenian Independence Day

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the results of the catastrophe of World

War I was the liberation of numerous suppressed nationalities from the oppressive alien yokes, and the rebirth of new states in Europe and Asia. The statesmanlike and democratic utterances of the late President Wilson, as enunciated his famous 14 points encouraged these suppressed peoples. Many of these national groups looked upon President Wilson as a great prophet of liberty. His principle of national self-determination was especially welcome. For that rea-

son the peoples of these new-born states were immeasurably grateful to him. This was particularly true of the Armenian people.

The Armenians are one of the few peoples whose early history is buried in the dim and distant past, and who, throughout their long and turbulent existence, have maintained their distinct national traits. Their country has been for ages the arena for contending and conquering forces. Centuries before Columbus