SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

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

Almighty and everlasting God, new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove. As we bow in contrition and reverence at the beginning of another week whose tasks and problems await, we would bring our perplexities to the light of Thy wisdom. Thou knowest the temptations which lie in wait as we walk our pilgrim way, with its unknown, distant scenes. Always we feel the pull of selfish and unclean motives and enticements which endeavor to sully the record for which some day we must give an account. Shine Thou into our souls with the white light of Thy splendor, before which every vileness must shrink away.

This day, as we act and speak for the Nation, may the thoughts of our hearts and the words of our lips and the decisions of our minds be acceptable in Thy sight, O God of our salvation. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 26, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and announced that on February 27, 1954, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evodoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] be excused from attending sessions of the Senate beginning today and for the next 2 weeks, for the purpose of attending the 10th Inter-American Conference, which convened today at Caracas, Venezuela. The Senator from Rhode Island was designated by the Secretary of State as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation to the Conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the morning hour there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, from the point reached at the last call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. After the call of the roll, it is my intention, if agreeable to the Senate, to take up the Executive Calendar, following which the Senate will proceed to consider the Legislative Calendar, as just agreed to.

Also for consideration today is the supplemental appropriation bill, which is on the calendar, but which obviously would not and should not be passed during the call of the calendar.

It is also desired to consider by unanimous consent the matter which I mentioned to the minority leader last week, the bill providing an extension of 1 year, the time when the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations must make its report. Action was held over from last week, and the bill should be considered today, because today is the last date, under the law on which the commission can make its report.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bush	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Duff	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate attending the sessions of the 10th Inter-American Conference at Caracas, Venezuela, as a congressional adviser on the United States delegation.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent on official business of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Cabot to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry F. Holland to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roswell Burchard Perkins to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Morton P. Fisher to be a judge on the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—ROUTINE PROMOTIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for routine promotions in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service of a routine nature be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the nominations of collectors of customs be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Kalteux to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the nominee has indicated that he will not be able to serve. At the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask that the nomination be passed over temporarily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding the Chief Justice of the United States.

Earl Warren was born in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 19, 1891, the son of Methias H. and Chrystal (Hernlund) Warren. He received his bachelor of laws degree at the University of California in 1912, and the degree of doctor of jurisprudence at the University of California, in 1914.

He holds the degree of honorary doctor of laws from the University of Redlands, College of the Pacific, University of Southern California, Santa Clara, Mills College, Cornell (Iowa) College, Occidental, Jewish Theological Seminary, Union (New York) College, and the University of Alaska.

He married Nina P. Meyers on October 14, 1925. His children are James C., Virginia, Earl, Dorothy, Nina Elizabeth, and Robert.

He was admitted to the California bar in 1914. He practiced in San Francisco and Oakland from 1914 to 1917; he served on the California Assembly Judiciary Committee of the California Legislature in 1919. He was deputy city attorney of the city of Oakland from 1919 to 1920; deputy district attorney of Alameda County from 1920 to 1923; chief deputy district attorney from 1923 to 1925; district attorney from 1925 to 1939; attorney general of California from 1939 to 1943; and Governor of California from 1943 through 1953, until his appointment as Chief Justice of the United States.

I have known the Chief Justice for almost 30 years. I know him as an outstanding American and a person of unimpeachable integrity. He possesses great ability, and I think he is an outstanding choice to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of California regard Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, with great pride. Shortly the United States Senate will overwhelmingly confirm the nomination of a distinguished native son of the State which I have in part the honor to represent, to be the 14th Chief Justice of our country.

Chief Justice Warren has devoted almost an entire lifetime to the service of his native commonwealth. Recognized as a distinguished lawyer, he enjoys an unsullied and high reputation as an able public administrator, not only within the legal profession but also beyond that realm, in the entire broad field of governmental and public administration.

Some time ago the New York Times published an illuminating article entitled "'Unpartisan' Chief Justice of the United States." I ask unanimous consent that several pertinent paragraphs of the article be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

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

UNPARTISAN CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

(By James Bassett)

LOS ANGELES.—Earl Warren, of California, called to his country's most honored judicial post in his 62d year, combines in a curious way some of the attributes of Abraham Lincoln, Hiram Johnson, and the average man.

If you ask him what sort of politician he is, Mr. Warren is likely to recall Lincoln's self-appraisal: "I'm a slow walker, but I never walk backward." And like the late Senator Johnson, of California, he has made a name for himself as a ruthless prosecutor of dishonest public officials, then as a highly individualistic governor.

But perhaps Mr. Warren can best be characterized as a spectacularly average man, self-made in a self-made State. His parents, he likes to say, could not even "afford the luxury of a middle name" for young Earl. And all his life he has worked, beginning with his grammar-school years when he peddled ice for 25 cents a day, until, today, he occupies the No. 1 seat on the Supreme Court. * * *

As the former Governor's friends and followers put it, Warren has been preparing himself for just such a responsibility throughout his 34 years in public life. His whole makeup is judicial, deliberative, and rational. His record indicates a keen sense of the legal nature of things. They point out further that some of California's, as well as the Nation's, best jurists have been men who approached the bench "cold," whereas some of the worst have been legal experts steeped in over-warm regard for cold textbook law.

In his unprecedented three terms as Governor of America's third largest State, Warren signed some 10,000 bills. None were overthrown by judicial review; and exceedingly few of his careful vetoes of other legislation were overridden by the legislature.

Beyond the question of Earl Warren's lack of formal judiciary experience is the more fundamental issue of his political, economic, and philosophical beliefs. A guide to these beliefs is provided by his writings, speeches, and actions as Governor.

* * * * *

"The radical," Warren says, "will be satisfied with nothing short of revolutionary change. The reactionary will be satisfied with nothing short of retrogression."

Neither extremist view, he thinks, commands more than a small minority of the total populace. Therefore, he says, the "70 or more percent in between * * * make the decision for the Nation. * * * These people represent the backbone of our citizenry. They are the vast majority of the working people of our country as well as most of the people in our businesses and professions."

In California he applied his philosophy to a peculiar brand of unpartisan, personalized politics—something his friends, and foes, termed Warrenism. Warrenism worked. In a State where Democrats outnumber Republicans 3 to 2, he managed to swing huge majorities in his favor, simply by presenting his own case—or brand of government—to the people.

Back in 1930, when as district attorney he was cleaning up an Augean stable of corruption in Alameda County, Warren remarked: "The public never turned me down. I took my story right to them, told them the facts bluntly, and when we get into a pinch they stayed with us."

So successful has this practice been that, in 1946, he swept into his second gubernatorial term by leading both party tickets in the primary.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the pride of the people of my State of California, I sincerely feel, is in no lesser measure likewise the pride of the people of the United States. An outstanding professional lawyer and, indeed, an outstanding American, is about to be confirmed for the highest judicial post in the Nation.

It is fitting at this moment to refer to the canons of professional and judicial ethics of the American Bar Association. The preamble of the canons con-

tains a statement which should appeal to the Members of the Senate, and to the citizens of the Nation generally, upon an occasion such as this:

In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of Government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system for establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration. The future of the Republic, to a great extent, depends upon our maintenance of justice pure and unsullied. It cannot be so maintained unless the conduct and the motives of the members of our profession are such as to merit the approval of all just men.

Aside from all the professional qualifications which the Members of the Senate and the people of our country know are possessed by the 14th Chief Justice of our highest court, they underscore the President's appointee as one whose integrity is well known and of which, win or lose, litigants before the highest court of our land in the future can be well assured. In Earl Warren's decisions integrity and Americanism will prevail.

Mr. President, during his long years of public service, Chief Justice Warren has been motivated by one simple goal for his country: clean, strong, honest American Government, in the executive branch, the legislative branch, and in the judicial branch. Now the head of the Nation's judiciary, that goal will continue to be his.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Earl Warren, to be Chief Justice of the United States?

The nomination was unanimously confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter H. Hodge to be a United States district judge for division 2, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of United States attorneys are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of United States marshals are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein to be Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air National Guard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Air National Guard are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the information of the Senate, particularly for the information of Senators who were not in the Chamber earlier today, following the regular morning hour I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills and other measures on the Legislative Calendar to which there is no objection, starting at the point where the Senate ended its consideration of measures on the last call of the calendar, with the exception that Calendar No. 373, S. 1691, to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue, NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, which has been added to the list of measures on the calendar to be considered today.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 338)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1953, to September 30, 1953, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1954.*

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Kings County Council Ladies' Auxiliary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the extension of veterans' benefits to members of the Armed Forces who served in Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSMIT PETITION TO NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to transmit to the National Archives the signed petition which was laid before the Senate on Friday last relative to statehood for Hawaii. It is a very large petition and it takes up a substantial amount of space. I think it contains 165,000 signatures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lawrence, Mass., with reference to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations. The purpose of the resolution is to oppose such admission, and with that I am in full accord.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution of City of Lawrence, Mass.

Whereas the admission of Communist China to the United Nations would destroy the purpose, betray the letter and violate the charter of that organization; and

Whereas the Red Chinese have disregarded every rule of civilized human behavior in imposing slavery upon the people of China and in murdering and torturing innocent civilians and prisoners of war, among which were some of our own young men; and

Whereas such admission to the United Nations of the international gangsters who control the mainland of China would destroy the prestige of our own Government and of the United Nations.

We hereby urge every citizen of Lawrence, Mass., to voice his opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations by affixing his signature to a petition which is now being circulated throughout the country by the Committee for One Million. Through such action, we will help strengthen the hands of our own Government and let our friends in Asia know just where we stand on this issue.

JOHN J. BUCKLEY,
Mayor.
JOSEPH E. CARNEY,
JOSEPH R. SUMIC,
LOUIS J. SCANLON,
JOHN W. FALLON,
Aldermen.

RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Wisconsin Federation of Music Clubs, signed by Mrs. A. A. Ladwig, secretary, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1106, relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines. I present the letter for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with all the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with all the signatures attached, as follows:

THE WISCONSIN FEDERATION
OF MUSIC CLUBS,
February 25, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman of Subcommittee,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The State Board of the Wisconsin Federation of Music Clubs passed a resolution requesting your personal attention to the favorable passing of legislation relative to the juke box bill—Senate bill 1106.

Motion was passed to have the secretary send this mesage with the names of all members who were present.

Yours truly,

Elvira G. Ladwig (Mrs. A. A. Ladwig), Secretary; Mrs. W. Paul Benzinger, Oconomowoc; Mrs. Marjorie Kaye, Oshkosh; Mrs. Ragnhild H. Congdon, Kenosha; Minnie M. Larsen, Kenosha; Mrs. R. A. Dougan, Beloit; Alice Walter, Burlington; Mrs. Ben Roderick, Brodhead; Mrs. A. A. Mellentine, Stevens Point; Mrs. O. T. Slagsval, Eau Claire; Mrs. E. A. Sletteland, Pigeon Falls; Mrs. D. S. MacKinnon, Milwaukee; Mrs. E. Woody Kuhlman, Milwaukee; Mrs. Morton Hull Starr, Whitewater; Verna Zeidler, Milwaukee; Mrs. Lillian Schuler, Milwaukee; Elfrieda H. Roth, Sheboygan; Mrs. Henry Koehnlein, Waukesha; Mrs. W. A. Freehoff, Waukesha; Mrs. L. A. Salisbury, Fond du Lac; Mrs. Lyle Brown, Waupun; Mrs. C. E. White, Madison; Mrs. A. A. Ladwig, West Allis.

APPROPRIATION FOR FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Nonpartisan League, whose chairman is Mr. Joe Wicks, of Cannon Ball, N. Dak., relating to appropriations for the Farmers' Home Administration in North Dakota.

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

Whereas it is reported that the Farmers' Home Administration has exhausted its appropriation within the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas there is a great demand for further loans from the Farmers' Home Administration as a result of poor crops, drought, and increased contaminations of the crop by rust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the county chairman of the Non-Partisan League in session at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 30th day of January 1954, That additional appropriations be made to the Farmers' Home Administration in North Dakota for further loans within the State and that the President of the United States be asked to declare North Dakota a disaster area; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the entire membership of the House and Senate from North Dakota.

JOE WICKS,
Chairman, Cannon Ball, N. Dak.,
Nonpartisan League.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at various meetings of the American Legion in the State of North Dakota which were sent to me by Bette Sherman, deputy to Mr. Erwin R. Kruger, county service officer.

All these resolutions are alike with the exception of the names of the people at the bottom of them. I ask unanimous consent that although only one resolution be printed, the names of those sponsoring the remaining resolutions appear at the end of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and names referred to were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas when our country is in peril and the sons of Americans must go to war to protect all that is dear to us, nearly everyone waves flags and is ready to back up the man in uniform; nothing is too good for him, so they then say; and

Whereas as soon as the war is won, the shooting and fighting stops, and the doughboy or GI Joe returns to his home (if he is fortunate enough to return), he soon discovers that a number of the very people for whom he offered to sacrifice his very life, have grown cool toward him and that even downright resentment exists in some quarters (since he has become an ex-serviceman); and

Whereas instead of remembering that GI Joe may have spent months in a living hell, and, as often happens, lay in military hospitals for weeks and months on end (and even now, as a civilian, he may have to return periodically to a veterans' hospital for further treatment), some of his voluble countrymen, who were willing to verbally back him up with a lot of promises when they needed him (and, incidentally, reap the immense economic, social, and political benefits directly resulting from the wartime activities of GI Joe), now openly declare he is costing our Government (the greatest the world has ever seen) too much money; that he is not entitled to care in a Government hospital or at Government expense; that our great Nation cannot afford to pay him adequate disability pensions, compensation, etc.; and

Whereas statistics from the United States Department of Commerce and the Veterans' Administration show that in the year 1890, when national income was $10,701 million, our Nation spent $106 million, or a little more than ninety-nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of that total income for the welfare of our ex-servicemen and their dependents; and

Whereas the national income for fiscal year 1953 was approximately $306 billion, and only seventy-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of that figure was spent in that fiscal year toward the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas it can clearly be seen that we are now spending a much smaller percentage of our vast national income than our Nation felt our veterans were in need of and entitled to 63 years ago, and that the needs of our veterans in 1953 have certainly not lessened, by any stretch of the imagination; and

Whereas in the light of the foregoing, there is no reasonable need for the Federal Government to make, in the name of economy, any reductions in the expenditures covering actual benefits to, or take care of, the defenders of our great Nation and their dependents, as is now being done; and

Whereas there is every reason why the expenditures for veterans' benefits should be increased, instead, because of the ever-increasing number and needs of our veteran population, due to the wars (and resulting unstable economic conditions), under which those, opposing such expenditures, are ever increasing, for the most part, their own private economic, social, and political standing, at the very evident expense and sacrifices of their fellow men, women, and children directly participating in, and/or affected by, such conflicts and aftermaths: Now be it hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to carry in all appropriation laws affecting the Veterans' Administration and all veterans' affairs, provisions explicitly denying the arbitrarily assumed right of any Government official or group to, in any way whatsoever, impound, withdraw, or otherwise reduce such appropriations, or any portions of them, since such actions are now having a detrimental and demoralizing effect upon the lives of many deserving and legally and morally eligible veterans and their dependents; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be strongly urged and encouraged to increase such appropriations as the need for such increase is shown by the ever-increasing numbers of our veterans and their dependents, always remembering to include the safeguards above mentioned, thus protecting the veteran and his dependent against being deprived of the benefits otherwise provided for; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted for proper and effective disposition to

the North Dakota department headquarters of the American Legion.

JOHN RIPSDORF UNIT NO. 91, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, NEW SALEM, N. DAK.
HENRY BIFFERT UNIT NO. 100, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY, HEBRON, N. DAK.
ALMONT POST NO. 261, AMERICAN LEGION, ALMONT, N. DAK.
SCHAFER-BOYE-LANGE POST NO. 69, AMERICAN LEGION, FLASHER, N. DAK.

POWER POLICY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram sent to me from Casper, Wyo., and signed by Carl Bechtold, international representative, Eighth District, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., relating to the REA.

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

CASPER, WYO., *December 15, 1953.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator from North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., has members employed by the REA cooperatives, private power companies, and Federal public power enterprises. The success and survival of the REA cooperatives is of vital concern to us, to the Government as mortgagee, and to the public as consumers being serviced by REA's. The power policy being proposed by the Department of the Interior means almost certain destruction and bankruptcy to REA cooperatives who are conscientiously trying to make their organizations pay in order to repay their loans to the Federal Government. Any action on the part of your committee to delay for at least 1 year the adoption of proposed power policy for further study will be appreciated by all of our membership in Wyoming regardless of what their employment source might be.

CARL BECHTOLD,
International Representative, Eighth District, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received from a farmer of Hope, N. Dak., by the name of Harold A. Willmert, dealing with the farm situation.

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

HOPE, N. DAK.,
December 5, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: In reply to your letter of recent date will say that there are quite a few things that Congress could do to help the farmer, and there are a lot of things being done that are causing a lot of concern, as well as a lot of hardships, at least to the farmers of our great Northwest.

This man Benson seems to want the farmers to go through some sort of freezing-out process, and would like to see a large part of the so-called inefficient farmers fall by the wayside. What, pray tell me, are we going to do with the farmers that he calls inefficient, but in fact, are finding themselves on the short end of ledger, mostly through no fault of their own, but because of falling prices and poor crops due to rust, drought, etc. Industry has the inefficient worker, but has to put up with him and can't even fire him. Don't we have too few farmers now? Do we want to cause a lot that are on the farms now to have to move off? Is a surplus of perhaps a billion bushels of wheat worse than say 10 million bushels too little? Are we going to be penalized for keeping the people of this country well fed when the least little thing could have caused a shortage? Take the drought in the Midwest this summer, had it come 3 weeks earlier we would have ceilings on the corn prices instead of Benson wringing his hands in despair crying surplus and what are we going to do with them. He should be the happiest man in the world in feeling secure as to the food supplies we have. Don't we have say $200 billion invested in atomic bombs and defense of Europe, and the taxpayer isn't mentioned in this case? What is a paltry $5 billion invested in food stuffs which we might well need sooner than we think compared to this other $200 billion which we should never use, or if we do, we will have no further need of anything.

Secretary Benson sure is grateful to North Dakota, which gave the Republicans the greatest majority of any State last election. He goes so far as to even be deceitful, supports oats and barley at the same rate as last year, but changes the parity formula, so in the long run it lowers the price of oats 7 cents and barley 10 or 11 cents. Flax also got a trimming of fifty-some cents a bushel. Now he wants to support wheat at 90 percent but wants to change the parity. Well all I can say is that we farmers in the Northwest aren't like the cow that the farmer put green glasses on so she would eat straw thinking it was hay, aren't going to be fooled by this neat little shell-game trick. I have been a Republican all my life and have never voted for a Democratic President, but so help me, I will never vote for a Republican President as long as I live. The Republicans waited 20 years to get back in power, and it took only 1 year to get themselves out. In fairness to you Senator LANGER, I think you have the interests of the people of our State at heart, but I think it is time all of you Congressmen from North Dakota get together and see that legislation detrimental to North Dakota does not get passed.

What kind of a program does Benson have? None that I can see. What are they doing about Canadian rye and oats? Not much, bragging about cutting imports of oats to 23 million bushels after the damage has been done. We could have used 10 million acres to grow the wheat, oats, barley, rye, and flax that have been imported the last year. How can I or the rest of the farmers support a $300-billion debt in the United States and Canada's economy as well, on $1 corn, $1.25 wheat, and $3 flax as Benson would like to see? Well I don't expect Congress or Secretary Benson to put out any constructive legislation, so I am going to act accordingly. If they want a depression, they have a good start, and I for one, have pledged myself to quit buying anything at all that I possibly can get along without. I have averaged buying $5,000 worth of farm machinery every year for the past 10 years. I shall get along with what I have. I am going to tighten up while I can, some others will do the same, a lot of others will have to. Republicans will lose control of Congress this next election. I have offered to wager $25 that they would but have found no takers as yet.

Well Senator LANGER, you asked for it, so I have tried to send you my views. I have lived in Hoover's time, and this administration sounds too much like his prosperity around the corner. I am not a Farmers' Union member but belong to the Farm Bureau, and surely not proud of Mr. Kline, the Farm Bureau's president.

With best wishes,

HAROLD A. WILLMERT.

SERGEANT DICKINSON—ACTION OF UNITED STATES ARMY—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me and signed by Mrs. R. S. Sandin, dated February 2, 1954, relating to Sergeant Dickinson.

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

UNDERWOOD, N. DAK.,
February 2, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a taxpaying, clear-thinking citizen of the United States, I am writing to protest vehemently the action being taken by the Army against Sergeant Dickinson.

Circumstances alter cases, as every intelligent person must know. Perhaps, and more than likely, in the position in which Sergeant Dickinson found himself, those who seem determined to make him suffer unreasonably could not be too sure just what they might do, and certainly not at 23 years of age. Life to us all is precious. Under stress of fear of losing it, any one of us, I am sure, could not definitely say what we might or might not be inclined to do—to what lengths we might go. Everyone makes mistakes. Granted, perhaps, this boy did. He has, nevertheless, realized his mistake, chose to return to his own country, and, I am certain, to return a loyal, no doubt repentant, citizen. Let's give him the chance he has coming.

If higher authority cannot be tolerant, understanding of and sympathetic with the youth of our country who were thrown into the midst of the hell of Korea and communism, what incentive is there for those youngsters who are stymied, mentally warped, in a Communist compound to come back to their own country? What security have they to which to look forward? Should they want or dare to return home?

No. The whole idea is wrong, and in so expressing my feeling on the subject I am voicing an opinion that is widespread in our community that this boy must be given a chance to live as a normal, loyal citizen, without the disgrace and suffering of a court-martial heaped on to an already tortured mind.

Should it be that I have written to the wrong party, Senator, will you please see that it is directed to the right place.

Respectfully,

Mrs. R. S. SANDIN.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committe on Banking and Currency:

S. 2845. A bill to amend section 3528 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the purchase of metal for minor coins of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3039. A bill to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3040. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3041. A bill to exempt States and political subdivisions thereof from the tax on conveyances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

S. 3042. A bill to provide for the acquisition by Reserve officers of a classified civil-service status; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 3043. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GOLDWATER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3044. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3045. A bill for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers;

S. 3046. A bill for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman;

S. 3047. A bill for the relief of Luzia Cox; and

S. 3048. A bill for the relief of Rosetta Ittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3049. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 3050. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF GRANT PROVISIONS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The purpose of the bill is as follows:

First. To maintain the basic program of vocational rehabilitation in the States by allotting to each State which maintains its State appropriation Federal funds equal to 100 percent of the administration, guidance and placement expenditures, and 50 percent of the case-service expenditures for the base year 1953.

Second. To provide for the extension and improvement of the program by allotting additional Federal funds to the States on a population basis, with one State dollar required to earn one Federal dollar, without regard for categories of expenditures.

Third. To end the obligation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to reimburse States for expenditures in excess of allotments.

Fourth. In States having two rehabilitation agencies, to provide for dividing funds between them in keeping with the ratio existing in the base year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3039) to amend the grant provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LEASE OF CERTAIN RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS, ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3043) to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Indians of Arizona and the Navajo Indians in New Mexico to make leases on their reservations.

At the present time, 19 million acres in the State of Arizona are occupied by Indian tribes. The reservations set aside for the Indians are in the process of being developed into areas of agricultural and mineral value. Under existing law, the tribes do not have the right to enter into leases. Therefore, I have introduced the bill which has for its purpose the correction of that situation.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO OAKDALE AND SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION DISTRICTS, CALIFORNIA, IN CONSTRUCTION OF TRI-DAM PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for Federal support of what is to me a fine example of local initiative. It provides Federal assistance to permit the financing and construction of the Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California.

This is not Federal assistance in the usual sense. On the contrary the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, agencies of the State of California, at the cost of $1¼ million have completed the planning and engineering of the $50 million irrigation hydroelectric Tri-Dam project. These people, approximately 30,000 in all, have voted by an overwhelming majority to assume the repayment of this $50 million project needed for the enlargement of their irrigation water-storage facilities.

The proposed legislation would authorize a Federal loan to the districts of an amount equal to that portion of the cost of the project properly applicable to irrigation but not exceeding $10,370,000. This latter figure is for initial financing and because of first costs which prevent the immediate contemplated financing of the project through issuance of revenue bonds.

To me this is a fine opportunity to apply the announced policy of our administration which is the recognition of the common responsibility of the Federal, State and local Governments toward improvement of our Nation's resources.

Mr. President, in this instance there is not only local participation but the people of the districts have indicated a desire to assume the whole burden of the project. When the Federal loan is repaid as provided in the bill, there will be all of the benefits of a federally sponsored project without ultimate cost to the Federal Government. It is certainly within our national interest to encourage such self-help when it is intelligently pursued and relieves the Government of further concern.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3040) to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES UTILIZATION ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to implement the authority of existing law so as to provide the Secretary of Agriculture broader authority to utilize surplus agri-

cultural commodities to aid unemployed persons and their families.

The bill is modeled after the section 32 program which has worked so well and which will continue. The bill will augment the assistance to the unemployed and their families available under the section 32 program.

The bill recognizes the following basic facts:

First. The reduction and termination of certain national defense activities is creating unemployment in many communities, particularly mining and manufacturing areas.

Second. Other economic factors are also creating unemployment.

Third. Extensive unemployment imposes excessive burdens on State and local welfare agencies.

Fourth. Unemployment compensation payments are inadequate both from the standpoint of the amount of the payment and their duration.

Fifth. Relief of the distress and suffering of unemployed people and their families is a matter of deep concern to the Nation.

Sixth. Congress has established the principle of using surplus agricultural commodities to alleviate distress.

Seventh. The American people—including the unemployed and their families—own through the instrumentality of their National Government stocks of beef, butter, cheese, powdered milk, vegetable oils, peanuts, and other food commodities in excess of market requirements, and the Government from time to time acquires perishable commodities to alleviate surpluses.

Eighth. The disposal of such commodities to State and local welfare agencies for distribution to the unemployed and their families would not only be of great benefit in conserving and promoting the health of the recipients, but would also provide a means to prevent spoilage and would benefit the farmer by helping to stabilize prices of farm commodities by the removal of surpluses.

Ninth. There is in existence in the National Government an established system for determining the extent of unemployment in particular areas throughout the country.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Evening Star of February 11, 1954, stating that the Department of Agriculture is donating Government-owned surplus foods to about two hundred thousand needy persons in West Virginia, Arkansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wyoming, Colorado and California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, these foods are being distributed under provisions that have been in the law for many years authorizing the utilization, for welfare and disaster purposes, of agriculture commodities purchased with section 32 funds. The officials of the Department of Agriculture charged with the administration of the section 32 program advise me that requests for surplus commodities for the relief of needy families have increased sharply in recent weeks. These officials point out that if the present rate of requests continues long or increases to any great extent, section 32 funds may soon be inadequate to meet such requests. They cite the limited amount of such funds and the limitations which the law imposes upon their use.

The President in his budget message advised that there will be in the section 32 fund in fiscal year 1955 a total of $421 million, derived from $241 million in carry-over funds, plus $180 million available from current tariff collections.

The President advised that anticipated expenditures will amount to $235 million. We know that this estimate necessarily had to be based largely on past experience, as it was impossible to foresee the extent of unemployment.

After deducting the anticipated expenditures, we see there will be left approximately $186 million in the section 32 fund, for use in meeting unanticipated needs of all the established programs, including the school-lunch program. These programs must be fully protected.

As I have stated, there are also limitations imposed by the law on the use of section 32 funds—limitations that restrict the types and quantities of commodities that may be purchased with section 32 funds either direct from producers or from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. For instance, the law provides that section 32 funds shall be devoted principally to perishable nonbasic commodities other than those commodities designated in title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The designated commodities in title II are those nonbasics that carry mandatory price supports. The designated foods are honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat.

Yet these designated nonbasics and the basics are the commodities that are in largest supply among the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So we readily see that we may soon have our heads against the ceiling in respect to our ability to fulfill, from section 32 funds and commodities, the increasing number of requests for assistance arising from unemployment.

The purpose of our bill is to implement the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture so as to enable him to augment—with stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation—the amount of surplus food available to the unemployed, from section 32 sources.

I want to make it clear that the authority conferred upon the Secretary by our bill is additional authority and not authority in lieu of that conferred upon him by any provision of existing law and this is specifically spelled out in the bill. In other words, the bill fully protects established section 32 outlets, such as the school-lunch program, and insures that no funds or commodities needed by such established programs shall be diverted from such programs.

Existing law authorizes the disposal of Commodity Credit Corporation owned stocks for welfare purposes if deemed by the Secretary as necessary to prevent spoilage. But no provision is made for the use of funds to reduce the large, bulky storage-size packages and quantities to a size suitable for distribution. Nor does the law provide authority for the use of funds for distribution in the manner provided in the case of section 32 acquired commodities.

Our bill will provide the Secretary of Agriculture this additional authority, including the authority to use section 32 funds for repackaging and distribution to the extent that such funds are in excess of the needs of previously established outlets for section 32 acquired commodities.

Mr. President, the persistent rise in unemployment in the Nation is a source of deep concern. While we have continued to look hopefully for a downward shift in the present trend of unemployment, Government agencies report a further sharp rise.

The Government figures on unemployment, covering substantially the same period, vary. The most conservative figure covering the period from the first week in December to the first week in January was published early this month by the Bureau of the Census. The Census Bureau reported the number of unemployed at 2,359,000—an increase of 893,000 in 1 month. On the other hand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor reported the number of unemployed increased by 2 million between mid-December and mid-January.

Recently the Department of Commerce, using a different system of measurement, reported total employment in January at 59.8 million, with 3,087,000 unemployed. This is some 728,000 more unemployed than previously reported by the Department of Commerce for the same period.

Included in the figure of 59.8 million employed are 6.9 million workers employed from 15 to 34 hours a week and another 2.1 million workers that were estimated to work only from 1 to 14 hours a week; and, of course, the figures on the number of unemployed represent only the number of breadwinners that are out of jobs and do not take into account the number of people in their families that are dependent on these breadwinners.

The figures added together do not, of course, constitute any great percentage of our total population. But if we are to give the unemployment figure its true meaning, we have to break it down and see how it is spread among different areas of the country having the highest concentration of jobless persons. This is best accomplished by reference to the bimonthly reports of the Bureau of Employment Security that are based on measurements of the extent of unemployment in areas covered by the surveys conducted by the Bureau.

The January reports of the Bureau show many cities and areas in the Nation where at least 6 percent of the total labor force is out of work. There are many other areas where the extent of unemployment approaches this figure. There are still other areas in the Nation that have not been surveyed.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the Bureau's explanation of its four employment survey classifications, and a list compiled by the Bureau showing the cities and areas included in each category as of January.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I ask to have included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks articles from the Washington Evening Star of February 9 and the Washington Post of February 10 relating the fact that Detroit, Mich., has, since the publication of the January report, been shifted from the classification described as moderate unemployment to substantial unemployment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I also ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks another article from the Washington Evening Star of February 10, headed Southern Economy Burdened by Jobless Back From North.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I have just referred to the shift of Detroit into the most critical unemployment classification. I am informed that Toledo, Ohio, has experienced a similar shift and that the commissioners of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., have recently requested that their city be shifted from the classification moderate unemployment to substantial unemployment.

I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of February 25 stating that the Government has added six more areas to its critical unemployment list. The areas are, according to the article, Battle Creek, Mich.; South Bend, Ind.; and the Quad-Cities area of Illinois and Iowa. The cities generally referred to as the Quad Cities are Moline, East Moline, and Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa. They make up what is commonly called the Detroit of the farm machinery industry. Also listed in the article are three smaller areas: Hudson, N. Y.; Welch, W. Va., and La Crosse, Wis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to point out that in my own State of Alabama, Gadsden and Jasper are in the most critical unemployment classification. Jasper is in the coal mining region of Walker County. Other areas are in the classification of moderate unemployment. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] who is a sponsor of this bill, well knows that in his State, Corbin, Hazard, Madisonville, the Middlesboro-Harlan area, the Paintsville-Prestonsburg area and Pikeville are all in the most critical unemployment classification. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who is also a sponsor of this bill, is fully aware of the fact that the Texarkana area in his State is in the most critical unemployment classification. Other areas in both Kentucky and Arkansas are in the classification of moderate unemployment.

The reports of the Bureau of Employment Security, to which I have just alluded, and its findings that I have just incorporated into the RECORD, show conclusively that contrary to many predictions of improved conditions, job opportunities have steadily diminished. Unemployment is creating excessive burdens on many State and local welfare agencies.

Let me emphasize the care with which this bill has been drawn. We have geared the assistance to be provided by the bill to the classifications established and reviewed every 2 months by the Bureau of Employment Security for the precise purpose of insuring that the foods distributed under the bill go only to areas found by the Bureau to be distress areas. This means that relief under this bill will stop automatically for any area at such time as the Bureau finds that such area is no longer a distress area.

The wisdom of this provision is that the foods shall go only to those areas in greatest need and thereby cause a minimum impact upon regular food channels. We believe that merchants in our distressed areas would welcome aid to their friends and neighbors who have for so long been their customers but are now unable to properly feed their families because they are unemployed.

Our aim being, as I have stated, to channel surplus foods into areas of greatest need, it seems desirable from the standpoint of uniformity of action to provide that aid to the unemployed under the section 32 program be likewise geared to the distressed area classifications of the Bureau of Employment Security.

We have taken pains to insure that no other welfare needs being served by the section 32 program are in anywise altered. In other words, the bill does not disturb or limit in any way the channeling of section 32 commodities to State and other public institutions, such as mental hospital or to State welfare agencies serving the aged, the sick and disabled, the blind and dependent children, and disaster victims, or private charity organizations such as Red Cross, the Salvation Army, Community Chest, and similar organizations performing the same type of service.

The only change relates to instances where assistance goes primarily to the unemployed who are members of the labor force and their families. In such instances, the section 32 assistance, like the assistance provided from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, will be geared to the distress area classifications of the Bureau of Employment Security.

Furthermore, the bill provides that in areas where assistance is already being furnished to the unemployed with section 32 commodities, such assistance may be continued. In other words, any area that is receiving aid under the section 32 program on the date of enactment of this bill may continue to receive it. I wish to emphasize once again that the bill makes no change in nor does it alter in anywise whatever the school-lunch program.

Unemployment, particularly in certain localities, is as we have seen increasing at a rapid rate. The harvest season in Florida and in similar climates is already here for some agricultural products and is rapidly approaching in other. This bill offers the means for matching food surpluses with the food requirements of the unemployed and their families. Now is the time for action. I urge the Senate to promptly consider and pass this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on the bill, a report from the unemployment bureau as to the number of unemployed, and a classification of areas of distress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill (S. 3044) to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Agricultural Commodities Utilization Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Governor," in the case of the District of Columbia, means the Board of Commissioners.

(c) The term "welfare agency" includes only an agency of a State or of a political subdivision of a State.

(d) The term "distress area" means an area classified by the Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor as an area of substantial unemployment.

CERTIFICATION OF DISTRESS AREAS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Labor is authorized and directed to make continuing studies of unemployment in the United States and to certify to the Secretary of Agriculture at least bimonthly these cities or areas which he determines as a result of such studies to be distress areas.

PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. Upon receipt of certification by the Secretary of Labor that a city or other area is a distress area, the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Governor of the State within which the area is located that such area is eligible for assistance under this act, and shall make a public announcement of such eligibility. Upon receipt of a request from the Governor of such State for assistance under this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available to such State and local welfare agencies as may be designated by such Governor, such amounts of Government-owned surplus agricultural commodities (a) as may be necessary to provide adequate diets (or to supplement existing diets to the extent necessary to provide adequate diets) for unemployed persons and their families found by such State or local agency to be in need of such assistance, and (b) as may be available for such purposes.

COMMODITIES AVAILABLE FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to use for the purposes of this act (a) any agricultural commodities acquired through the use of funds made available under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), to the extent that such commodities are in

excess of the needs of previously established outlets therefor, and (b) any agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations.

DELIVERY OF COMMODITIES

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide for the preparation for delivery and the delivery of commodities under this act to State and local welfare agencies, or to any agent designated by such welfare agency for such purpose, and to pay the expenses of transportation of such commodities to the point of delivery, but none of the costs of further transportation or local distribution of such commodities shall be paid by the United States.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall terminate the delivery of commodities under this act to any area whenever—

(a) The Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Secretary of Agriculture that such area is no longer a distress area; or

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture finds that such commodities are not being used for the purposes for which they have been made available under this act.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to consult with State and local welfare agencies, and to enter into such agreements with such agencies as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 9. Sums made available to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), which are not needed for other authorized purposes, may be used by the Secretary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such purposes. Any such sums may be used for making payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation to reimburse the Corporation for its investment in commodities used by the Secretary for the purposes of this act and for any expenses incurred by it in making such commodities available for such purposes.

SEC. 10. The authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture by this act shall be in addition to and not in lieu of the authority conferred upon the Secretary by any other law; except that no agricultural commodities purchased with funds made available to the Secretary under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), shall be used for the purpose of providing assistance primarily to unemployed members of the labor force and their families, except to the extent authorized, and in the manner provided by this act. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the continued use of such funds in any area in which they are being used for such purpose on the date of enactment of this act.

The matters which, on request of Mr. HILL, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 11, 1954]

UNITED STATES FEEDING 200,000 NEEDY IN 11 STATES

Officials said yesterday the Agriculture Department is donating Government-owned surplus foods to about 200,000 needy persons in 11 States.

Most of those receiving food are said to be rural families, who suffered heavily from drought and crop failures last year, and coal miners who long have been out of work.

States in which the food is being distributed include West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wyoming, Colorado, and California.

Officials said that while surplus foods have been available for distribution to needy families for many years, the demand has been very small in recent years until the last few weeks.

The foods being donated include butter, cheese, dried milk, and in some areas canned beef.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1954]

DETROIT IS CALLED DISTRESS AREA—WILL GET CONTRACT PRIORITY

Detroit, the Nation's automotive capital, has been declared a distressed area with "substantial" unemployment. This entitles it to preference in obtaining Government contracts.

The Labor Department announced last night it has added the city to a list of 20 other major cities and 31 smaller communities with more than 6 percent of their labor forces out of work.

The department's Bureau of Employment Security acted on the basis of a special study by the Michigan Employment Security Commission which reported 107,000 jobless in the Detroit area in mid-January. This is 7.1 percent of the civilian labor force there.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND CUT IN 30 DAYS

The Michigan commission reported that 15,000 automotive workers had been released in the past 30 days.

Walter Reuther, CIO and United Auto Workers president, had asked for the survey after Detroit was left off the Labor Departments most recent list of distressed areas, although it reported unemployment at 6.2 percent.

Commissioner Robert C. Goodwin of the Bureau of Employment Security explained to a congressional committee last Friday that the group IV—distressed area—rating was withheld from Detroit because many workers there were laid off temporarily with instructions to report for work within 30 days.

GET CONTRACT PRIORITY

Group IV listing entitles Detroit companies to special consideration in award of Government contracts. In the event of a tie bid, a company in a distressed area automatically gets preference over a company in a nondistressed area.

The Michigan study predicted an upturn in Detroit employment by mid-May in line with anticipated increased auto sales.

[From the Washington Post of February 10, 1954]

WILSON CALM OVER DETROIT IDLENESS TOTAL

Secretary of Defense Wilson said yesterday that "I wouldn't worry about Detroit."

Commenting at a news conference on Monday night's announcement that the auto capital has been designated as a distressed-labor area, the former General Motors president added:

"Come spring, it's going to be all right."

The announcement from the Labor Department added Detroit to a list of 20 other major cities and 31 smaller communities with more than 6 percent of their labor forces out of work.

Wilson, commenting generally on the situation, said the Detroit area is well able to look after itself in any period of temporary labor surplus.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported, meanwhile, there was a decline of 2 million workers on the payrolls of industry, transportation, Government, and trade between mid-December and mid-January.

The nonfarm total of employment last month—47,700,000—was the largest ever reported for the month except in 1953 BLS said. It was 646,000 smaller than a year ago because of factory layoffs; in nonmanufacturing industries, January employment was the highest on record.

Factory payrolls dropped by 380,000 between mid-December and mid-January, BLS said. This drop, appreciably larger than usual, was described as the sharpest reduction for the season since the recession year 1949.

STUDEBAKER NIGHT SHIFT ENDED; 2,500 LAID OFF

SOUTH BEND, IND., February 9.—The Studebaker Corp. discontinued its night shift today and laid off more than 2,500 employees.

P. O. Peterson, executive vice president in charge of manufacturing, announced production will be consolidated into a single day shift and the work staff cut to about 12,000.

This is slightly more than half of the peak employment of 23,000 workers in 1953.

Elimination of the night shift meant that day-shift workers who have been on a 32-hour week will go back on a 40-hour week.

AID STATIONS SET UP FOR ARKANSAS JOBLESS

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., February 9.—State and Federal agencies moved today to help an estimated 4,000 to 5,000 hungry, ill-clad persons suffering from seasonal unemployment and last summer's drought in northeast Arkansas.

State Welfare Commissioner A. J. Moss said offices were opened at Lepanto and Marked Tree this morning as the first step toward providing food and other aid for the needy families in Poinsett and Mississippi Counties.

Other offices will be opened at Harrisburg, Trumann, and Tyronza, he said.

The Production and Marketing Administration's surplus commodities division at Dallas and the State Commodity Distribution Office were planning to provide food.

[From the Washington Post of February 25, 1954]

SIX MORE AREAS PUT ON CRITICAL JOBLESS LIST

(By Maureen Gothlin)

The Government had added 6 more areas to its critical unemployment list, bringing to 59 the number eligible for special Federal help in trying to create jobs.

The new areas include three major industrial centers—Battle Creek, Mich, South Bend, Ind., and the quad-cities areas of Iowa and Illinois. Also listed were three smaller regions, Hudson, N. Y., Welch, W. Va., and La Crosse, Wis.

The Labor Department blamed the increase in unemployment on layoffs in the auto industry, farm machinery, coal, textile, general durable-goods manufacturing, transportation, and trade.

An area is listed as having substantial unemployment when 6 percent or more of its labor force is jobless, with no immediate prospect of increased work. In such areas firms may bid on certain Government contracts set aside to relieve unemployment in distressed cities.

Meantime, Government officials said there is a good chance employment will pick up next month. To bolster their optimism, they have Census Bureau statistics showing that employment has risen in March in 12 of the past 13 years.

Since the unemployment census started in 1941, the number of jobless has increased in March only once. That was the immediate postwar year of 1946. Even during the 1949 recession, employment rose by 480,000 in March.

Mr. Eisenhower conferred with AFL President George Meany, who has expressed concern about rising unemployment. The Chief

Executive also met with State labor officials and union representatives attending a labor conference here.

[From the Washington Star of February 10, 1954]

SOUTHERN ECONOMY BURDENED BY JOBLESS BACK FROM NORTH

MEMPHIS, TENN., February 10.—There are signs that the South's economic stream is being complicated by an undercurrent of drift-back job seekers.

These unemployed are southerners, most of them laborers and former farmworkers, who went North during the 1940's, lured by high wages.

During the last few months, a lot of them, in the wake of northern industrial layoffs and other reasons, are coming home.

Any sizable drift back would add to pressure already felt in the Cotton Belt, coming on top of cotton-acreage cutbacks, mechanization, and day cropping.

EIGHT THOUSAND NEAR HUNGER

Some farm leaders believe the homing workers are the underlying cause of the situation in upper east Arkansas and part of the Missour bootheel, where about 8,000 are reported on the edge of hunger.

"I think the biggest trouble is that a lot of people who went up North are coming back," Hilton Bracey, manager of the Missouri Cotton Producers' Association, said today.

"And a lot of people who usually move on somewhere else stuck around. There are lots of factors. Drought, maybe, but it's hard to put a finger on it."

APRIL WILL TELL

There won't be any clear picture until about April, when planting is under way and seasonal layoffs in industry usually end.

For unemployed farmworkers, another factor is the cotton-acreage cutback imposed by law because of the cotton surplus.

Reduced cotton acreage has put an undetermined number of tenant farm families on the road. There isn't enough cotton land to go around. Some farm owners have turned to day cropping.

Under this method, the farmer hires workers by the day when he needs them. Under the old sharecropping system, the worker remained on the farm. If he ran out of money in midwinter, the planter would advance credit on the next crop.

UNEMPLOYMENT CLAIMS

Louisiana and South Carolina reported a normal seasonal increase in interstate claims. Arkansas noted an increase, but "not too great a trend."

Sharp increases in such claims were counted, however, by Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina.

In Tennessee about 8,000 interstate claims are on file, double last year's total.

Alabama: Interstate claims up to 2,839 for January, 100 percent over the previous 4-month period.

Georgia: A steady increase of claims over the past 5 months, ranging from 770 in September to 1,873 in January.

Florida: January claims 4,865, about 1,000 more than for the same period in 1953.

North Carolina: 2,745 new interstate claims in January, a 91.4-percent increase over 1953.

EXPLANATION OF CLASSIFICATION CODES

Group I—Areas of labor shortage: Areas in which labor shortages exist or are expected to occur in the near future which will impede "essential activities."

Group II—Areas of balanced labor supply: Areas in which current and prospective labor demand and supply are approximately in balance.

Group III—Areas of moderate labor surplus: Areas in which current and prospective labor supply moderately exceeds labor requirements.

Group IV—Areas of substantial labor surplus: Areas in which current and prospective labor supply substantially exceeds labor requirements.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGIONS OF THE BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Region I: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island.

Region II: New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico.

Region III: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia.

Region IV: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee.

Region V: Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio.

Region VI: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin.

Region VII: Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Region VIII: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.

Region IX: Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming.

Region X: Arizona, California, Nevada, Hawaii.

Region XI: Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Alaska.

CLASSIFICATION OF LABOR MARKET AREAS ACCORDING TO RELATIVE ADEQUACY OF LABOR SUPPLY, JANUARY 1954

Region I

Group I: Hartford, Conn.

Group II: Bridgeport, Conn.; New Britain, Conn.; New Haven, Conn.; Stamford-Norwalk, Conn.; Waterbury, Conn.

Group III: Portland, Maine; Boston, Mass.; Brockton, Mass.; Fall River, Mass.; Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.; Worcester, Mass.; Manchester, N. H.

Group IV: Lawrence, Mass.; Lowell, Mass.; New Bedford, Mass.;[1] Webster, Mass.;[2] Providence, R. I.

Region II

Group I: None.

Group II: Buffalo, N. Y.; Rochester, N. Y.; Syracuse, N. Y.

Group III: Newark, N. J.; Paterson, N. J.; Perth Amboy, N. J.; Trenton, N. J.; Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N. Y.; Binghamton, N. Y.; New York, N. Y.; Utica-Rome, N. Y.

Group IV: Atlantic City, N. J.; Gloversville, N. Y.;[2] Mayaguez, P. R.; Ponce, P. R.; San Juan, P. R.

Region III

Group I: None.

Group II: Baltimore, Md.; Charlotte, N. C.; Allentown-Bethlehem, Pa.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Lancaster, Pa.; York, Pa.; Hampton-Newport News-Warwick, Va.; Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.; Richmond, Va.

Group III: Wilmington, Del.; Washington, D. C.; Greensboro-High Point, N. C.; Erie, Pa.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Reading, Pa.; Roanoke, Va.; Charleston, W. Va.; Huntington, W. Va.-Ashland, Ky.; Wheeling, W. Va.-Steubenville, Ohio.

Group IV

Cumberland, Md.;[2] Asheville, N. C.; Durham, N. C.; Winston-Salem, N. C.; Altoona, Pa.; Clearfield-DuBois, Pa.;[2] Indiana, Pa.;[2] Johnstown, Pa.; Pottsville, Pa.;[2] Scranton, Pa.; Sundbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Pa.;[2] Uniontown-Connellsville, Pa.;[2] Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Pa.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.;[2] Covington-Clifton Forge, Va.;[2] Beckley, W. Va.;[2] Fairmount, W. Va.;[2] Morgantown, W. Va.;[2] Parkersburg, W. Va.[2] Point Pleasant, W. Va.[2] Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.[2]

Region IV

Group I: None.

Group II: Jacksonville, Fla.; Miami, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.; Macon, Ga.; Aiken, S. C.-Augusta, Ga.

Group III: Birmingham, Ala.; Mobile, Ala.; Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.; Columbus, Ga.; Savannah, Ga.; Jackson, Miss.; Charleston, S. C.; Greenville, S. C.; Chattanoogo, Tenn.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.

Group IV: Gadsden, Ala.;[1 2] Jasper, Ala.;[2] Cedartown-Rockmart, Ga.;[2] La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell, Tenn.;[2] Newport, Tenn.[2]

Region V

Group I: None.

Group II: Flint, Mich.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lansing, Mich.; Saginaw, Mich.; Akron, Ohio; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio; Loraine-Elyria, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio.

Group III: Louisville, Ky.; Battle Creek, Mich; Detroit, Mich.; Canton, Ohio; Toledo, Ohio.

Group IV: Muskegon, Mich.;[1] Corbin, Ky.;[2] Hazard, Ky.;[2] Madisonville, Ky.;[2] Middlesboro-Harlan, Ky.;[2] Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Ky.;[2] Pikeville, Ky.;[2] Ionia-Belding-Greenville, Mich.[2]

Region VI

Group I: None.

Group II: Aurora, Ill.; Chicago, Ill.; Rockford, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Madison, Wis.

Group III: Davenport, Iowa-Rock Island-Moline, Ill.; Joliet, Ill.; Peoria, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; South Bend, Ind.; Duluth, Minn.,-Superior, Wis.; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Racine, Wis.

Group IV: Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Ill.;[2] Terre Haute, Ind.; Vincennes, Ind.;[2] Kenosha, Wis.[1]

Region VII

Group I: None.

Group II: Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans.; Omaha, Nebr.

Group III: Kansas City, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.

Group IV: None.

Region VIII

Group I: None.

Group II: Tulsa, Okla.; Dallas, Tex.; Houston, Tex.

Group III: Little Rock-North Little Rock, Ark.; Baton Rouge, La.; New Orleans, La.; Shreveport, La.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Austin, Tex.; Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; El Paso, Tex.; Fort Worth, Tex.; San Antonio, Tex.

Group IV: Texarkana, Tex.-Ark.[1 2]

Region IX

Group I: None.

Group II: Denver, Colo.

---

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

[2] Smaller areas covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

[2] Smaller areas covered because of substantial labor surpluses. These areas are not part of the regular major area reporting program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

Group III: Salt Lake City, Utah.
Group IV: Albuquerque, N. Mex.[1]

Region X

Group I: None.
Group II: San Diego, Calif.
Group III: Phoenix, Ariz.; Fresno, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Bernardino-Riverside, Calif.; San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; Stockton, Calif.; Honolulu, T. H.
Group IV: None.

Region XI

Group I: None.
Group II: None.
Group III: Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Spokane, Wash.
Group IV: Tacoma, Wash.[1]

ESTABLISHMENT OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments. I ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a statement by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3049) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish policies and programs for the use of acreage diverted from production by the establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Congress hereby finds and declares that the disruption of the orderly planting of farm commodities due to the use of acreage allotments made necessary by wartime production and the failure of American farm production to move in world trade impairs the purchasing power of farmers and that these conditions affect the planting of other crops not under acreage allotment, will tend to increase the surplus of nonbasic commodities, and will not increase soil fertility, and whereas we have exhausted about 40 percent of our fertile soil and with a greatly increasing need for the restoration of our soils if generations to come are to enjoy our present high standard of living.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a program for the use of acres taken out of production because of the declaration of acreage allotments.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide, through agreements with producers or by other voluntary methods, that acreage of commodities subject to acreage allotments in order to be eligible for this program must be taken out of production of any crop sold in normal channels of trade or used in the production of any product sold in normal channels of trade. Diverted acres are to be used solely for soil-conserving purposes. Practices to be used in carrying on this program are to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, taking into consideration soil-conserving practices normally used in each farming area of the country. Such acreage shall also be eligible for benefit payments under any soil-conservation program now in effect or to be put into effect by the Congress.

SEC. 3. Rental or benefit payments in connection with such agreements or other methods shall be determined by taking not less than 25 percent of the average county per-acre yield of the commodity subject to acreage allotments and multiplying by the support price of said commodity to arrive at the per-acre rental or benefit payment. Payment shall be made as far as practicable on contiguous tracts in order to encourage soil-conservation practices, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to make payments not in excess of 10 percent of the acreage that would be diverted because of the establishment of acreage allotments.

SEC. 4. No payment shall be made to any cooperator in such program for less than $25 nor more than $2,500.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

One of agriculture's most pressing problems is what to do about acres diverted from production of crops in oversupply.

We can ease that problem by providing the proper incentive for diverting such acres into conservation farming building up our soil to meet future needs.

During an address before the 16th annual banquet of the Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul last December, I outlined some of the constructive steps I felt needed to be taken for American agriculture.

Among my suggestions was this comment: "We need adequate incentive premiums to convert 'diverted acres' under production restrictions to soil building conservation practices, rather than to other competing and soil depleting crops."

That is just what my bill proposes to provide.

This is a constructive move supported by all of the great farm organizations, and called for by President Eisenhower in his messages to this Congress.

Resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its convention in Chicago the same date I was speaking about "diverted acres" in St. Paul, call for stockpiling fertility in the soil, building a "soil fertility bank" as a reserve for use in national emergencies.

My bill would encourage such conservation of our resources, at a time when we are troubled with production not beyond human need but beyond current effective demand at prices reasonable to the producer.

Without a positive program of wise land use, the diverted acres taken out of production because of the declaration of acreage allotments will only tend to increase the surplus of nonbasic commodities and help defeat the very purpose of acreage allotments.

We spend millions every year to mothball our naval and merchant marine vessels. Isn't an even better investment in our future standard of living and defense to "mothball" our diverted acres, not merely preserving them as we do ships but actually improving them while they are "resting" in reserve?

Under this bill, benefit payments per acre would be determined by taking 25 percent of the average county yield per acre of the commodity under acreage controls and multiplying it by the support price of the commodity.

We have already exhausted 40 percent of our fertile soil, and only a concentrated program of restoration will assure us of the food our rapidly growing population will need in the future.

Now, when acres must be diverted from production of some of the cash crops without upsetting the farmers' purchasing power, which must be maintained for the good of all, seems the logical time to move forward on our conservation efforts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star, long one of the Midwest's most active champions of conservation, has called for such an approach as my bill provides. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Star on Tuesday, February 23, entitled "Soil Banks for Idle Acres," be published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

SOIL BANKS FOR IDLE ACRES

Troubling many farmers and officials is the question of what to do with land taken out of production when acreage restrictions on basic crops go into effect. The surplus problem won't be solved if a man cuts down on his wheat acreage only to increase his barley planting.

In a letter to the Star, Lester M. Anderson, of Litchfield, Minn., accuses us of propagandizing against the farmer in the name of the consumer. He says farmers are quite willing to accept crop controls. For the acres thus released he suggests a Government payment to cover rent and the seed to put the land into soil-building grass.

The Star is very much interested in maintaining farm income because this whole region is largely dependent on farm prosperity for general prosperity. What we have warned against are high support prices which build up surpluses and threaten a revolt against the whole support idea. We think Government supports should be insurance against drastic drops in income, but that farmers should produce for the market, not for Government storehouses.

As for soil-building payments, we think they offer a way out of the idle acre problem. Government officials are talking about soil banks, by which they mean storehouses for fertility. Bills are already before Congress to implement the plan.

Under the old PMA, so-called conservation payments were made—and to some extent still are being made—to farmers for practices which have little relationship to soil conservation. But if a program is evolved which actually encourages the building up of the soil, all Americans should support it. A nation which is growing by 3 million population a year will some day need all the good earth that can be found.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, by increasing the penalty rate on tobacco marketed in excess of acreage allotments from 40 percent of the previous year's average price to 50 percent of the previous year's average price.

The basic strength of the tobacco program, and, in great part, the great success of the program can be traced directly to the acceptance by the growers of the need to revise the program from time to time to meet changing economic conditions. The approval of changes made from time to time can easily be demonstrated by the fact that since 1939, marketing quotas and acreage allotments have been approved by the growers in referenda held every third year. The last overall vote resulted in 96

[1] Areas in the Group IV column marked with an asterisk do not meet the criteria for classification as chronic labor surplus areas in which certified defense facilities may receive additional tax amortization consideration.

percent of the growers favoring quotas in the Burley, flue-cured, and dark tobacco areas, representing over 98 percent of all the tobacco grown in the United States.

The measure introduced today meets with the approval of the great majority of the growers, and represents, in their judgment, a sound approach in discouraging the production of excess tobacco, the continuation of which, if not checked, could constitute a threat to the future of the program. The bill has the endorsement of the organized growers association, the Kentucky Farm Bureau, and other interested and allied organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3050) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. COOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LEIF ERICKSON DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erickson Day.

People of Scandinavian descent all over the United States are proud of the fact that they played a part in the early discovery of America when the distinguished Scandinavian explorer, Leif Erickson, became the first European to set foot on the soil of North America.

It is fully appropriate the United States Government recognize that the link between Scandinavia and the United States should be duly commemorated by the proclamation of Leif Erickson Day. I urge favorable consideration for my resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) requesting the President to proclaim October 9, as Leif Erickson Day, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FILLING OF VACANCIES ON FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution. It refers to the Federal Reserve Board and the operations of the Federal Reserve Board, particularly the Open Market Committee. I make note of the fact that there have been vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board since October 30, 1952.

I also note that the law of the Congress establishing the Federal Reserve Board calls upon the Executive, the President, to fill such vacancies so that the Board may be thoroughly representative of not only the economic functions of America, but also the geographical areas of our country.

I further make note of the fact that the resolution pertains to the operations of the Open Market Committee and its relationship to the members of the Federal Reserve Board.

I suggest that the resolution be carefully studied. It seems to me that one of the most important areas of study and interest today is the matter of fiscal and credit policy.

I also make note of the fact that the Federal Reserve Board at the present time and for a period of more than a year and a half has been without its full membership; and I consider such a condition to be the result of a lack of fulfilling the requirements of the Congress of the United States.

The resolution (S. Res. 216), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas Congress has, by legislation long debated and duly enacted, created a Federal Reserve Board to consist of seven members to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, said Board to operate as an agency independent within the Government, not subject to control of any other department of Government except the Congress, but specifically provided that said Board should report to and be under the direct supervision of the Congress; and

Whereas the Congress has given said Board broad discretionary powers in the conduct of its affairs and in its supervision of the Federal Reserve System, the regional Federal Reserve banks and their respective branches and the Federal Open Market Committee; and

Whereas the Congress has also created by legislation the Federal Open Market Committee as an integral part of the Federal Reserve System, giving this committee also wide discretion in the conduct of its affairs, and the Congress provided that said committee should consist of the 7 members of the Federal Reserve Board plus 5 presidents of 5 separate Federal Reserve banks, said 5 to alternate from year to year between the 12 Federal Reserve bank presidents; and

Whereas the Congress, when it determined that the number of members of the Federal Board should be seven, did not reach that decision by chance or caprice or by compromise, but only after long and serious and objective and nonpartisan consideration and debates; and

Whereas the legislative history shows that the number seven was finally determined as being the minimum number in the opinion of the Congress which would achieve fair geographical and functional representation on this powerful Board for all sectors of our economy and all sections of our vast country; and

Whereas Congress in the creation of the Federal Open Market Committee was careful to limit to five the number of Federal Reserve bank presidents who would be members of said committee in order to insure a working majority at all times of Federal Reserve Board members, who are Presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate, as against the five members composed of Federal Reserve bank presidents, who are elected to their bank positions by the boards of directors of the respective Federal Reserve banks, two-thirds of the membership of which boards consists of commercial bankers or their representatives; and

Whereas there are now and have been vacancies on said Federal Reserve Board, one since June 30, 1952 (for more than 1 year), and another since January 31, 1954, thereby causing an upset in the balance of power in the Federal Open Market Committee, contrary to the intention of the Congress; and, further such vacancies deny equitable representation on the Federal Reserve Board itself of the various geographical sections of our Nation and the multiplicity of economic elements thereof; and

Whereas the law specifically provides that the Board shall consist of seven members, that when a Board member's term expires he shall serve until his successor is appointed and qualified, and that the President shall appoint to fill vacancies occurring in the Board, such provisions indicating clearly that it was the intent of the Congress that there be constantly seven members on the Board; and

Whereas by the use of the word "shall" instead of the word "may," it was clearly indicated that the Congress intended it to be obligatory upon the President to maintain at all times the membership of said Federal Reserve Board at the statutory required number of seven members; and

Whereas the said Federal Reserve Board is particularly an instrument of this Congress, answerable only to the Congress, and is the only instrument of the Congress through which it may discharge its responsibility for the conduct of the monetary and credit policies of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to select immediately proper and qualified citizens to fill these vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board and submit the names of such citizens to the Senate for confirmation as provided by law, in order to correct the present unfair and unsound predominant influence of private bankers in the Federal Open Market Committee and, further, to remedy the lack of proper balance in geographical and economic representation on said Federal Reserve Board, and thereby, by such appointments to restore said Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to its intended number and necessary form as an instrument so important to the Congress in the exercise of its responsibilities in monetary and credit matters.

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE TRUCE OF THE BEAR

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a patriotic, timely, and inspiring address entitled "The Truce of the Bear." Its author is the renowned Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. Every morning he prays that Senators will be provided wings to flee from hell, and every night that stars will guide their feet to heaven.

On a certain occasion the Master uttered these words:

Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist.

So said Jesus of John, so say I of the beloved Dr. Harris.

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

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE TRUCE OF THE BEAR

(By Frederick Brown Harris, minister, Foundry Methodist Church; Chaplain, United States Senate)

The hideous face of atheistic world communism at long last is unveiled for all who have eyes to see. It is the most monstrous mass of organized evil that history has known. It is the sum of all villainies. The idealistic mask which, from the genesis of this deceptive revolution, covered its cruel sadistic countenance now has been torn to shreds by heartless policies and designs which crucify all decent impulses. Often in earlier days that utopian false face has deceived high-minded, gullible liberals.

The closest counterpart to this ghastly system in the animal world is the octopus, whose reaching tentacles drag the victim to a horrible death. To avoid detection, the devilfish inks the sea about it. So this satanic system blacks out visibility.

The explanation of the isolating curtain is succinctly suggested in the New Testament, whose inexorable insights the Soviet blaspheme: "Men love darkness better than light, because their deeds are evil." The incarnate iniquity which today faces freemen at ever so-called conference has forfeited all claim for respect and credence. To gain its ends it openly accepts as part of its technique the twisted methods laid down by its prophet Lenin: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful methods, even concealment of the truth." Its dealing with those brought within its fell clutch at home or in subjugated countries is a shuddering recital of torture, slave labor, blackmail, and liquidation.

Even to this day prisoners of World War II, by the thousands, far from home, are scourged like galley slaves under inhuman conditions to help build the strength of a system they loathe. For the accomplishment of set goals a coterie of gangsters who seized power have murdered millions. The ruthless regime is lower in its practice than primitive, cannibalistic tribes. Even they will not turn on their own. The Soviet savagely and treacherously mark their highest chieftains for death and call it a purge. Any means is used to break resistance or deviation. The tales told by those who have escaped from the hell of the police state are almost incredible. The army of terrified refugees fleeing from the Red terror in East Germany makes the voice of Russia more potent in accusation than the Voice of America.

As gradually those still fortunate enough to be on the outside of this fantastic world have peered into the abysmal tyranny of this abomination of abominations it becomes evident that the whole spiritual concept in which the free world has been nurtured is not only ridiculed, but held in complete contempt. A keen student of what actually has been going on in this debased "experiment in human welfare" sums up his findings in one sentence: "By purges, propaganda, by the use of terror and intimidation, human beings are being rendered utterly plastic, by being stripped of their dignity, to say nothing of rights, and turned into anonymous particles with no will and no judgment of their own."

The Magna Carta of human rights and dignity is not in the rantings of Marx, but in the revelation of Christianity. In that majestic, redemptive movement is the promise for man's emancipation from all that would make of him a chattel or a slave. The One who is the truth declared in deathless words that rings down the ages: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Across 2,000 years that truth has been marching on. It is the releasing word which blazed with a dazzling effulgence, never before seen in political decrees, in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. They mirror Christian fundamentals: All men equal under God and the law endowed with rights inalienable, rights which no government can give or take away. For a thousand groping years the world had been waiting for this new charter.

The true symbol of the emancipated man is not Lenin but Lincoln. In the true utopia man's rulers are not the elect but the elected. Christianity is the real revolution which will yet free all men, Russians included with all the innate religious instincts of that great people. Atheistic communism is but a counterrevolution against the great and final revolution which came out of Palestine. That spurious counterfeit Red revolution denies God and man, freedom and spiritual verities. It repudiates everything which is lifting men slowly, but surely, to their destined inheritance as the sons of God.

No wonder the blind masters of the Kremlin go to all lengths to pull up the roots of supernatural religion and especially to detract from the Christian tradition by bringing it down to the level of astrology and soothsaying and presenting it as a relic which no longer matters. But, ah, stored in that relic is the dynamite of God which will yet pulverize that refuge of lies!

Inasmuch as democracy pure and undefiled is the social expression of Christianity, it follows that America, with her vast moral and material might, is the one foe totalitarianism most fears and hates. Communism as directed from the Kremlin is out to dominate the world. It knows that to do that it must destroy the United States of America. That is its goal and strategy. Nothing is more important than that the free world be alerted to that fact. The unvarnished truth about this aggressive, worldwide, criminal syndicate presents so vile a picture that it is a defiling experience for any free people to go through the motions of any negotiations with her robot representatives.

With any political agreements necessary to make it possible that the Christian revolution and the spurious Communist revolution for the time being, in this dread atomic day, may together occupy the planet, this article does not deal. What military strength must be massed to face the increasing might of communism around the earth is not the legitimate concern of this column. But it becomes crystal clear that both these systems cannot finally survive. To paraphrase Lincoln, and in a vaster sense than he could know, this world cannot remain half slave and half free. Let us say it bluntly: The foul thing the Kremlin symbolizes must be destroyed. It must perish from the earth—but not just by guns or bombs. This heinous incarnation of demoniac perversion must be pierced by the sword of the truth which makes men free.

The most devastatingly explosive thing in the world is truth. Again and again, history proves that there is no force equal to the pulverizing impact of facts. We sadly confess the denials and betrayals of democracy by some who march under its banners. But that is not the point. There are certain verities at the heart of things which can no more be abrogated than can gravitation by some fanatic's dictum.

The Soviet's inverted vocabulary cannot revise the dictionary, so that black becomes white, tyranny democracy, peacemaking, warmongering. This liberation enslavement, and grotesque system built on dead men's bones and on the seared souls of the living must be shattered by the glorious light of freedom. That means its ultimate destruction. The mills of the gods grind slowly. But they grind.

God's truth, which dispels darkness, already has written on the walls of the most obscene thralldom ever to contaminate great peoples the ancient prophecy of doom: "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled. Your agreement with hell shall not stand. Your refuge of lies shall be swept away. When the overflowing scourge shall pass through, ye shall be trodden down by it. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

In the light of that judgment it follows that we cannot accept any truce except as a stage in the war that knows no retreat. Appeasement of this malignity must be resisted as virtue turns from the devil. We deal with an insatiable leopard which cannot change its spots. Compromise is impossible. Only eternal vigilance can save us from acceding to suggestions of a trickery which to sign would mean the sure doom of our Republic and all that the free world holds dear.

The Russian bear, subtle and cunning, presents a global threat. For that beast, as with us, it is all or nothing. May the God of truth give us a new breed of Rudyard Kiplings, to see now what he discerned so clearly a half century ago. Concerning that same marauding bear that prophet-poet warned.

"When he stands up like a tired man, tottering near and near,
When he stands up as pleading, in wavering, man-brute guise,
When he veils the hate and cunning of his little, swinish eyes,
When he shows as seeking quarter, with paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril, the time of the truce of the bear."

THE TWIN CITIES ARSENAL

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, early in February I was in communication with the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, relative to some letters and telegrams which had come to me from constituents in the State of Minnesota dealing with the munition plants in the vicinity of the Twin Cities, particularly with respect to their activities being curtailed or perhaps even being closed down.

I received a letter from the Department of the Army, under date of February 11, 1954, to which I replied under date of February 15, 1954. Finally, on the 26th of February 1954, I received a complete report from the Department of the Army, signed by the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army. The letter gives information concerning the munitions plants in Minnesota and also with respect to offshore plants. Further, it deals with contracts now in force and what is contemplated in that regard in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: I am writing with reference to our recent conversation concerning the situation whereby Twin Cities Arsenal production is being curtailed, while at the same time the Government is conducting offshore procurement programs.

As you know, with the cessation of hostilities in Korea, the combat expenditure of ammunition stopped and the extensive training expenditure was materially curtailed. However, the existing production rate resulted in a rapid buildup of stocks which necessitated a reexamination of the Army's entire ammunition procurement program. This review is of a continuous nature and takes into consideration the current peacetime period, the position of worldwide stocks, training requirements and mobilization requirements, and the desire to maintain a going production base as long as possible. As a result of this review and reexamination, cutbacks and stretchouts have been instituted throughout the ammunition program. As with other producers, this has resulted in a reduced production rate at Twin Cities Arsenal.

Under the mutual defense aid program, as formulated by the Congress, the establishment of a sound mobilization production base overseas for military end items, to include all components, was deemed essential.

In accordance with this national policy, orders for military items for the use of our allies have been placed offshore.

I think it interesting to note that present offshore ammunition procurement programs, had they been scheduled with producers in this country, would serve only briefly to sustain our present expanded production rate.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SLEZAK,
Under Secretary of the Army.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 15, 1954.*

The Honorable JOHN SLEZAK,
Under Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SLEZAK: I have received your letter of February 11, made in reply to the inquiries which I submitted directly to the Secretary of Defense relative to the extent and effect of the production curtailment at the Twin Cities Arsenal and other plants in that area.

While I appreciate that cessation of hostilities in Korea would necessarily require a reexamination of ammunition production requirements, I specifically requested information as to the effect which offshore procurement has had with respect to curtailment of production in the United States, leading to extensive layoffs of workers. You merely state that had our ammunition procurement programs been scheduled with producers in this country this would serve only briefly to sustain our present expanded production rate.

In other words, what I am trying to obtain from the Department is information as to whether consideration has been given to the impact on the unemployment situation of large-scale layoffs in the Twin City area. What is the extent of our offshore procurement? Is it being increased? If so, in what countries? What further adjustments at the Twin Cities Arsenal and other nearby plants are contemplated?

The questions to which I must find the answers are: How many American workers have been displaced by the offshore procurement? Are offshore procurements being made at the expense of American workers and American manufacturers?

Your letter of February 11 does not give me sufficient facts upon which to base a conclusion as to the desirability of the Department's current policy in this matter. I shall appreciate having further information in answer to the specific questions I have raised.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: In the absence of Mr. Slezak, permit me to reply to your communication of February 15 requesting detailed information concerning contemplated adjustments to be accomplished at the Twin Cities Arsenal and the impact of offshore procurement on American producers.

Plans contemplate a further reduction in the operations of contractor operators at the Twin Cities Arsenal prior to June 30, 1954. The Federal Cartridge Corp., the small-arms-ammunition producer, has recently discontinued its "C" shift and is presently operating two 8-hour-per-day, 5-day-per-week shifts; and it is anticipated that a further reduction to one shift will be accomplished by May 1. The Donovan Corp., the 155-millimeter shell producer, is presently operating two 8-hour-per-day, 5-day-per-week shifts and will reduce to one shift by March 1. Minieapolis Moline, the 105-millimeter shell producer, is currently operating one 8-hour-per-day, 5-days-per-week shift. The contracts of the Donovan Corp. and Minneapolis-Moline expire in June of this year and, on the basis of current production schedules, they will be able to continue a single-shift operation until that time.

There are no other ammunition producers within the Twin Cities labor area with the exception of the Anoka Plant of the Federal Cartridge Corp. Currently, no change is contemplated in production at this facility.

Future production requirements will not provide sufficient work for all producers currently manufacturing ammunition. However, each will be afforded an opportunity to submit proposals on such work as will be available. These proposals will be carefully evaluated prior to award of contracts with cost, quality of product, reliability of manufacturer, and the existence of distress labor areas being among those factors considered in the selection of facilities to be retained. If Donovan Corp. and Minneapolis-Moline are selected for this continuity production, they will probably be able to extend operations well into the future.

The MDAP-Army offshore procurement program was developed, pursuant to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, to insure a sound logistic future for NATO and other allied forces which requires that they be able to support themselves in combat from local sources. The establishment of a substantial indigenous production base is prerequisite to attainment of this objective. United States facilities to which offshore procurement of ammunition could be diverted are required to meet United States forces mobilization requirements in the event of an emergency, and should not be considered as a production base for mutual defense assistance program mobilization requirements. In the selection of military items to be produced offshore, emphasis has been placed on items of high combat mortality and those ammunition items in which the greatest deficiencies in United States production would occur in the event of an emergency.

Contracts and awards obligated by the Army worldwide for MDAP offshore procurement of military end items during fiscal year 1953 aggregated $968.7 millions, of which $776.7 millions was obligated for the production of ammunition. This program encompassed the regular MDAP requirements for Europe, the French budgetary support program, and the Pleven commitment which supported requirements for metropolitan France and Indochina, and Far East MDAP and special Far East Command reserve requirements. These items were for consumption of NATO and other allied forces.

As of this date, no obligations have been made during fiscal year 1954 for MDAP-Army offshore procurement. This program is currently being coordinated by the Director of Offshore Procurement, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and has not been finalized. However, planned Army obligations for offshore procurement during this fiscal year are estimated at $540.2 million of which $440.9 million are programed for the procurement of ammunition. Obligation of these funds is dependent upon obtaining contracts satisfactory with respect to prices, quality, and delivery.

As a basis of comparison between the extent of the procurement of ammunition offshore and that being accomplished through United States production, it is pointed out that the dollar value of ammunition deliveries by United States producers during fiscal year 1953 was $2,600 million, deliveries estimated for fiscal year 1954 aggregate $3,500 million, and projected deliveries for fiscal year 1955 are estimated at slightly below $1,500 million. In contrast, the dollar equivalent of deliveries of ammunition contracted offshore in conjunction with MDAP-Army procurement are estimated at $196 million for fiscal year 1954 and at $318 million for fiscal year 1955.

MDAP-Army contracts were awarded offshore during fiscal years 1950 through 1953 in the amount of $1,300,000,000 for the manufacture of military equipment and munitions. The equivalent dollar value of these contracts represented approximately 16 percent of the total MDAP-Army programs during this period. Distribution of contracts by countries was as follows:

	Percent
France	47
Italy	17
United Kingdom	18
Belgium	4
Greece	2
Japan	6

With the remaining 6 percent being distributed among Denmark, Formosa, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Inasmuch as no MDAP-Army offshore procurement contracts have to date been awarded during fiscal year 1954, it is not feasible at this time to forecast a distribution by countries of planned offshore obligations previously cited.

Estimates of the numbers of American workers who are affected adversely by MDAP-Army offshore procurement are not available, and if computed would be highly hypothetical. It is reiterated that production of ammunition being contracted offshore through the MDAP-Army program is for delivery to, and consumption by, NATO and other Allied forces. Funds used are appropriated for foreign aid specifically and are not part of the Army's regular budget. Items procured under MDAP contract offshore are not for United States troops either in this country or overseas. The procurement agencies of the Army are being utilized only as agents in connection with MDAP offshore procurement contracting.

In addition to the MDAP-Army offshore procurement discussed above, approximately $15 million was obligated during fiscal year 1953 and $60 million during fiscal year 1954 for offshore procurement of munitions for consumption by United States forces. In evaluating the effect on United States producers of this $75 million in contracts overseas, it should be borne in mind that generally these items either were required locally in such small quantities and were of such a character that production overseas was more economical, or production of foreign-licensed items was being accomplished for test purposes.

I trust that the detailed information which has been presented herein will satisfactorily comply with your inquiry. Mr. Slezak's letter of February 11 outlined the primary reasons necessitating the actions which are being taken to curtail ammunition production within the United States.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me if I may be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. HIGGINS,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army.

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 23, a Senator made the following statement in this Chamber:

I care not what the State may be, check with the unemployment insurance officials of the State and ask them how much the bread lines in the State have increased in the last few months by way of idle men and women calling for their unemployment checks.

In this regard, I invite the attention of the Senate to a news article which appeared in the February 25, 1954, issue of the Baltimore Sun, under the

headline "Employment in State Rises," and Mr. President, I would therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, the complete text of this article.

Also, Mr. President, on the same subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, an interesting article from the February 12, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 25, 1954]

EMPLOYMENT IN STATE RISES—DROP IN COMPENSATION PAYMENTS REFLECTS JOB GAIN

Unemployment in Maryland, as reflected by State compensation payments, is showing a slight decline, Daniel E. Klein, chairman of the employment security board, announced yesterday.

In effect, this could mean that more jobs are becoming available in the Maryland area, for it shows that less jobless persons are applying for or drawing unemployment compensation.

DECLINE IN ALL THREE CATEGORIES

Mr. Klein said that this finding is based on an analysis of trends that developed in the unemployment compensation program in the State during the last 2 weeks in January.

Also, the week ending February 20 showed a decline in all three categories observed, namely, the number of new claims filed, the total number of compensation checks paid and the amount of money paid in benefits.

In comparison to the same 8-week period last year, the three categories show the following change:

	1953	1954
New claims	23,342	48,033
Total checks paid	99,909	192,117
Total amount paid	$2,007,769	$4,614,377

Mr. Klein said yesterday that about $375,000 of the increase in benefits is due from an increase of $5 in the maximum weekly benefit amount, raising it from $25 to $30, which became effective last June 1.

DROP IN NEW CLAIMS

For the week ending January 2, the records show that 7,883 new claims were filed, and 17,686 checks were mailed totaling $421,514.

By February 20, the new claims had dropped to 3,945, although the number of checks had increased to 26,106, totaling payments of $632,884.

[From U. S. News & World Report of February 12, 1954]

JOBS IN UNITED STATES STILL PLENTIFUL—MOST PERSONS CHOOSY AS TO WORK AND PAY THEY'LL ACCEPT

Jobs remain plentiful in the United States even though unemployment is reported to be rising a bit. In fact, more people are at work today than have usually been working in most of the booming postwar years.

Actually, by ordinary standards, the country is enjoying practically full employment. Nearly 60 million people have steady jobs—a goal that was regarded as close to fantastic only 10 years ago—and less than 4 percent of the labor force is counted as jobless. Not so long ago, New Deal economists were saying that, if unemployment could be held to 5 percent of the labor force, the country would really be enjoying full employment.

There also are quite a number of prospective employers who are looking for workers. Householders still find it difficult to get workmen promptly for needed repairs or improvements. Maids are few and cooks have virtually gone out of fashion. Farmers have been getting along year after year with fewer and fewer hired hands, not so much because they need less help but because they can't find help. The help wanted columns of most city newspapers at this time heavily outweigh the positions wanted ads.

These are all signs that the vast majority of American workers still are able to find employment. Their pay, moreover, stays high. The average hourly earnings of factory workers are higher than they ever have been, although weekly pay checks often are trimmed a bit because a good many plants have reduced overtime. The Commerce Department finds that fewer factory workers now are putting in extra hours than at any time since early 1950.

What this means, really, is that American industry no longer is operating under forced draft, as it had been since the Korean war began. Most of the evidence to date suggests that the dip in business activity that began in the middle of 1953 is simply an adjustment closer to a normal rate of operations. It could mean, further, a more efficient rate of operation and perhaps a prelude to some price cuts as industry manages to reduce costs.

JOBS LOST

In this process, some workers have lost jobs. Unemployment now is about 500,000 more than a year ago. A good bit of this increase, however, involves women, young people and older workers. The great bulk of men between 25 and 65 years of age, the customary breadwinners of American families, are holding down jobs. Among the total number of jobless, only about half are men 25 and older.

In few communities is unemployment a severe problem. The only areas of real distress reported by the Labor Department are in textile and coal-mining centers, whose industries have been relatively depressed for some time.

Most of the workers out of jobs are those without experience and with no skills. In Hartford, Conn., for example, a shortage of skilled workers is reported, although there is a surplus of unskilled help. That condition is fairly typical.

Some of the unemployment now reported also results from the refusal of workers to be downgraded, or persuaded to accept lower paying jobs. During the boom sparked by the Korean war, a good many workers were upgraded and got jobs for which they were not really fitted. Now these marginal workers are being laid off, and many are reluctant to return to their former tasks.

Some union men, too, are reluctant to take jobs outside their industry because they are afraid to risk their seniority standing and their pension rights. They prefer a period of temporary idleness to giving up these benefits.

AID TO JOBLESS

Unemployment insurance often acts to spur this trend. A large portion of workers recently laid off are entitled to unemployment benefits. Sometimes these benefis run as long as 26 weeks, or half a year. That reduces the pressure on people to seek new jobs in different lines of work, or even in different communities. Unemployment benefits buy some of the necessities of life while the worker waits in the hope that his regular job will open up again. In some places it is reported that companies keep unemployment rolls and payrolls in balance by laying off workers who are entitled to benefits and then rehiring people who have exhausted their benefits.

There is a definite expectation, too, that jobs will reopen. Midwest farm-machinery plants are reported to be calling back workers who were furloughed some months ago when production was cut back. Detroit's unemployed auto workers don't expect to stay idle through the year. The textile industry is looking for an upturn in orders before long. Construction workers expect to find jobs when the building industry takes its usual seasonal upturn.

In short, there is nothing in the present picture to indicate that the relatively small numbers of jobless will increase by any large amount, or that those who now hold jobs are about to lose them. Also many of these now listed as "idle" might find work if willing to accept jobs considered by them as unsuited to their skills.

FEWER WORKERS

Figures on employment suggest further that labor, as well as plant, was working under forced draft during the post-Korean boom. In other words, more people held jobs than normally would be looking for jobs. This is indicated by the fact that the labor force—the total number either at work or looking for work—has been shrinking since last summer. People in the labor force now are reported to number almost 600,000 fewer than a year ago.

What happened was that a good many workers, drawn into jobs by the prospect of high pay, just left the labor market when their jobs ran out. In this group are thousands of women who have gone back into their homes, young people who have returned to school, older persons who have retired. The shrinkage in the labor force is evidence that a good many job losses were taken in stride, without hardship. Apparently, a sizable number of workers took jobs in recent years because of choice rather than necessity. When layoffs came, they chose not to look for other jobs.

Another sign of job abundance is disclosed in more detailed figures on where people work. Employment is higher than a year ago in wholesale and retail trade, which ranks next to manufacturing as the most important employer of labor. Banks, insurance companies, and real-estate firms also are employing more workers than a year ago. So, too, are the service industries, which include repair shops, laundries, dry-cleaning establishments, as well as professional services such as engineering, medicine, and law. Commerce Department figures show that wage and salary payments to people outside the producing industries have been quite steady since last August. There is little reflection of a business downturn in these fields.

The want-ad sections of newspapers give further indications of job openings. Many firms are looking for salespeople and office help. There is a strong demand for engineers, draftsmen, machinists, tool and die-makers, and others with high skills. The shortage of schoolteachers is acute and is not expected to be met for several years. Farmers also are pressing the Government for an agreement with Mexico so that the farm-labor situation can be eased.

The downturn in activity, in fact, centers primarily in manufacturing. Even here, there are few signs of outright distress. Factory employment is down from the peak, but it still is higher than the monthly average for any year before 1953. And the Federal Reserve Board index of factory production shows output still to be running substantially ahead of the 1947–49 average.

The end of the boom has brought little evidence that any severe decline is generating in the American economy. What seems to be happening is a gentle settling back to a less hectic pace. After 6 months of this settling process, production continues to be high and sales volume is being well maintained. Prospects are that boom peaks will not be reached again this year, but jobholders appear to have little to worry about.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received numerous letters from constituents who reside in cities in the State of Wisconsin, asking why I take the position that milk and milk products should be placed on a 90-percent parity basis. I have replied to them that the State of Wisconsin produces approximately 16 billion pounds of milk. If the parity price on milk should be reduced 50 cents, it would mean a loss of $80 million in the economic stream of the State of Wisconsin. Persons who write from the cities apparently do not want the support price to be in effect, and I ask them, "What is going to happen to your stores and to the economic life of the State which depends upon that $80 million in Wisconsin's economic life stream?"

I receive letters saying, "We did not understand it that way."

There was a very challenging statement made not long ago by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in which he contended that income-tax exemptions should be increased to $800. If that should be done, it would amount to approximately $5 billion for consumers to spend. The sum of $80 million in my State would mean the difference between economic health and sickness.

Mr. President, it is not simply in the interest of the farmer that we are contending; we are contending in the interest of the general welfare.

A day or two ago one of our distinguished citizens, William O. Purdue, general manager, Pure Milk Products Cooperative, representing more than 18,000 farmers, who produce almost 2 billion pounds of milk, was in Washington speaking on this subject. He made a very challenging suggestion in relation to the surplus problem. I recognize that the problem has two facets: First, the matter of better economic health, and, second, the matter of getting rid of the surplus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from Mr. A. W. Patterson, chairman of the shippers and purchasers committee of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, showing that within the past year individual citizens have shipped abroad some $50 million worth of products, which is a contribution to the solution of the surplus problem, but in the statement of Mr. W. O. Purdue he tackles the problem from another angle. I think the statement is very challenging, and I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 26, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As you will recall, the Congress approved appropriation of $1,825,000 for reimbursement during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, of ocean freight charges on shipment to certain areas of relief supplies by American voluntary agencies including the members of this council listed on the reverse.

Largely as a result of the large amounts of surplus dairy products made available to our agencies on a donation basis by the Department of Agriculture, the volume of our shipments of relief supplies has been substantially greater during the current fiscal year than in previous years. Dried milk, butter, and cheese shipped by voluntary agencies in the current fiscal year have already totaled over 65,000 tons valued at approximately $50 million (on which the Government is no longer required to pay storage charges). When this trend became evident, the Foreign Operations Administration took steps to obtain from the President an additional $2,500,000 to cover these ocean freight reimbursement needs.

The purpose of this letter is twofold:

1. We wish to inform you that reports received from overseas representatives in many countries of our member agencies continue to attest to the effectiveness of this program. Not only are these shipments of American surplus dairy products and other relief supplies making a vital contribution to the relief of human need and suffering, but also the American origin of the goods is widely known to the recipients, as is indicated by the countless letters of thanks and appreciation received by our agency representatives overseas from recipient individuals and organizations in many countries throughout the world.

2. We wish to express our appreciation of the action taken by Congress in voting funds for reimbursement of freight costs on relief shipments by voluntary agencies and to express our conviction that Government freight reimbursement facilities have played an important part in permitting our agencies to help meet human needs throughout the world and thereby create goodwill and friendship for America.

We therefore wish to thank you personally for your part in facilitating this important action by the Congress and to express our hope for continuation of similar support in the coming fiscal year.

Sincerely yours,

A. W. PATTERSON,
Chairman, Shippers and Purchasers Committee.

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO DAIRY PRICE CONTROLS BY WILLIAM O. PURDUE, GENERAL MANAGER, PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE, FOND DU LAC, WIS.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative is the largest milk producers bargaining cooperative in the Nation. We have a membership of dairy farmers in excess of 18,000 residing in the State of Wisconsin.

I appear before you today to appeal to each of you to support the overwhelming majority of farmers in Wisconsin in their pleas to continue price supports for dairy products at not less than 90 percent of parity and to use your influence to bring about the necessary legislation to make this possible.

The proposed cut in dairy support prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture will mean a reduction in income for Wisconsin dairy farmers of at least 65 cents a hundredweight for milk or more than $95 million annually.

This slash in the support program would mean a reduction in income of $10½ million annually to the membership of Pure Milk Products Cooperative alone. Pure Milk Products is the largest milk producers' cooperative in America with a membership of over 18,000. The annual production of this cooperative last year was 1,666,000,000 pounds of milk. It will exceed 1.75 billion this year. At no time have dairy prices sunk to the level of 75 percent of parity since the early days of depression in 1930–33. This cut in supports spells ruin for the American dairy farmer. The reduction from 90 to 75 percent means the lowest percentage of parity realized by dairy farmers in the past 20 years.

In the past year, 90 percent of parity did not yield a 90 percent return for manufactured milk to the dairy farmers of Wisconsin. Support prices in the past year were calculated at approximately $3.34 a hundred pounds of milk used for manufacturing purposes, but actually the farmers in this State only received $3.20 to $3.25 per hundredweight from the major plants.

While major plant operators were paying below support prices to the farmer, the same companies have been in a position to sell their products to the Government at the full 90 percent level. More than one large concern in Wisconsin has purchased milk from producers as currently as December at prices as low as $2.95 per hundredweight and enjoyed a market with the Government of 90 percent of parity or approximately $3.34 a hundredweight yield.

This reduction in supports will not reduce the surplus. Every critical period in prices has shown an increase in milk production on the part of the dairy farmers. Dairy farmers are prone to boost their milk production to keep the level of their income at about the same figure. This procedure can be traced as far back as the records for milk production go for the United States.

The early 1930's was a demonstration of this procedure. Milk production in those days jumped from 100 billion pounds annually to as high as 105 billion pounds.

How did our present increase in production come about? Dairy farmers answered a patriotic call. Dairy farmers all over the Nation were pleaded with by the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and every other agency in the Nation that makes contact with the farmer to increase milk production for the war purposes. They responded by boosting production from a level of 115 billion pounds annually to a high of 120 billion pounds of milk in response to the patriotic call to serve their Nation.

Dairy farmers now are entitled to an opportunity for an orderly retreat from this high production and it cannot be done overnight without the assistance from the same people that brought on the plea for more milk to get into the field and plead with the farmers to reduce their herds.

I believe there are today in the Nation enough "boarders" (low-producing cows) which could be sent to slaughter and reduce milk production of the Nation between 6 and 8 billion pounds annually. This could be done almost overnight with the help from all available agencies.

If the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, chairmen of Agriculture Committees in the House and Senate, county agents, and all other agencies pleaded with the dairy farmers for a nationwide program of production of economy instead of high production, our problem would be solved.

To say the American dairy farmer is surprised by the announcement of the new support program is putting it mildly. Only a few short days ago while I was in Washington, we were given to understand by the Secretary that he would proceed in an orderly manner to reduce support prices by degrees. The President indicated in his message to Congress that this should be the policy. Most dairy farmers believed that the President meant just what he said, that reduction in support prices would not exceed 5 percent of parity. The President in his message said "that agriculture should be protected against too drastic a drop in income" and recommended 5 percent as being the maximum allowed in a single year. He referred to this as an orderly transition. It

is inconceivable for anyone to believe that 15-percent reduction in support levels comes under the head of orderly transition, especially when it means a 25-percent drop in dairy-farm income of our 1954 and 1955 prices are set by this new support level.

If Wisconsin dairy farmers are to be expected to receive in proportion under this program the same treatment they did under the program which will expire April 1, then dairy prices can be expected to drop as low as $2.20 per hundredweight for manufactured dairy products. No industry in America could stand such a reduction in its sale prices while at the same time everything it purchases to bring about these sales has increased.

Dairy farmers continue to pay more for every item they buy to make their production than they did at any time in the past 12 months with a very few exceptions. The board of directors of Pure Milk Products were called for a special session to consider future immediate action with respect to obtaining new legislation nationally to gain at least 90 percent of parity support for dairy products. The cooperative will not cease in its efforts to obtain at least 90 percent of parity. Dairy surplus holdings on the part of the Government which have been singled out almost daily in the newspapers, represent only 2½ months' supply for the Nation. This is not large when compared to Government holdings of other commodities such as wheat, representing 1 year's supply, and cotton and cottonseed oil, representing more than a years supply.

We are solidly behind the principle of removing surpluses and have offered several plans to the Government to remove these surpluses at little or no loss to the Government. I also feel that dairy production should be reduced in an orderly fashion, not in a manner that will spell ruin to dairy farmers and especially those of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin dairy farmers stand to receive the brunt of the most severe agricultural income reduction of all other States in the Nation by the very nature of the Secretary's announcement.

A review of total production by years

	Billion pounds
1930	100
1935	101
1940	109½
1945	121½
1948	115½
1949	119
1950	120½

REDUCTION OF "BOARDERS" (LOW-PRODUCING COWS)

We could eliminate our stockpile of surpluses almost overnight by eliminating the so-called boarders in the Nation's herds, at the rate of 1 to 16. That is to say, if we eliminated 1 out of every 16 cows, which is a conservative figure as a boarder, we could reduce milk production in excess of 5 billion pounds annually.

HOW IT COULD WORK

If we'd take the lowest production per cow with respect to annual production, use the average of 1925 to 1939 when the average dairy cow was producing 4,379 pounds—then use the cow population for 1953 which was estimated at 22,256,000. There would be, conservatively speaking 1,391,000 head of poor producing cows available for culling.

This figure multiplied by the annual production of the lowest figure published recently of 4,379 (1925–39) would give 5.85 million pounds of milk annually as a reduction.

This program has far more merits than has attracted the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture. This program was presented to the Secretary of Agriculture by Pure Milk Products Cooperative, February 6, 1954, in the Secretary's office.

The program was adopted by resolution by the National Milk Producers Federation executive board in session, Friday, February 5, 1954.

The program has a lot more merit if it is to be considered as a method of price support. I will dwell upon that later. It is necessary here to review how we came into this tremendous surplus of production. In 1925 to 1939, our annual milk production was about 100,400,000,000 pounds. In 1940, this production had increased to 109 billion largely because of low milk prices.

Then came World War II, and this is an important era in milk production to review and remember how we came about producing more milk than our Nation would consume. It is a pathetic picture. Every public-spirited person who came in contact with farm people were called upon by the President of the United States, and by the Secretary of Agriculture, by the War Production Board and every public-spirited organization who was trying to be of some patriotic service to his country. These people put on the most dramatic program of pleading with farm people to increase production—increase all phases of agricultural production—for food and fiber. Special emphasis was placed upon milk production. The plea went up that we were desperately short of shipping space for food, and that dairy products could be condensed and dried and take up so much less space than other food items. So dairy farmers were especially singled out to serve their country, and a patriotic plea went up to them to increase milk production—the dairy farmers of America and especially of Wisconsin responded wholeheartedly to this cry of more milk production. They wanted to be patriotic and serve their country. You will recall during this period that huge subsidies were handed out as bait—some not quite in the form of bait to increase milk production.

There were subsidies as high as $1.20 a hundredweight if my memory serves me right, in some of the Southern States. Wisconsin was paid as much as 60 cents a hundredweight to encourage more milk production and as I have said Wisconsin dairy farmers responded beyond the fondest dreams of all of our war agencies. We lifted our milk production from a former high of 115 billion pounds to 119,828,000,000 pounds in 1945. Then the war ended, and there was not so much need for milk production. Shortly thereafter the Korean war came on, and tremendous demands were again made upon the producers of Wisconsin for dairy products for manufactured products. They responded again and continued the high flow of milk.

The point I am trying to make here is that if we as a public-spirited group of American people would put forth the same effort and the same patriotic spirit of saving our agriculture as we did to save the world, then I am quite sure if it was done on a national basis, that farm people again would respond to reason of economy and reduce their herd thereby reduce the milk production, and at the same time increase their prices due to the law of supply and demand, to the point where I believe there would be no need, no legal reason, for price supports, because I believe that milk production would level off to such a point that prices in turn would increase upward to where dairy products for manufacturing purposes as well as fluid milk purposes would soon reach a level of in excess of 90 percent of parity. Let's pursue this reasoning a little bit further and assume that we are seeking a program of price support that would require less outlay of dollars, and at the same time provide food for the starving nations that we are trying to help. Assume the average weight of the average "boarder" cow to be around 1,000 pounds, and assume that the Government wanted to reduce milk production, and not persecute the dairy farmer. It would be a very simple matter to indemnify "boarder" cows at up to 10 cents a pound for beef and have less money involved in these cows than 1 year's production of milk and butter to be supported at the new 75 percent parity level, and believe me, farmers would really get rid of the boarders.

For example: Taking the lowest milk production record since 1925: 4,379 pounds with 172 pounds of butterfat—the butterfat would yield a little over 200 pounds of butter—for example: use 200 pounds at the new 75 percent level, butter would be supported at Chicago at 57½ cents a pound. This would amount to $115 dollars that the Government would have invested in the production of this "boarder" cow for butterfat alone—saying nothing for the amount of skimmed milk that would be produced. The Government could save a minimum of $15 per cow by encouraging farmers to cull their herds and get down to economic milk production, eliminate the surplus and have less dollars involved.

Therefore, I appeal to you as Members of Congress from Wisconsin to use your best efforts to help bring about an orderly retreat in this overproduction of dairy products—bring about a retreat that will not mean financial ruin to the average dairy farmer of America.

In conclusion, I would like to point out another apparent injustice—one that has been passed over—this whole program of supports has been geared to the large type operator—that is the favor has been in the direction of the largest operators. The huge corporation farms of America that produce cotton, corn, and wheat, soy bean operators—these are the farmers that will receive the highest percentage of parity—those are the farmers that need less margin to operate on than the small farmers operating dairy farms.

I believe I am safe in saying that the average dairy farmer of Wisconsin who milks 18 to 20 head of cows has far more money, proportionately, in land and machinery and cattle, invested in his little plant, than the average wheat grower has invested in his tremendous plant. Yet, these dairy farmers have been singled out at the Nations whipping post. They are to be pictured as the one seeking more and more Government help—when as a matter of fact, they are not asking for that—our only plea is that dairy farmers be given equality of treatment, justice of treatment, and an opportunity to survive in an economy of equality. Not that their prices be supported at 75 percent of parity and the commodities they have to buy from brother farms be supported at higher percentages of parity.

We are not asking that supports be brought down, or supports brought up. We are asking that there be an equality among all crops in a comparable manner rather than in an arithmetical manner.

Wisconsin dairy farmers have demonstrated their faith in you. This was done last November—a year ago. They placed their confidence there year after year. They have voted for you. Now, they are asking that you work for and vote for them, and the welfare of all our people of this Nation.

IMPORTS AND SURPLUSES DESTRUCTION OF AMERICAN WORKMEN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator if he includes in his remarks the butter surplus which now confronts the Nation?

Mr. WILEY. When I use the word "surplus" I am speaking particularly in relation to the dried milk and cheese surplus which we have in the State of Wisconsin, and to the butter surplus which

involves butter produced mostly in Minnesota and Iowa.

Mr. MALONE. Do the butter imports from Denmark, Sweden, and the Low Countries aggravate the surplus situation about which the Senator complains?

Mr. WILEY. I think they do, to a certain extent. The quantity is small, but I think it does have an effect upon what we might call the market price.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be interrogated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks increased foreign imports would help to aggravate the surplus in the commodities included in the Senator's complaint.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure it would be a very serious mistake to open the gates to any commodity, whether a manufactured product or anything else, of which we have a surplus in this country.

I have talked to various big business men who have gotten away from the trade-not-aid program as being simply a mythical solution. They recognize that the best market in the world is the United States of America and that 97 percent of it is supplied within our borders. We should not give away that market by attempting to get more markets abroad.

On the other hand, when it comes to the question of trade, there is a field in which we can utilize our surpluses. I shall have something to say with reference to that subject within the next few days. I think it can be done to the advantage of America and to the advantage of other nations.

MORE TAXES AND DEFICITS

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that butter and cheese and dried milk are only 3 of 500 or 600 products as to which the surplus problem is being aggravated at this time. There is a similar problem with reference to zinc, lead, tungsten, oil, crockery, watches, machine tools, textiles, wool, cattle, and several hundred other products which industries are being destroyed with imports from the low-wage and sweatshop labor nations. They are being shipped from other countries, under the State Department trade agreements, and we are now considering coming up with more tax money to solve the problem.

Our only solution for 22 years is more taxes and more deficits. Does that make sense?

Mr. WILEY. I think what the Senator from Nevada implies is that it is necessary to think this problem through. The markets of America cannot be permitted to be flooded by cheap imports. To do so would be perfectly ridiculous. We shall not help the world or help ourselves if we incapacitate ourselves or make ourselves inadequate to meet head on the economic and political problems which are constantly arising.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

CONGRESS ABROGATED ITS CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. I am very much interested in the problem referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that until we can work out of the surplus problem, deliberately created, it will be necessary to continue certain subsidies.

But at the moment the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, named "reciprocal trade" to sell free trade to the American people transfers the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade to the Executive, meaning as it has worked out, the State Department. The State Department has been busily engaged for 22 years in selling the industries of America down the river for a mythical political gain from foreign nations.

So I say to the Senator from Wisconsin if the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is allowed to expire on June 12 of this year, as it will if not again renewed, the regulation of foreign trade reverts to the Tariff Commission as an agent of Congress—and they are directed under existing law to adjust the duties or tariffs on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, and we are back in business.

The Senators and Congressmen are now wearing out their trousers crawling up to a State Department begging them to put an oxygen tent over their industries to prolong their life in competition with like products from the sweatshop labor countries, when the Constitution of the United States—article I, section 8—says it is their job in the first place. It is a humiliating experience just to observe the subservience of Congress.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to comment on that situation. I think what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has in mind is that the so-called reciprocal treaties should be allowed to expire. "Reciprocity" is another term like "trade, not aid." If it is utilized properly, and is really mutual, and if we protect ourselves in the operation of it, reciprocity can be mutually advantageous. If, perhaps, we deal with other nations who do not play according to the rules of the game, and who, after they have agreed, make their own rules and upset the applecart, so to speak, by engaging in practices which are anything but reciprocal, the result, of course, will be disastrous to America.

In further reply, I may say that the world has been shrunken by the inventive genius of man. In January a meeting was held in Washington, at which it was disclosed that two-thirds of the world is in the red, or has a deficit, from the standpoint of dairy products, while one-third of the world seems to have, for the time being, a surplus. The problem is one of distribution of dairy products.

In the State of Wisconsin, speaking along the lines the Senator from Nevada has just mentioned, there are lead and zinc mines. I think we have made a serious mistake in not looking after the welfare of the mining industry in certain portions of our country, so that if a great catastrophe or emergency should arise, those mines would be operating and able to take care of the demands of the Nation.

I think we shall have to be a little more practical in our dealings with certain nations. We shall have to keep our eyes open. As I have said once before, we shall have to have a few Scotchmen dealing for America.

CONGRESS SHOULD REAFFIRM ITS RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MALONE. I respect the Senator from Wisconsin for his views, which are very frankly free trade with such foreign nations; but if the United States Congress continues a course of action in accordance with his views, and continues to abrogate its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade on a purely economic basis, by extending the act beyond June 12, leaving it in the hands of the executive, which inserts the political factor in our dealings with foreign nations, then, in my earnest opinion, this Nation will most certainly average its living standard with such nations, and there is no place for our living standards to go but down.

A report will be coming to the Senate in connection with Senate Resolution 143, which will show the subterfuges foreign countries use to avoid any show of reciprocity.

The report will show the currency manipulations of the foreign countries for the trade advantages. Such countries utilize quotas, specifications, exchange permits, trade permits, subsidization of exports and many other tricks and manipulations to avoid any reciprocity. They simply do not carry out their part of the agreement, they never have, and they never intend to when such agreements are entered into.

The words "reciprocal trade" are mouthed around the Senate on both sides of the aisle. Those two words do not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which was never intended to make trade agreements reciprocal, and the agreements are not reciprocal.

The trade agreements are made by the Department of State, which has been engaged since 1934 in dividing the markets of this country with the foreign nations of the world—our markets are the source of our income.

Until we get our feet back on the ground in this Nation, and until Congress reassumes its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and to fix duties, excises, and imposts on an economic basis, there is nothing the Members of the Senate and the House can do except to keep spending additional money secured from the taxpayers to help depressed areas, which we ourselves have depressed through the trade agreements, by putting industries in those areas which are uneconomic on the face of it or they would be there already; as long as we continue to mouth catchwords and phrases which have been created for us by such foreign nations for 22 years, phrases such as reciprocal trade, dollar shortage, and trade, not aid, just so long will we be hearing complaints such as the distinguished Senator is making here today.

"Trade, not aid," was invented by Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, in November 1952. The junior Senator

from Nevada told that one on him in November of 1952.

The British, including the sterling bloc nations, have secretly laughed at us because we have used their slogans. They never have kept trade agreements, and they never intend to keep them.

IT IS UP TO CONGRESS

Until Congress has the guts to reassume its constitutional responsibility to do for the American public the work it was created to do, it deserves very little credit.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his fairly good résumé of what has happened in some instances, but I am frank to say that reciprocal trade treaties, under the circumstances where the nations have kept faith, have proved, time and time again, to be mutually beneficial.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to have the Senator cite one example of a country that has kept a trade agreement made under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. WILEY. If there is anything to indicate that Congress has been remiss, I think the Senator would be remiss if he did not show in what respect the machinery does not work. If it is found that an international partner or nation with whom we are entering into trade agreements does not play the game, then we should simply have adequate machinery available to dispose of such an agreement immediately and to cancel it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

LET THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT EXPIRE—THREE METHODS OF DESTRUCTION

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that Congress has such machinery, and it is in good working order, except that Congress abrogated its constitutional responsibility through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act — so-called reciprocal trade—as extended—it now expires on June 12, 1954.

This act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to the executive branch, meaning, as it worked out, the State Department, which does not know an industry from a bale of hay, and for 22 years they have been busily engaged in transferring the jobs and investments to the low-wage-standard-of-living nations. The State Department is always after some fancied political advantage, but they have never ended up with either a political or a financial advantage. I defy the Senator to name one instance in which a trade agreement ever has been kept by a foreign country.

There are three approaches to destroy this Nation:

First. The political approach, identified as communism. This approach did not start yesterday. It started with the recognition of Communist Russia in 1933.

Second. The economic approach, the foundation of which is the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, transferring the responsibility of Congress—article I, section 8, of the Constitution—to regulate foreign commerce and to adjust the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs and import fees, to the executive. GATT, General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, organized at Geneva, is based upon the act. The International Trade Organization, ITO, and its successor, is based on GATT. The whole house of cards for world-cartel control crumbles with the expiration of the act.

Third. The constitutional approach, which the Bricker amendment was meant to halt—that of executive agreements and commitments with proper authority.

Mr. WILEY. I do not desire to pursue the matter further. What I had in mind at the outset, and I repeat it, is that I cannot believe the administration would want to see a State, like my own State of Wisconsin, suffer. Wisconsin has been self-supporting; it has never asked for Government aid in any enterprise. It is a State which is about 50 percent agricultural and about 50 percent industrial, making a really balanced setup, and is made up of sturdy folks from Europe and their descendants, who, on the good basis of self-initiative and work, have built up the State to the point where I think it is about the best-balanced State in the Union, economically, politically, and otherwise.

The point I am trying to make in my brief remarks is that we must not, in the pursuit of far-off buyers, forget ourselves. Even the Good Book contains a lesson to that effect, when it says that he who does not look after his own is himself unworthy of being helped.

I am satisfied a solution can be found for the problem of the surplus if we attempt to solve it, but we must not make the surplus an excuse to paralyze the economic growth of a great commonwealth like Wisconsin. That was the reason I rose to make these remarks.

Mr. President, I now desire to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

FEDERAL AID TO NEEDY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a taxpayer in the Poynette School District which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. This letter points out the plight of the needy school districts which fully qualify under Federal school-aid regulations, but which cannot receive funds because of insufficient appropriations.

My own feeling is that, if the Congress agrees on the value of a policy of Federal aid to schools in defense areas, then it should be willing to support that policy with adequate funds.

I doubt if a single legislator would quarrel with the vital need for proper education for our young folks. This generation of post-World War II children should not be denied the privileges of adequate schooling merely because they happened to be born at this particular time.

We cannot postpone consideration of this problem. As parents and grandparents, we in the Congress must face up to it today, while the children are growing. I for one intend to give my support to adequate Federal funds for education in distress areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter I have received from Mr. James F. Clark, an attorney of Madison.

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

ELA, CHRISTIANSON & ELA,
Madison, Wis., February 18, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter to me in answer to my inquiry regarding the application for Federal aid by the Poynette School District, application No. 54–C–402 and No. 54–E–507, filed pursuant to Public Laws 246 and 874.

We understand that our school district was denied building aids pursuant to application No. 54–C–402 filed under Public Law 246 because of the insufficiency of the appropriation of funds to pay the aid to all districts which qualified and that therefore the aid was paid to those districts which had the highest priority in terms of need.

As a taxpayer in the Poynette School District and on behalf of your constituents and the school board of that district we respectfully request that you use your influence and direct your efforts toward the adoption of legislation which would provide the necessary appropriations to cover the application for aid of all districts which are qualified to receive the same under the law but which have been denied the same solely because of insufficient funds. We in the Poynette district are only too appreciative of the desperate situation facing many school districts in our country because of insufficient funds to build proper school facilities for the increasing number of young Americans who must be educated, many of whose parents are working in Federal or federally subsidized plants.

I can truthfully say that everyone with whom I have talked in our district and in the surrounding areas of the State is heartily in favor of more Federal aid to school districts both for building and operational purposes.

Thank you sincerely for your cooperation in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES F. CLARK.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter I have received from Mrs. Marian W. Epton, of Portland, who is State chairman of national defense of the Oregon Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commending the Governor of Oregon for his proclamation of February as American history month in Oregon.

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

OREGON SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1954.

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: In response to a request which I made to Governor Patterson on behalf of the Oregon State Society, DAR,

the Governor has issued the following proclamation which you may like to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Recognizing the splendid efforts of the Daughters of the American Revolution in fostering greater interest in American history and realizing the urgent need of a rededication of our people to the full appreciation of our glorious record of development, Gov. Paul L. Patterson has designated the month of February as American History Month.

"Governor Patterson urged all to give special observance and that our public schools, colleges, and universities give primacy to the study of American history."

Yours sincerely,

MARIAN W. EATON.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8069, an act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Let me say that I have discussed this matter with the minority leadership. The bill is one which was under consideration last week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8069) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we are about to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, from the point where the last call of the calendar ended—in other words, to begin with Calendar No. 935, Senate bill 2728, to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes.

In a moment I shall suggest the absence of a quorum; but at this time I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be considered first, during the call of the calendar, instead of at the end of the calendar call, a bill which it was agreed, at the last call of the calendar, would be called during this call of the calendar. I refer to Calendar No. 373, Senate bill 1691, to authorize the Potomac Electric Power Company to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue, NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Burke	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bush	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Carlson	Hunt	Payne
Case	Ives	Potter
Chavez	Jackson	Purtell
Clements	Jenner	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Duff	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Magnuson	Williams
Gillette	Malone	Young
Goldwater	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). A quorum is present.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION WORK BY POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order previously entered, the clerk will call Calendar No. 373, Senate bill 1691.

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, which amendments had been agreed to on July 28, 1953.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that they have heretofore been agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on February 5, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], after conferring with other Senators who had considered the bill, submitted certain amendments which he had intended to propose at this time. It was his intention that the amendments be printed and lie on the table, but they were referred to the District Committee, which has not had a meeting, and therefore has had no opportunity to act on the amendments. Therefore, I send to the desk at this time amendments identical with those previously submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, and ask that they be read and considered en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, beginning with line 7, it is proposed to strike all of section 3 down to and including line 11 on page 5.

On page 5, line 12, it is proposed to strike "SEC. 4." and in lieu thereof insert "SEC. 3."

On page 5, after line 20, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to authorize any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks, or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad equipment by and between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. via the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that this section shall not preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue, or preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service described in this section when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue, or when necessary for construction of facilities described in section 1 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendments are rather complicated. Before they are agreed to, I believe it would be in order for the distinguished Senator from Maine to make an explanation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the first amendment I have proposed strikes all of section 3 of the bill. When the bill was first reported by the District Committee, Potomac Electric Power Co. felt that it would need authority to acquire some of the property of Capital Transit Co. which lies near the bridge authorized by this bill. The power company is now satisfied that it will not have to have the condemnation authority provided by section 3 to construct the proposed bridge, and to meet an objection of the Capital Transit Co., has agreed to the elimination of section 3.

The second amendment proposed merely renumbers the following section as section 3.

The third and final amendment proposed is designed to meet the objections of those parties having an interest in the arrangement by which coal is delivered to the power company's Benning plant by a combined use of the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the East Washington Railway Co., and the Capital Transit Co. It merely states that the authority to build the bridge at Foote Street shall not be construed to authorize any construction, relocation, or removal of tracks or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation to the Benning plant over these combined facilities. The committee, in considering this bill, clearly understood that this alternative route to the Benning plant would not be disturbed by this bill and is glad to have this clarifying amendment which will remove any doubt on this point.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to say that the pending bill was previously passed on a call of the calendar and then restored to the calendar, after action on it had been vacated, at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Other Senators who also indicated an interest in the bill felt that as originally drafted and introduced by me the bill confiscated some existing rights. My understanding is that the form of the bill as now presented is satisfactory to all parties concerned, and that it does not in any sense confiscate any rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction and operation of the crossings, tracks, and other facilities authorized by this act, and that—

SECTION 1. Potomac Electric Power Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States of America relating to the District of Columbia and a domestic corporation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain in the District of Columbia railroad tracks providing a direct connection between the area bounded by Kenilworth Avenue NE., Benning Road NE., Foote Street NE., and the Anacostia River (hereinafter called the Benning plant area) and the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in parcels 176/100 and 176/101 in said District; to construct, operate, and maintain an overhead bridge carrying such tracks across said Kenilworth Avenue NE.; and to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area all such industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections as in the opinion of said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns, may be or become necessary or expedient or advisable for the development and use of the Benning plant area for such uses as may now or hereafter be permitted by or under the zoning regulations and maps of the District of Columbia as now or at any time hereafter in effect; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, until said overhead bridge is completed and ready for operation, to construct, operate, and maintain across said Kenilworth Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, a railroad-track crossing at grade to provide a direct connection between the Benning plant area and said right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and from said crossing at grade to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections to the extent hereinabove authorized; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, in connection with the tracks, crossings, and other facilities herein authorized, to construct, operate, and maintain such electrical or other equipment and installations as in its opinion may be necessary, expedient, or advisable for the operation of said tracks, crossings, and other facilities: *Provided*, That upon completion of said overhead bridge, but not later than 1 year from the date of approval of this act or within such further period of time as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall permit, said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, shall remove from said Kenilworth Avenue said temporary railroad track crossing said avenue at grade authorized by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. Before any portion of the construction work authorized by section 1 of this act shall be begun on the ground, a plan or plans for such portion shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their approval, and only to the extent that such plan or plans shall be approved by said Commissioners shall such portion of the construction work herein authorized be permitted or undertaken: *Provided, however*, That such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld by said Commissioners.

SEC. 3. Said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to permit any railroad company or companies to use the bridge, Kenilworth Avenue grade crossing, industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, siding, and connections authorized by section 1 of this act to the extent deemed necessary or expedient or advisable by said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 4. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to authorize any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks, or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad equipment by and between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. via the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that this section shall not preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue, or preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service described in this section when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue, or when necessary for construction of facilities described in section 1 of this act.

COLLECTION OF INDEBTEDNESS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now proceed with the call of the calendar beginning with Order of Business 935, Senate bill 2728.

The bill (S. 2728) to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over for further study. I object to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

RENEWAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CARRYING MAIL ON WATER ROUTES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 361) to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 361 was reported favorably by the committee with the following amendments: The word "inland" preceding the words "water route" was deleted which removed the restriction confining the routes to the continental United States. The remaining changes are necessary to make the proposed legislation conform to existing law which earlier amendments modified.

The extension of the desirable provisions applicable with respect to star-route contracts to contracts for water-route service should result in many instances in eliminating the necessity of terminating contracts and inviting new proposals for service, since there is little turnover in contractors at the end of the 4-year contract period. The giving of weight to satisfactory performance as the basis for continuation of their services will result in better morale among the contractors and provide added protection against the losses incurred in investment through underbidding of contracts.

The Postmaster General may renew the contract without advertising route for bids, where the service has been satisfactory, with the original contractor or where the original contractor has failed to give notice of his desire to renew the contract within 90 days, the Postmaster General may award the contract to the subcontractor operating thereunder. It gives the Postmaster General in his discretion, with the consent of the contractor, the right to readjust the compensation paid under the contract for increased or decreased cost occasioned by changed conditions during the term of the contract that could not have been anticipated at the time of the original or renewed contract.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the bill go so far as to include sea transportation?

Mr. CARLSON. It provides for contracts for water route service. It extends the provisions which now apply to star route contractors with regard to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of compensation under the contracts.

Mr. GORE. Was not the bill amended to grant the same privilege to ocean-going vessels carrying mails?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. It was amended to include the provision which he has suggested. Such amendment had the approval of all the departments concerned.

Mr. GORE. What was the position of the Post Office Department with respect to the bill after the amendment was added.

Mr. CARLSON. So far as I know, the Department favored the provision. It had its representatives at the hearing when the amendment was proposed and discussed and adopted. Therefore, I understand that it had the approval of the Post Office Department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am informed that the bill would cover a great many contracts, and that since ocean mail has been added it is now a bill dealing with large contracts, whereas

the bill as originally introduced merely provided relief for star route carriers.

Mr. CARLSON. If there is any question about whether it has departmental approval, I would be willing to have the bill go over.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee would be prepared to withhold his objection if the proposed amendment were stricken out, but he would not be prepared to allow the bill to pass at this time with the amendment in the bill. Therefore, if the distinguished Senator would not object, I would suggest that the bill go over.

Mr. CARLSON. Personally, I would be happy to have the bill go over, because I wish to check into it further myself.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAILS ON MOTOR-VEHICLE ROUTES

The bill (S. 2773) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756) was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2773 authorizes the Postmaster General to use his discretion in contracting or using Government-owned motor vehicles for the transportation and distribution of mails.

The committee reported the bill favorably with two amendments. The first amendment on page 1, line 8, provides that the Postmaster General would have the option either of using private contract or Government-owned motor vehicles. The second amendment is on page 1, line 9. The clerks covered therein are now known as "postal transportation clerks" instead of "railway postal clerks."

This proposed legislation removes the restriction which prohibits the establishment and operation of motor-vehicle service, equipped to distribute mail en route, where adequate railroad facilities are available. Under the present law, the Postmaster General is only authorized to contract for the carrying of mails and railway postal clerks on routes between points where it is found that railroad facilities are inadequate or are not available.

S. 2773 will allow the Postmaster General at his discretion to contract or use Government-owned motor vehicles for the transportation and distribution of mail en route. The new yardsticks to be now applied will be that of economy and service and the extended latitude for establishing highway post offices, such as are provided herein, will give the desired flexibility of schedules and service. They will be controlled by the needs of the Post Office Department and made to conform to their service needs rather than to conform to passenger needs as in the railroad service.

It is believed that by the removal of this restrictive provision which prevents free competition and by the proper administration in its freedom to choose the most efficient and economical methods of transportation of mails, the Post Office Department can offer greater service to its patrons at lower cost.

The Postmaster General, Bureau of the Budget, and Comptroller General recommend favorable consideration of this legislation in their reports.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have a particular case in mind in the State which I have the honor in part to represent. The Post Office Department seems to be quite eager to eliminate railway service to an important town in my State. The citizens of the community are very much opposed to the elimination. Under the bill, as I understood the explanation, the Postmaster General would be given complete discretionary authority to change the railway mail service to highway post office service and truck service. Does the bill include also bus service?

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that is correct. Under the amendment the Post Office Department is authorized to set up a motor carrier mail service. In addition to the federally owned and operated trucks, the Post Office Department would be authorized to make contracts with private carriers, which it cannot do at the present time.

Mr. GORE. May I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Kansas if there was a division in the committee on the bill, or whether the action of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to state that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and the members of the committee hoped it would receive early approval because there was a need for the proposed legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withhold objection to the bill. I do not object, Mr. President.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the bill is to save money for the Post Office Department, is it not?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; and also to improve the service in communities where train service is being removed.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2773) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756), which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, in line 8, after the word "to," to insert "use Government-owned motor vehicles or," and in line 10, after the word "and," to strike out "railway postal clerks" and insert "postal transportation clerks," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756), is hereby amended by striking out that part which precedes the first proviso and by inserting, in lieu thereof, the following: "The Postmaster General is authorized to use Government-owned motor vehicles or contract for carrying the mails and postal transportation clerks on routes between points where, in his judgment, conditions justify the operation of such service in motor vehicles especially designed and equipped for the distribution of mail en route."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 60 provides for the approval by the Congress of approximately 929 cases which have been recommended by the Attorney General for adjustment of immigration status to that of permanent residence. Appropriate quota charges are made in each case.

These cases were under the old immigration law, pursuant to which the Attorney General was empowered to suspend deportation of certain limited types of cases and to adjust the status of the alien involved to that of permanent residence, but his action is subject to affirmative congressional approval. Each of these cases has been carefully scrutinized for eligibility and for merit and their approval is recommended.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. By whom were the beneficiaries scrutinized, and who made the recommendations?

Mr. LANGER. They were scrutinized, first, by the Immigration Service, and then by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Was there a written recommendation?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, yes. This is under the old law.

Under the new law, the Immigration and Nationality Act, the categories of suspension cases requiring affirmative congressional approval have been limited so that affirmative congressional approval will be required only in those cases of suspension of deportation in which an adjustment of status is made for an alien in the criminal, subversive or other restricted categories.

Each case is gone into very carefully and reported to the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of this concurrent resolution see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1954, p. 1711.)

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of this resolution see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1954, p. 1715.)

MRS. ELEANOR EMILIE NELL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I find there is no report from the Department of Justice on this bill. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee will give us an explanation of why the Justice Department has not made a report on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, first of all, I shall give a report on the bill.

This bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 23-year-old native and citizen of Germany who last entered the United States on August 22, 1952, as a visitor to attend the funeral of her deceased husband who had been serving with our Armed Forces in Germany at the time of his death. The beneficiary is presently residing with her husband's mother, and, except for the death of her husband, she would have been eligible to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant as the wife of a United States citizen.

This case was brought to my attention by the American Legion of the State of North Dakota. An American soldier had married in Germany and had died, and the widow is now living with her mother-in-law.

There was a report made on July 30, 1953, by the Department of Justice. I read:

JULY 30, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request of the Department of Justice for a report relative to the bill (S. 507) for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell, there is annexed a memorandum of information from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files concerning the beneficiary.

The bill would grant the alien permanent residence in the United States upon payment of the required visa fee. It would also direct that one number be deducted from the appropriate immigration quota.

The alien is chargeable to the quota of Germany, which is not oversubscribed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield further?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What explanation does the distinguished Senator have for the lack of a Justice Department report on this bill? Is there a change in policy?

Mr. LANGER. No. The Acting Commissioner is an agent of the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has full charge of immigration and naturalization and names the Commissioner of Immigration. The Commissioner of Immigration once in a while goes to foreign countries, and during his absence there is an Acting Commissioner.

Mr. GORE. Does that same situation hold true with respect to other private immigration bills on the calendar?

Mr. LANGER. It holds true in certain cases, and in others it does not. It depends upon who makes the examination. There is a memorandum attached to the report which goes into the matter very fully. In other words, it has been approved by the Department of Justice.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I can follow the conclusion which the distinguished Senator reaches. I hesitate to object to the passage of a bill with reference to which the Senator gives such assurances. I wonder whether he would object if the bill should go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to its going over until next week.

Mr. GORE. That would be better.

Mr. LANGER. I am perfectly willing to have it taken up next week.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JULIE NICOLA FRANGOU

The bill (S. 662) for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julie Nicola Frangou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DAVID T. WRIGHT

The bill (S. 893) for the relief of David T. Wright was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? It involves the sum of $617.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the proposed legislation would pay to David T. Wright, Berkeley, Calif., the sum of $617 to reimburse him for losses suffered as a result of his being discharged during 1951 from his position as a steamfitter with a private contractor at Fort Richardson, Alaska, because of a determination by the United States Army, later found erroneous, that the claimant was a poor security risk.

This mistake was due to the fact that the Army confused the claimant with another individual of the same name. As a result, the claimant was forced to return to his home in California at his own expense, and to secure other employment.

The claimant asks reimbursement in the sum of $617 to cover transportation costs, travel time, and loss of salary during 10 days until he secured other employment after his untimely discharge.

The claimant cannot recover under the Federal Tort Claims Act, since, in this instance, the Army's mistake resulted from the exercise of a discretionary duty to which the Federal Tort Claims Act does not apply.

The Depatrment of the Army has no objection to the granting of an award in a reasonable amount.

The Bureau of the Budget makes no objection to the Army's report.

Does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee follow me?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, here is a man having the same name as another man who was found to be a bad security risk.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with that explanation, I have no objection to the passage of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David T. Wright, 1525 One Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Berkeley, Calif., the sum of $617, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of losses suffered as a result of his being discharged in September 1951, from his position as a steam fitter for the Urban Plumbing and Heating Co. at Fort Richardson, Alaska, because of a determination by the United States Army, later found erroneous, that he was a poor security risk: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AUGUSTA BLEYS (ALSO KNOWN AS AUGUSTINA BLEYS)

The bill (S. 915) for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill. I observe that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, the author of the bill, is in the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill would permit Augusta Bleys, also known as Augustina Bleys, to remain in the United States and to become a citizen. Mrs. Bleys came to the United States in 1949 as a teacher and nurse for a British consul, who later returned to Great Britain. She is a native of Holland. She was born in 1912. Mrs. Bleys has remained in this country since the return to Great Britain of the British consul by whom she was employed.

She took a course at Glocker-Penrose Hospital, in Colorado Springs. She is not a registered nurse, but is a practical nurse.

She is also a very talented and accomplished musician. She plays the flute

with the Denver Symphony Orchestra. She is a very splendid person in every respect. Unless the bill is enacted she will be deported. Mrs. Bleys is the kind of person who, I am certain, we desire to have become a citizen of the United States. If she is permitted to become a citizen in accordance with the bill, her entrance into the United States will be subtracted from the quota of Holland, so it will not mean that she will be received into this country in addition to the number permitted in the quota. If Mrs. Bleys is permitted to enter the country, it will mean that the United States will have the advantage of a very talented musician and a very splendid citizen, and a fine woman.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CLEOPATRA STAVROS MILIONIS

The bill (S. 929) for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cleopatra Stavros Milionis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. UHENG KHOO

The bill (S. 1209) for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I observe that the able senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the sponsor of the bill, is in the Chamber. I wonder if he will explain the bill.

Mr. BUSH. The distinguished junior Senator from Florida does me great honor. This is a bill which I introduced. Dr. Uheng Khoo is a woman who has been very highly recommended to me by Dr. Edmund Sinnott, dean of the graduate school of Yale University, and also head of the department of science at Yale University. She has also been recommended by Dr. James G. Horsfall, director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.

Mrs. Khoo was a British national of Chinese parentage. She was born in Malaya in 1921. I shall not go into her entire background, but the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned, in whom I have absolute confidence, speak of her as a young woman whose good character goes along with her excellent qualifications. I have no hesitancy whatsoever in recommending favorable action on the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Uheng Khoo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTATE OF SUSIE LEE SPENCER

The bill (S. 1265) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. This bill proposes to pay the sum of $7,500 to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., a Federal employee who was killed in 1943 during the course of her employment. Death resulted from the negligence of a fellow employee. The claim of her husband for death compensation under the provisions of the Federal employees Compensation Act was denied upon the ground that he was not fully dependent upon her for support at the time of her death.

The Department of Labor opposed an identical bill of the last Congress on the ground that it was contrary to the underlying principles of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. It observed that the act is aimed at compensating employees for loss of wage-earning capacity upon which they are dependent, and that it provides for equal treatment of employees. The Department of Justice concurred in the views of the Department of Labor.

Identical bills passed the 81st and 82d Congresses, but were vetoed by the President. Both veto messages were predicated upon the ground that the Employees Compensation Act is limited to those persons who are wholly dependent for support upon the deceased employee at the time of death.

The committee believes that this claim should not be so narrowly confined. The fact that the present claimant was not wholly dependent upon his wife, and for that reason alone his application for compensation under the act was denied, does not operate to bar claimant from petitioning the Government for a redress of grievances.

In considering this claim under the general rules governing tort liability in accordance with the rule of the place where the act occurred, and with special cognizance of the findings of the Navy's investigating officer, the committee is constrained to view this claim favorably, and in doing so it is acting upon a petition for redress of grievances presented by the claimant. The committee intends no circumvention of the Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would not the Federal Tort Claims Act provide relief in this case?

Mr. LANGER. No; it would not.

Mr. GORE. Is it because this case is not within the jurisdiction of that act?

Mr. LANGER. It is not within its jurisdiction. As I said a moment ago, previous legislation in behalf of this claimant was twice vetoed by the President on the ground that the Federal Tort Claims Act applied. As a matter of fact, it does not.

I do not know of a case which the committee has considered more carefully than it has this case, because of the fact that it might establish a precedent. I may say that the bill was reported unanimously after the committee had gone into the matter in great detail, with all members of the committee being present.

Mr. GORE. I do not understand what the able Senator from North Dakota said about the bill establishing a precedent.

Mr. LANGER. I said the committee went into the matter very carefully, because we did not wish to present a bill which might have established a precedent on the part of the committee itself. The committee considered the case solely and purely upon the merits, as it was presented by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. GORE. Will the bill, if passed, establish a precedent?

Mr. LANGER. The committee does not think so. We think that under the peculiar circumstances and the peculiar set of facts involved, a precedent would not be established. As a matter of fact, the person concerned was not covered by the Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. GORE. Was the decision on the part of the committee actuated purely by the equities in this particular case?

Mr. LANGER. Solely by the equities in this particular case. The committee is of the opinion that the bill is not unlike many others previously considered favorably by Congress and approved by the President, granting monetary relief to the surviving spouses who have died from injuries caused by the negligence of an employee of the Government. The committee, therefore, recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for

a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, of Spartanburg, S. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Susie Lee Spencer sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Navy locomotive at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Va., on December 11, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AND OTHER ACTS—BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have called out of order Calendar No. 1037, S. 2846, because it is necessary for me to leave the floor in order to attend a committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill S. 2846) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, the Trust Indenture Act of 1939, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. It is not my intention to ask for action on or to explain the bill today. I asked that it be called because I shall object to its consideration. I think the bill deserves very careful consideration by the Senate. It represents a great deal of work and a very thorough review of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. I think the questions involved are too important to be dealt with on the basis of a bill to which there is no objection. For that reason I object to the immediate consideration of the bill, and I thank the distinguished Senators for their courtesy in allowing me to have the bill called out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FRANKLIN JIM

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 970, H. R. 1883, be taken up out of order. I am in somewhat the same situation as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, since I shall have to leave almost immediately to attend a committee meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to strike out "to the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor" and to insert in lieu thereof "Franklin Jim, a."

Mr. GORE. Before the amendment is considered, I wish to reserve the right to object to the consideration of the bill at this time. The bill proposes a grant to a boy for an accident, and, so far as I am able to learn from the report, the liability of the United States Government is not clearly established. It may be that the author of the bill has information which I do not have. Before consenting to its present consideration, I desire to have an explanation of the liability of the Government.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is deeply interested in the bill, because it is for the purpose of partially compensating an Oklahoma Indian who, as a 13-year old boy, was attending an Indian boarding school at Pawnee, Okla. His name is Franklin Jim. He is a full-blooded Pawnee Indian. He and some other boys were assigned to assist in the operation of a sorghum mill.

Mr. GORE. By whom was the assignment of duty made?

Mr. KERR. The assignment of duty was made by the principal of the school.

I shall read to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a quotation from the statement by L. E. Larson, principal of the school:

As principal, I assume primary responsibility for permitting the operation of a machine with exposed gears. I am familiar with various regulations on safety, but the oversight occurred because it was a rented machine and only operated 2 or 3 days each year. Usually it was operated only by adults. Mr. Overman, Mr. Morris, Mr. Lane, and Mr. Walquist all share with me, in a degree, the responsibility for the accident. Each of these four men should have voiced vigorous protest at boys working near the machine. All were deeply shocked and grieved that the accident occurred. Boys are never permitted to drive tractors, disks, drills, or other power implements. This was the one exception and we paid for it.

This 13-year old boy was taken off one job where he was working in the building and, by the order of the principal or one of the teachers, directed to work at the sorghum mill. He protested against it, but was directed to go ahead and do the work assigned to him. In doing it, this accident occurred, by reason of exposed gears in a machine which violated not only the safety rules of the State of Oklahoma, but those which reasonable prudence would have dictated. The result was that the boy lost most of his left hand.

Franklin Jim has been seeking to be compensated for a number of years in order to finish his education. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to a statement in the report showing what has happened to the young man since that time.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator reads that, will he yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. In the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, was the teacher clearly acting as an agent of the United States Government when making the assignment of duty to the students?

Mr. KERR. I cannot believe other than that that would be the necessary interpretation. The 13-year-old boy was in a school, and under the supervision and control of those in charge of the school, and he had no choice but to do that which was assigned to him to do.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the report contains a story which has a great deal of human appeal to it. This young man was admitted to the Pawnee-Ponca Hospital, at Pawnee, Okla., on October 10, 1945. The diagnosis was a crushing wound of the left hand. The treatment was amputation of the thumb, second, third, and four fingers of the left hand. He was dismissed on November 16, 1945.

During the summer of 1950 he had to go to the hospital at Tulsa, Okla., where he had a finger stump removed to facilitate use of the rest of the hand. Assistance for the operation was provided by the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service.

Because of the failure of the Government to meet its responsibility, this claimant, then a boy, now a young man, has had a very rugged experience, while seeking assistance from the vocational rehabilitation service, assistance in the way of an Indian Service educational loan back in 1950 and 1951, and further assistance to continue his college education through an additional educational loan.

Because of what happened to Franklin Jim under the circumstances described, he is physically disabled from working as an average American citizen. Therefore, in the interest of his own welfare, and in order to enable him to take care of himself and the family which he hopes to have, he is compelled to educate himself so that he may make a living in a more highly useful occupation than that of a day laborer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is an able lawyer and a very responsible Member of the United States Senate. As author of the bill, if he states that upon his considered judgment there is liability on the part of the Government, then I shall accept his opinion.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for his statement. I say to the distinguished Senator that this young man is not permitted to go into court and establish his claim. His only recourse is to appeal to the Congress of the United States. I think every element of justice and equity would indicate a direct and affirmative answer to the question asked by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma.

If the Senator will yield further, I had some question about the amount of the payment. Is the Senator satisfied that $5,000 should be disbursed in this case?

Mr. KERR. I think $5,000 is inadequate. In the report there is a notation that in the 82d Congress a bill was enacted which provided for the payment of $5,000 to Harvey Marden for similar injuries which occurred in the United States Government laundry at the Mescalero Indian School in Mescalero, N. Mex., in 1932, which bill became Private Law 278 of the 82d Congress.

I really think the amount is inadequate and that, as I have indicated, it is fully justified.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in connection with this bill, I should like to say that the majority calendar committee has studied this case and desires that ample consideration be given to it. I believe there was liability, and, furthermore, judging from the statement of the superintendent of schools, negligence was almost admitted.

However, I should like to address a question to some member of the Judiciary Committee. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has raised a question about the amount of the claim. What is the policy of the committee in regard to considering a resolution which would simply refer all such cases to the Court of Claims for determination of the actual damages?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from Kentucky, let me say that, in the first place, I doubt that the Court of Claims would have jurisdiction over such cases. In the second place, the Judiciary Committee can handle such matters much better than they could be handled downtown.

When the bill came to the committee, we considered all extenuating circumstances. We took into account the fact that the boy had been given some aid by way of education and had been carried along on the reservation, and not completely cut loose. We thought that under the circumstances the amount of $5,000 was a reasonable and adequate recovery in this particular case.

Mr. COOPER. Even though the committee might believe there is liability in such cases, it could, by means of an appropriate resolution, refer them to the Court of Claims for determination by it of the amount of damages.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I also call to my colleagues' attention the fact that the bill had already passed the House of Representatives, and in that connection the House had voted for the amount of money named. Our committee concurred in the finding of the House.

Mr. COOPER. I say again that in this particular case there is no disposition on my part to object on the basis of the facts, because I myself believe there is liability. However, case after case and bill after bill of this sort would seem to indicate that at times such matters could be referred to the Court of Claims for determination by it of the amounts due.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Of course, I think the Court of Claims is an excellent court. However, its jurisdiction is restricted to cases arising in contract. Its docket is 3 or 4 years behind. If claims of the character of this one were added to the court's already crowded docket, it would never get through with its work.

Inasmuch as this claim is one of a category on which the Judiciary Committee has customarily passed, I believe the committee should retain control of these cases, at least until further study.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Maryland has said. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to a letter, appearing in the committee report, from the Honorable Grady Lewis, who was the attorney for this Indian boy. The letter is dated June 10, 1952, and in it Mr. Lewis urges favorable action. I read from his letter:

> It will be borne in mind that several years have elapsed since this boy suffered the loss of almost an entire hand. He has, in one way or another, been able to remain in school and does not need a lot more time to finish college. If a sum that would slightly compensate him for his being made a cripple for life, together with an additional amount that would enable him to finish his college course, could be appropriated now, it would meet the actual needs of the situation.
>
> As attorney, I am quite willing to, and do, waive any claim for any fee that I might earn representing this minor.
>
> I hope the committee will see fit to grant this consideration to this worthy young man.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> GRADY LEWIS.

Mr. President, I appreciate the expeditious action of the Judiciary Committee in reporting this measure, and I appreciate the attorney's waiving of his fee, in order that the amount voted by the House of Representatives may be voted by the Senate, and in order that action may be taken and relief granted.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from North Dakota is for the purpose of taking care of the situation arising from the fact that the claimant attained the age of 21 after the bill was reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Dakota, which will be stated again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "to the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor," and insert in lieu thereof "Franklin Jim, a."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Franklin Jim."

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration, out of order, of Senate bill 2698, Calendar 982, to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. I make this request because I have an appointment in one of the departments. Therefore, I should like to have the bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Senate bill 2698, provides for an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. In order that there may be no confusion as to why this additional judgeship was not considered in connection with Senate bill 15, the omnibus judgeship bill, which recently passed the Congress and was enacted into law by the signature of the President, I shall state that the judgeship was not considered in the early study of Senate bill 15, which had passed the Senate and the House in the last session, when it became apparent that relief should be given to the southern district of Mississippi.

In the September meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, an additional district judgeship for the southern district of Mississippi was recommended by that body. In view of the fact that Senate bill 15 had at that time passed both Houses, there was no way in which this recommendation could be included in that legislation.

The facts are that, of the 86 districts in the United States, in 1953 the civil caseload for the southern district of Mississippi has made that district the fourth highest caseload district in the United States. This rise has been due primarily to contract cases. For example, actions dealing with Government contracts soared from 22 in 1952 to 102 in 1953, which, of course, is almost an increase of 5 times the number of cases in that category. Contract actions under the diversity jurisdiction of the court have risen from 36 to 49, which is also a substantial increase.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Why was it that the Judicial Conference did not make this recommendation soon enough to permit this matter to be considered in connection with the general bill which was passed recently?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know why the Conference did not make the recommendation sooner. The recommendation was made by the Judicial Conference in September of last year, and at that time the omnibus bill had passed both Houses and was in conference.

Mr. GORE. Therefore, this matter would not then have been in order as an amendment to the bill; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. And not having been in either the Senate version or the House version of Senate bill 15——

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the circumstances, the conference committee would have no jurisdiction. In fact, I did not request the conference committee to consider this item.

Mr. President, I may note that the southern district of Mississippi is a one-

judge district, and the device of assigning judges from other districts for temporary help has been extensively used; but even with that temporary help, the caseload has continued to increase. In 1941, as of June 30, there were pending before the court 241 civil cases. As of June 30, 1953, this figure had risen to 365, so that it is obvious that over this period of time it has been impossible for the court to keep abreast of its work. Should this increase be allowed to continue, the southern district of Mississippi will find itself in the same dire circumstances as were many other districts which were given help by the enactment of Senate bill 15. In fact, the southern district of Mississippi is rapidly approaching that condition, and something must be done.

The same increase applies to criminal cases. The national average of criminal cases commenced per judgeship for 1953 was 171 per judge; while the figure for the southern district of Mississippi was 286. The Congress has been made aware of the distress existing in the Federal judiciary system due to the overload of the dockets, and thus enacted S. 15 to alleviate this situation. Unfortunately, the southern district of Mississippi was not included at that time.

On the basis of the facts related, the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the unanimous recommendation of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which considered this bill, and the unanimous recommendation of the full Judiciary Committee, I think the bill should be enacted.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the change made by this act in the number of judgeships for the southern district of Mississippi, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to such district:

"Districts	Judges
"* * * * *	
"Mississippi:	
"* * * * *	
"Southern	2
"* * * * *."	

FIRST PREFERENCE FOR FORMER OWNERS OF CERTAIN DWELLINGS SOLD UNDER LANHAM WAR HOUSING ACT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am obliged to leave the Chamber to attend a meeting. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, that Calendar No. 1036, House bill 6130, be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, upon first study this appears to be general legislation; and under the procedure under which we have been operating recently, it is doubtful whether it should be considered on the call of the calendar. However, I should like to have an explanation from the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that it is general legislation, but it is extremely fair and equitable legislation.

I read from the committee report, which is very brief, and which I think covers the question rather clearly:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under Lanham War Housing Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

Under the existing provisions of section 607 (b) of the Lanham Act, preference in the purchase of all permanent housing is required to be given (1) to veteran occupants, (2) nonveteran occupants, and (3) to veteran nonoccupants who intend to occupy the housing.

Most of the dwellings being disposed of under the Lanham Act were built by the Federal Government and were not in existence at the time the Government acquired the property in the project in which they are located. In one project, the Shanks Village project in New York, and possibly in one or two other isolated cases, however, at the time the Federal Government acquired the property a small number of permanent dwellings were already located on the site. This bill would give to the former owners of these existing dwellings a preference in purchasing them prior to that of veterans and present tenants. It would not give any preference to former owners of real property with respect to the sale of vacant land or of housing which was constructed by the Government.

The bill, it is important to note, gives the Administrator discretion in granting preference to former owners. This discretion could be used to take care of situations such as exist in one project where some of the dwellings are located on land which has been reserved for right-of-way of a federally aided highway. In such an instance it would not be feasible for the first preference to be given to former owners of the houses. There may be other cases where it would not be practicable to give such a preference.

The Housing Administrator could also provide a reasonable time limit on the duration of the preference or attach appropriate conditions to the sale, for example, that families now residing in the houses shall have a stated time in which to find other accommodations before they can be evicted.

Since your committee has been advised by the Housing Administrator that the legislation would avoid hardship to former owners, since it affects not more than an estimated 70 housing accommodations, and since your committee is satisfied that it would not disrupt the disposition program nor impair the aforementioned general preference provisions, your committee recommends that it be enacted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, the Senator from New York has presented a very persuasive argument for the passage of the bill. Personally I favor its passage; but the question is raised as to whether a bill proposing general legislation should be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. IVES. It is frequently done, especially when it is noncontroversial; and this seems to be noncontroversial.

Mr. GORE. At the call of the calendar previous to the last one, criticism was voiced on both sides of the aisle against the consideration of bills proposing general legislation on the call of the calendar. The distinguished senior Senator from Florida raised the question. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] raised the question on the other side of the aisle. At that time there seemed to be considerable sentiment against the consideration of bills proposing general legislation on the call of the calendar.

It is not for the junior Senator from Tennessee to lay down any policy; but Senators absent themselves during the call of the calendar and, pretty generally, as they have said to me, do not expect general legislation to be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. We would certainly greatly restrict the operation of the unanimous Consent Calendar if we were ever to accept as the policy of the Senate that no general legislation shall be considered on the call of the calendar. I respectfully say to the Senator from Tennessee that I think our policy has been not to consider general legislation which we say is major in scope; but so-called general legislation which is minor so far as its scope is concerned is considered on every call of the calendar.

I do not believe that our committees could do business if, in considering so-called minor bills, we had to look forward to a scheduled discussion of such bills following a motion to proceed to consider them. I think we might as well adopt a 12 months' calendar so far as our attendance is concerned, if we ever adopt such a rule.

In my judgment the test which we must apply goes to the question of our wisdom and discretion in deciding whether or not we are dealing with a bill so major in scope that, from the standpoint of public policy, we think it ought to be opened to general debate and have a time set for its consideration, as the result of a motion.

I am sure all Senators will agree with me that time and time again on the call of the calendar we have considered so-called general bills. However, for the most part they are unanimously recommended by the committee and, as the Senator from New York has said, they are noncontroversial. We operate in that way to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not the function of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle to notify the majority or minority leader if a certain legislative proposal is one which should be taken up separately? In the absence of such procedure, the Senate would not be able to transact its business.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Maryland raises an interesting question about the function of the calendar committee. The junior Senator from Tennessee has been undertaking to discharge that function, and has been personally criticized for allowing bills to pass on the call of the calendar when they were general in nature. The distinguished Senator from Oregon says that if they are noncontroversial, it is all right. He says that the scope shall determine whether we should allow a bill to pass on the call of the calendar.

The bill in question would appear to be minor in nature, but upon the explanation of the distinguished Senator from New York, its scope appears to be rather broad. It is a general amendment to the Lanham Act.

Mr. IVES. The scope is broad only in appearance. It is not actually broad at all, because there are too few properties to be affected by the proposed legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say most sincerely that I believe the Senator from Tennessee and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on this side of the aisle, have been doing a remarkable job on the calendar. I believe they have been following the very sound policy of permitting so-called minor bills, although they may be general in scope, to come before the Senate on the call of the calendar, and they have held for motion bills which are either highly controversial, even though minor in nature, or what we consider in the Senate to be so-called major legislation. Each of us knows when a bill comes up whether we are dealing with major legislation or a so-called run-of-the-mill bill.

I respectfully say that the pending bill is the type of legislation which is only minor in scope, although general in application, in the sense that it fits the general rule, but its application makes it a very minor bill, it seems to me.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the understanding of the able Senator from Oregon, of the difficulties under which the members of the calendar committees perform their duties. I am persuaded in this case to withdraw my objection. However, I hope that the discussion will serve to illustrate the difficulties which we who serve on the calendar committees in performing a rather thankless task, encounter in permitting to pass without objection proposed legislation, which may appear minor in nature to one Senator, but very major in nature to another Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that, after all, all Senators know the members who serve on the calendar committees. I agree that the members of the calendar committees perform a heroic and thankless job. I have great respect for the members of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle. However, the fact remains that last Friday it was announced that the Senate would have a call of the calendar today. Every Senator had a right to voice his objection to the calendar committee on either side of the aisle. Every Senator understands that failure to voice objection with the calendar committee means that no objection will be made by the calendar committee. Therefore, I believe the situation is well taken care of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. First I should like to say that there are on the calendar today bills on which reports have reached the calendar committee only today. On last Friday the Senate concluded a historic debate. A few Members of the Senate have left town on official business, and some Senators have left the city on personal business. I am quite sure that there are a number of bills on the calendar of which those Senators have had no notice whatever. There are bills on the calendar of which I had notice only since I came into the Chamber.

Therefore, the rule does not always apply. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I wish to supplement what the Senator from New York has stated. I believe that Members of the Senate who are not members of the calendar committees have an obligation to defend the members of the calendar committees when they carry out their functions.

However, I also believe we have the right to object when a Member of the Senate asks the calendar committee to proceed to exercise some kind of blanket objection to a category of bills, without specifying a particular bill. To do so is to ask the calendar committee to do something it has no right to agree to do. Every Member of the Senate has the duty either to be on the floor of the Senate when the calendar is called, or to file with the calendar committee a specific objection to a specific bill.

I, as one Member of the Senate, object to any attempt on the part of any of my colleagues, or any group of my colleagues, to make the calendar committee a sort of general objecting committee to a category of bills which some Members of the Senate desire to characterize as bills proposing general legislation.

I say to the members of the calendar committees that if they yield to that kind of objection they are doing the rest of us a wrong. The rest of us have a right to have the calendar considered on the basis of specific objections filed with the calendar committees by individual Senators. But I do not believe that the work of the Senate should be handicapped by a general, unspecified objection, filed with a calendar committee. The members of the calendar committees, in turn, should not assume that responsibility for other Members of the Senate. I believe the rest of us ought to make it very clear to the Senate that we do not expect the calendar committees to be subjected to that kind of procedure, because it is not fair to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, what the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon says sounds very good, but it does not work out that way so far as my experience as a member of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle is concerned.

For example, there is on the calendar, and has been on the calendar for the past several weeks, a bill to grant statehood to Hawaii. So far as I am concerned I have not had one Member of the Senate request me to object to the bill. I have objected to it several times, on the ground that it is general legislation and important legislation, and that it is legislation which is too important to pass on the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Therefore, if we are to sit here merely as a register of objections filed by other Members of the Senate, we would minimize and practically eliminate our functions.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Tennessee has been objecting to a bill granting statehood to Hawaii, and it has been perfectly proper for him to do so. It is in keeping with the policy I have just discussed. But, if the Senator from Tennessee is objecting because he has a feeling that some of his colleagues do not believe that legislation which is general in scope should be passed on the call of the calendar, then I say most respectfully I believe it to be a bad policy. I believe we are entitled to have individual Senators specifically object to bills for specific reasons. We ought not to have general objections filed with the calendar committees, and the members of the calendar committees should not feel compelled to carry out requests which are in the nature of so-called general objections. When the Senator from Tennessee objects to a bill granting statehood to Hawaii there is always the power in the Senate to move that the bill be considered and I do not believe any harm has been done by following that procedure.

If the kind of bill now before us is to be objected to on the ground that it proposes general legislation, and it is necessary to wait until the majority leader will let it come up on motion, that kind of legislation will never get before the Senate, and it will die at the end of the session, because the majority leader probably never will find the time to have it brought up on motion for consideration by the Senate.

I hope the calendar committees, in their conferences together, will consider the point which the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Oregon are raising this afternoon. We are trying to do two things. First, we are fighting to protect the jurisdiction of the calendar committees in that we do not believe that the members of the calendar committees should be handicapped in the way that some Senators are trying to handicap them. Secondly, we are trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind Senators of the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GORE. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that in the year I have served as a member of the calendar committee on the majority side, no member of the majority has ever protested or filed any protest with the majority calendar committee that it has failed to prevent the passage of general legislation on the call of the calendar.

I agree with the statement of the purpose of the calendar committees which was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. We consider it to be our function to register objection made by members of the majority, if they are not able to be present. Furthermore, I would say that if as an individual Senator I believed, or if my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] believed, or if the members of the minority calendar commitee believed there was some question as to whether a bill was of major interest, we would have a right to object individually.

Each of us knows, when a bill is called on the calendar, whether we are dealing with major legislation or a so-called run-of-the-mill bill.

It is a matter of individual objection. We believe that the protection against the passage of proposed general legislation a call of the calendar lies not only in the hands of the calendar committees, but in the power of any Member to be present and to object. We certainly do not take the position that we are some supercommittee attempting to determine what type of legislation can be passed upon a call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] if any check has been made with veterans organizations as to whether they have any objection to the elimination of veterans' preferences.

Mr. IVES. No. I happen to be a member of several veterans' organizations, myself, and I have heard of nothing of that kind.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator knows of no reason why veterans might feel that this bill might take away some of the preferences which Congress has previously given to them?

Mr. IVES. It would take away the preference to the extent which I have indicated in reading the report. It is very limited in that the original owners of the property themselves should have a vested right in it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the able Senator from New York have the same feeling as to other properties which may have been taken by the Government, and then, when the Government is ready to dispose of them, is it his opinion that the former owners should have first priority in repurchasing the land?

Mr. IVES. There is something besides land involved. There are houses. If it were only land, I would not feel that way about it. That is why discretion is left with the Administrator.

It was at first proposed to make it mandatory. I objected to that, myself. After all, I think the discretion should be left with the Administrator.

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask these questions only because it may be that an effort is being made to establish some new policy. As the Senator well knows, there are many instances of property being taken at the time of the war from private owners and used for military installations, and since that time the military installations have been removed. Now the question arises on the part of most of the property owners as to why they do not have a right to get back the property. The law says they cannot do so.

Mr. IVES. If the bill were on a broad scale I would have opposed it, but it is so limited in its application that I do not think any damage could occur from it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6130) to permit a first preference for former owners of certain dwellings being sold under the Lanham War Housing Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle for their courtesy.

EXTENSION FOR 5 YEARS FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN FOR ADMITTANCE TO LOW-RENT HOUSING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar 1038, Senate bill 2937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2937) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from New York agree that the same general situation regarding the bill just passed applies to this bill?

Mr. IVES. I think here we have even a clearer case because the law expires today, and we are having to extend it to August 1 in anticipation of a new housing act which it is expected will be passed before Congress finally adjourns. It is very essential that the law be extended.

Mr. GORE. The title of the bill refers to amending the United States Housing Act of 1937, so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing. It involves a 5-year period.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish me to read the committee report?

Mr. GORE. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will do so.

Mr. IVES. The report reads as follows:

> The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2937) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent housing without meeting the requirements of section 15 (8) (b) (ii) of that act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.
>
> This bill as introduced would have amended section 15 (8) (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to extend for 5 years the period in which the families of veterans and servicemen may be admitted to low-rent public housing without meeting the requirement of such section that they must have come from substandard housing at the time of admission to public housing. Unless extended, this period expires March 1, 1954. Your committee has amended the bill to provide for a temporary extension to August 1, 1954, in order to give your committee an opportunity to consider this provision in connection with other housing legislation pending before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2937) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1, 1949" and insert "August 1, 1954", so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 15 (8) (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1415 (b)) is amended by striking out "not later than 5 years after March 1, 1949" and inserting "not later than August 1, 1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to have considered three bills out of order. They are Calendar Nos. 1000, 1001, and 1003, Senate bills 740, 747, and 924, respectively. I make this request because there will be a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2:30, which I must attend, and I should appreciate it if we can consider these three bills at this time out of order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have been working for some time this afternoon, and have considered approximately only 12 bills. I recognize the reasons which require certain Senators to ask that certain bills be considered out of order. I simply suggest that we can never finish the calendar if such a practice is continued. I shall not object in this instance, but, for the sake of orderly procedure, I think we should in the future proceed with the regular call of the calendar.

SANTA MUCIACCIA AND OTHERS

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for not objecting.

Mr. President, I first ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1000, Senate bill 740.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 740) for the relief of Santa Muciaccia and others.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. This bill is for the purpose of permitting three Sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary to remain in this country to help man the staff of a hospital. These three Sisters are now working as nurses at the Joseph P. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Massachusetts. They came from Italy in 1949, and they are all vitally important to the administration of the hospital, and, therefore, would like to remain in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 740) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santa Muciaccia (Sister Maria Fridiana), Teresa Saragaglia (Sister Maria Eutropia), and Caterina Isonni (Sister Maria Giovita) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JACEK VON HENNEBERG

Mr. KENNEDY. I next ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1001, Senate bill 747.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 747) for the relief of Jacek Von Henneberg.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to a Polish young man. He had 3 brothers, 1 of whom was killed by Communists. He went to England and studied architecture and has established himself in the community. A former Governor of Massachusetts, and other citizens who know him well, recommend him. I have known him well, and I think he would be a good addition to this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 747) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacek Von Henneberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SOFIA B. PANAGOULOPOULOS KANELL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Order No. 1003, Senate bill 924.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 924) for the relief of Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill concerns a young girl, Sofia B. Kanell, who was adopted by an American citizen. In 1948 she was approximately 10 years old. She is a grandniece of an American who adopted her. Her family suffered hardships as a result of the guerilla struggle in Greece. A number of members of her family were destroyed. Therefore she has been adopted by her great uncle.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be is enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sofia B. Panagoulopoulos Kanell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George V. Kanell, citizens of the United States.

BERENICE CATHERINE MONTGOMERY

The bill (S. 1594) for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Berenice Catherine Montgomery shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DORA VIDA LYEW SEIXAS

The bill (S. 2534) for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dora Vida Lyew Seixas shall be classified as an immigrant under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (C) of that act.

REV. ARMANDO FUOCO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 235) for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee," to insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Armando Fuoco shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

PANTELIS MORFESSIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 267) for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pantelis Morfessis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

HAROLD TREVOR COLBOURN—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 268) for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 26-year-old native of Australia who last entered the United States as an ex-

change scholar to attend college. After receiving his degree, he attended Johns Hopkins University to obtain a doctor's degree in history. The beneficiary is married to a lawful resident alien and is employed as instructor in American history in a State college.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from Maryland know whether there is an amendment prepared to the bill, which would provide that the young man would have to repay to the Government the money which he has received under the Exchange Students Act for his education?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is no amendment to cover that situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Under those conditions, I am constrained to object, because I know several Senators have objected to similar bills introduced on behalf of students who, after having come to the United States, and having studied under the Exchange Students Act, applied for permanent residence. It was believed that the students should at least reimburse the Federal Government for the amounts which had been paid to them. Until that is done in this case, I shall object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MOSHE GIPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 945) for the relief of Moshe Gips, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Moshe Gips shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1062) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", and on page 2, line 1, after the word "available", to insert "The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the deportation proceeding heretofore instituted against Eliseu Joaquim Boa as well as the order and warrant of deportation issued therein; and the said Eliseu Joaquim Boa shall not hereafter be subject to exclusion or deportation from the United States by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding order and warrant of deportation were issued.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DR. JAGANATH P. CHAWLA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1156) for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Dr.", to strike out "Jaganath" and insert "Jagannath", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Jagannath P. Chawla shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jagannath P. Chawla."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 8069) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRAGEDY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I withhold my request.

Mr. SMATHERS. I desire to ask the Senator from Maryland if he is suggesting the absence of a quorum because he has obtained information from the news ticker that several Members of the House have been shot at from the House gallery, and he believes it to be wise to have a quorum present before a decision is reached as to what the Senate should do in the circumstances?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I may say to my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, that I shall suggest the absence of a quorum so that the majority leader can come to the Chamber and be apprised of the situation; and then, after consultation with the minority, either move to recess or continue with the call of the calendar.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able senior Senator from Maryland if it is his intention to proceed with the call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was my intention to do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Has the Senator given any consideration to requesting a recess until tomorrow, out of respect for the Members of the House of Representatives who have been injured in line of duty?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes, I have. The majority leader has just appeared on the floor of the Senate, and I shall ask him to answer the question of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances in the other Chamber, and the concern of the Members of the Senate for our colleagues in that body, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. If the circumstances are such that we should proceed with the call of the calendar tomorrow, the intention is to proceed from the point at which the call was interrupted today. In the meantime, I shall be in touch with the minority leader on any further developments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1954:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

John M. Cabot, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry F. Holland, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Roswell Burchard Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1944.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister of the United States of America

Edward T. Wailes, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 1:

George M. Abbott, of Ohio.
Garret G. Ackerson, Jr., of New Jersey.
Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa.
Howard Rex Cottam, of Utah.
Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama.
Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho.
James B. Pilcher, of Georgia.
Harold M. Randall, of Iowa.
Horace H. Smith, of Ohio.
Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts.
Carl W. Strom, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 2:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Robert M. Carr, of California.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
Leon L. Cowles, of Utah.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey.
James W. Gantenbein, of Oregon.
William M. Gibson, of New York.
Theodore J. Hohenthal, of California.
John P. Hoover, of California.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
David A. Thomasson, of Kentucky.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
Thomas K. Wright, of Rhode Island.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 3:

Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado.
John A. Calhoun, of California.
William H. Christensen, of Ohio.
Adrian B. Colquitt, of Georgia.
William N. Dale, of New York.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
Clifton P. English, of Tennessee.
Joseph N. Greene, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Henry A. Hoyt, of California.
Charles E. Hulick, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
LaRue R. Lutkins, of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
David G. Nes, of Maryland.
Herbert V. Olds, of Virginia.
James L. O'Sullivan, of Connecticut.
Richard I. Phillips, of California.
Ernest V. Siracusa, of California.
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California.
S. Roger Tyler, Jr., of West Virginia.
Livingston D. Watrous, of New York.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4:

Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James J. Blake, of New York.
Frank E. Cash, Jr., of Minnesota.
Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
Samuel D. Eaton, of New York.
Richard T. Ewing, of Maryland.
Richard G. Johnson, of New York.
Bruce M. Lancaster, of Mississippi.
Roye L. Lowry, of Washington.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Herbert F. Propps, of Wisconsin.
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. Recknagel, of New York.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
Galen L. Stone, of Massachusetts.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
Charles R. Tanguy, of Maryland.
John M. Thompson, Jr., of Florida.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Robert L. Yost, of California.
Robert W. Zimmermann, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 5:

John A Baker, Jr., of Connecticut.
Harry G. Barnes, Jr., of Minnesota.
John W. Black, of Washington.
Samuel C. Brown, of Rhode Island.
William A. Buell, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Pratt Byrd, of Kentucky.
Christian G. Chapman, of New York.
Elwin F. Chase, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
George T. Churchill, of Colorado.
W. Kennedy Cromwell 3d, of Maryland.
Frank J. Curtis, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Arthur R. Day, of New Jersey.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., of California.
James B. Engle, of Iowa.
Raymond E. González, of California.
Herbert I. Goodman, of Pennsylvania.
Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnestota.
Gordon G. Heiner 3d, of Maryland.
Henry L. Heymann, of Pennsylvania.
Max E. Hodge, of New York.
Lewis Hoffacker, of Arizona.
Robert B. Houston, Jr., of Missouri.
Wharton Drexel Hubbard, of New York.
Heyward Isham, of New York.
James R. Johnston, of Ohio.
Walter M. McClelland, of Oklahoma.
John A. McVickar, of New York.
William B. Miller, of Ohio.
Grant E. Mouser 3d, of Ohio.
Paul M. Popple, of Illinois.
Clifford J. Quinlan, of Minnesota.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
David T. Schneider, of Massachusetts.
Peter A. Seip, of Iowa.
Roland C. Shaw, of Massachusetts.
Herman T. Skofield, of New Hampshire.
Paul A. Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Richard E. Snyder, of New Jersey.
William F. Spengler, of Wisconsin.
Daniel Sprecher, of New York.
Jack A. Sulser, of Illinois.
David R. Thomson, of the District of Columbia.
Theodore A. Tremblay, of California.
William N. Turpin, of Georgia.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
Orme Wilson, Jr., of New York.
Arthur I. Wortzel, of New Jersey.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.

Bligh A. Dodds, of New York, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y.

James W. Bingham, of Texas, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.

James L. Latimer, of Texas, to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

SUPREME COURT

Earl Warren, of California, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

To be United States attorneys for the district indicated with their respective names

Jack D. H. Hays, of Arizona, district of Arizona.

Osro Cobb, of Arkansas, eastern district of Arkansas.

J. Leonard Walker, of Kentucky, western district of Kentucky.

Robert E. Hauberg, of Mississippi, southern district of Mississippi.

Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, district of New Hampshire.

Theodore F. Bowes, of New York, northern district of New York.

Donald R. Ross, of Nebraska, district of Nebraska.

Julian T. Gaskill, of North Carolina, eastern district of North Carolina.

Sumner Canary, of Ohio, northern district of Ohio.

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, district of Oregon.

Heard L. Floore, of Texas, northern district of Texas.

Malcolm R. Wilkey, of Texas, southern district of Texas.

Louis Gorman Whitcomb, of Vermont, district of Vermont.

George Edward Rapp, of Wisconsin, western district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

To be United States marshals for the districts indicated with their respective names

Claire A. Wilder, of Alaska, division No. 1, district of Alaska.

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, division No. 3, district of Alaska.

Albert Fuller Dorsh, Jr., of Alaska, division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Cooper Hudspeth, of Arkansas, western district of Arkansas.

Tom Kimball, of Colorado, district of Colorado.

Donald A. Fraser, of Connecticut, district of Connecticut.

Billy Elza Carlisle, of Georgia, middle district of Georgia.

Vernon Woods, of Illinois, eastern district of Illinois.

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, district of Kansas.

Edward John Petitbon, of Louisiana, eastern district of Louisiana.

Louis O. Aleksich, of Montana, district of Montana.

J. Bradbury German, Jr., of New York, northern district of New York.

George M. Glasser, of New York, western district of New York.

Xavier North, of Ohio, northern district of Ohio.

Frank Quarles, of Tennessee, eastern district of Tennessee.

John Overall Anderson, of Tennessee, middle district of Tennessee.

Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, district of Vermont.

Peter Auburn Richmond, of Virginia, western district of Virginia.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, to be The Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard:

Brig. Gen. Laurence Coffin Ames, AO131519, to be major general, California Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Guy Nelson Henninger, AO129883, to be major general, Nebraska Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. James Alvin May, AO356464, to be major general, Nevada Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Brig. Gen. Errol Henry Zistel, AO286558, to be major general, Ohio Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Lewis Allen Curtis, AO729140, to be brigadier general, New York Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Joseph Jacob Foss, AO944215, to be brigadier general, South Dakota Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Maurice Adams Marrs, AO274899, to be brigadier general, Oklahoma Air National Guard, to date from October 12, 1953.

Col. Winston Peabody Wilson, AO398325, to be brigadier general, Arkansas Air National Guard, to date from January 21, 1954.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the grade indicated in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be ensigns

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple
Daniel W. Urish
Cecil C. Davis (Naval Reserve aviator)
Lee H. Sherman (Naval Reserve aviator)

To be lieutenant (junior grade), Medical Corps

Charles K. Deeks

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Chaplain Corps

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

To be lieutenant, Dental Corps

Marvin H. Scott

To be lieutenant (junior grade) Dental Corps

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

John W. Crozier, Benson.
Richard E. Lawrence, Jerome.
Ollie C. Wilson, Scottsdale.

ARKANSAS

Thomas H. Edwards, De Queen.

CALIFORNIA

Amey L. Weiser, Aptos.
Robert H. Marshall, Bakersfield.
Edwin R. Vetter, Big Creek.
Emil J. Nelson, Brookdale.
Martha L. Ward, Canby.
Carl H. Stahlheber, Chula Vista.
Charlie L. Veitch, Compton.
Ellen G. Goforth, Covelo.
Ronald L. Pascoe, Gustine.
Donald H. Onstad, Ione.
John Healy, Livingston.
Edward S. Chadburn, Needles.
William L. Klette, North Fork.
S. Merritt Williams, Palm Springs.
Eugene E. Schulenburg, Pismo Beach.
John H. Shewman, Pomona.
Warren J. Bond, San Quentin.
Louis Sibilio, Santa Maria.
Leola E. Heinz, Shingle.
Alma W. LaChambre, Sunset Beach.
Elizabeth J. Otto, Temecula.
Harold E. Rolfe, Topanga.
Blythe W. Richards, Tracy.
Charles Hugh Ross, Tulare.
Warren F. Hollingsworth, Turlock.
Roy A. Ray, Upland.
Fred H. Jenkins, Watsonville.

COLORADO

Austin C. Bledsoe, Fleming.
Phillip J. Woods, Las Animas.
Reba L. Bradley, Palmer Lake.

CONNECTICUT

Ellen S. Breining, Bloomfield.

FLORIDA

Thelma S. Speer, Boca Grande.
Bernard O'Brien, Panama City.

GEORGIA

Mattie H. Chandler, Keysville.
Lloyd C. Ricks, Macon.
Albert D. McKee, Moultrie.

ILLINOIS

Carrie L. Smith, Bellflower.
Donald W. Fraser, Blue Island.
Alan E. Rigg, Bone Gap.
Charles E. Eyestone, Brownstown.
Gertrude E. Dean, Flossmoor.
Harley Gustine, Greenfield.
Orville O. Rathbun, Gridley.
Frank A. Smallwood, Harmon.
Gregory M. Sheahen, Highland Park.
James A. Hight, Karnak.
Milo L. Craig, Kewanee.
John S. West, Lockport.
Cynthia Afton Stewart, Olive Branch.
Edgar J. Baldwin, Palos Park.
Curtis Fenton, Sims.
Harold J. Winans, Sycamore.
James L. Rousey, Wapella.
Kenneth J. Tate, Waterman.
Clifton M. Evans, Waukegan.

IOWA

Arthur M. Robinson, Bayard.
Kenneth C. Anderson, Clinton.
Ralph O. Woods, Colfax.
Louis F. Obye, Estherville.
Keith H. Radloff, Farmersburg.
Stewart L. Schwab, Guthrie Center.
Donald E. Clayton, Hamburg.
Lewis L. Welden, Iowa Falls.
James Emerson Evans, Joice.
Goldie M. Schneider, Popejoy.
Erwin G. Dieter, Rock Rapids.
Norman W. Jespersen, Royal.
Morris G. Dahl, Sloan.

KANSAS

Esther L. Thomm, Athol.
Reuben H. Moore, Holton.
Edward J. Schoenhofer, St. Paul.

LOUISIANA

Alton Leander Lea, Baton Rouge.
William C. Tucker, Haynesville.

MAINE

Ralph A. Miles, Jr., Burnham.
Arthur Atwood Anderson, Caribou.
Bentley L. Glidden, Damariscotta.
George W. Warren, Dover-Foxcroft.

MARYLAND

Nelsie M. Hannon, Accokeek.
Robert R. Ripple, Clinton.
Anna V. Groves, Glenn Dale.

MASSACHUSETTS

Martha Helen Lindsey, Huntington.
Mabel Griffin, Mendon.
John J. Gobell, New Bedford.
Emile F. St. Onge, Ware.

MICHIGAN

Lewis G. Howe, Bath.
Clair E. Courtade, Buckley.
Bernard C. Shankland, Cadillac.
Lawrence A. Olson, Coleman.
Harold J. Geers, Kent City.
George W. Crist, Litchfield.
James Martin Littlejohn, New Buffalo.
Carl E. Dennis, Rockford.
George E. Osgood, St. Johns.

MINNESOTA

Harvey M. Madson, Grand Rapids.
Keith W. Oleson, Isanti.
Darrell W. Matter, Lyle.
Carrol J. Strom, St. James.
James P. McCoy, Savage.
George H. Carrell, Zumbrota.

NEBRASKA

Eugene J. O'Neill, St. Libory.

NEW JERSEY

Wilbur F. Rue, Allentown.
Thomas Alfred Stevens, Cape May.
Margaret H. Merrill, Essex Fells.
Wilbur A. Smock, Farmingdale.
Robert F. Wichmann, Little Silver.
Richard G. Haffey, Longport.
Eleanor S. Howell, Stewartsville.
Harry Thomas Applegate, Toms River.
George R. Baldwin, Wenonah.
William C. Nestor, Westfield.
Leon E. McElroy, Woodbridge.
Louis A. Pime, Woodbury.

OREGON

William A. Rees, Fairview.
Glendora V. Smith, Grass Valley.
Walter E. Sneddon, Lowell.
Robert R. Ireland, Milton-Freewater.
Herbert R. Parker, Oakland.
James H. Grieve, Prospect.

PENNSYLVANIA

Franklin Levis Stringfellow, Chester.
William H. Anderson, Ebensburg.
Earl M. Miller, Elizabethtown.
Kathryn E. Kurtz, Leacock.
George A Paul, McConnellsburg.
Elmer B. Neff, Mount Holly Springs.
Milton L. Dodge, Smethport.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Florence M. Weiland, Marion.
Vada E. Koehne, Oldham.
Elmer R. Humeston, Redfield.
Chester A. Beaver, Yankton.

TEXAS

John Brice Jones, Baird.
James T. Jolley, Clarksville.
Dudley C. Jernigin, Fort Worth.
William X. Priesmeyer, Garwood.
Mario M. Seymour, Jacksonville.
Nell G. Pryor, Kirbyville.
Julia W. Toalson, Kyle.
Guy Wetzel, Longview.
Rufus L. Boren, Mart.
Cecil F. Sorell, Mission.
Bertrand T. Hansen, Navasota.
Frank N. Cook, Olney.
Allie M. Sanders, Scurry.
Thomas Everett McClanahan, Slaton.
Margie Hugonin, Tomball.

VERMONT

Lois G. Hughes, Bomoseen.

VIRGINIA

Fitzhugh L. Davis, Altavista.
William L. Skinnell, Bedford.
Tousley M. Hooker, Berryville.
Marian H. Gardner, Fredericks Hall.
Thomas W. Travis, Keysville.
James M. McIntosh, Orange.
Wilbur R. Johnston, Winchester.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, whose divine laws and beneficent purposes are the only foundation of a social order wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace, we thank Thee for this new week.

Grant that daily we may be inspired to see that the human race, which is

one in origin and destiny, must also be one in a great fellowship of good will and friendship, of sympathy and service.

Help us to understand that if our religious faith has in it the principle of the fatherhood of God then its practice must be that of the brotherhood of man.

Show us how we may hasten the dawning of that blessed time when the human heart shall be impervious to all feelings and attitudes of hatred and prejudice and bigotry.

May men and nations everywhere be partners in the moral and spiritual enterprise of building a nobler world order and may each day be radiant with the promises of a more magnanimous and brotherly spirit.

In Christ's name we bring our petitions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 27, 1954, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) entitled "Joint resolution granting the status of a permanent residence to certain aliens"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. HENDRICKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 1, 1954.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on February 25, 1954, the Clerk received on February 26 from the Secretary of the Senate, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2175) entitled "An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch"; and

That the Vice President has appointed Allen N. Humphrey, Chief of the Records Management and Services Branch of the Office of the Comptroller General, as a member of the Federal Records Council vice Ellis S. Stone, transferred; and

That the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54–8.

Respectfully yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Thursday, February 25, 1954, he did on February 26, 1954, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2175. An act to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 338)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1953, to September 30, 1953, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1954.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill which will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay transportation and handling charges within continental United States for surplus agricultural commodities which are donated to agencies and organizations for distribution to needy persons.

Under the present law, CCC is prohibited from delivering the commodities to the recipient agencies. The law provides that surplus foods may be donated to school lunch programs; Federal, State, and local public welfare organizations; private welfare organizations operating within the United States; and private welfare organizations—such as CARE—for distribution to needy persons outside the United States, but the recipients must pay transportation and handling costs from the point of storage.

This bill will authorize CCC to pay not only transportation charges within the United States but also packaging and handling charges necessary to make the food available to the recipient agency, and storage charges not to exceed 30 days at the point of delivery.

The purpose of the bill is to permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities in bulk to organizations and agencies for their distribution. CCC is specifically prohibited by provisions of the bill from undertaking any of the distribution to individuals.

Although CARE and similar agencies are not mentioned in the bill, it will permit CCC to deliver surplus commodities to ocean ports within the United States and there turn them over to such organizations for relief distribution overseas.

It is far better to give food away than to let it spoil. If it is needed in our own country for distribution to needy persons, I think it should be used here. If there is more than we need for that purpose, then we should make it available for relief overseas.

If my bill is enacted, I think it will make possible a big increase in distribution of our surplus foods to needy people both here and abroad.

Latest figures of the CCC show that it has on hand, among other commodities, the following quantities of foods: 275 million pounds of butter, 290 million pounds of cheese, 482 million pounds of dried milk, 452 thousand 100-pound bags of dry beans, 551 thousand gallons of olive oil, and 8,368 tons of peanuts.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1431), is hereby amended by deleting from the last sentence thereof the phrase "at the point of storage at no cost, save handling and transportation costs incurred in making delivery from the point of storage," and by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding *"Provided*, That such commodities may be made available by donation in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policy of this section including the payment by the Commodity Credit Corporation of repackaging, handling, and other services, and transportation within the continental United States from points of storage or acquisition by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the points of delivery to the recipient agencies and organizations, and storage within the United States for a period of not to exceed 1 month after delivery to such agency or organization, but the Corporation shall not incur any expense, other than such storage, with respect to distribution of the commodities after such delivery."

AMENDMENTS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO OUR SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. GOLDEN. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide insurance benefits to schoolteachers, ministers, attorneys, physicians, and other professional people and to provide social-security protection for totally and permanently disabled persons who have heretofore contributed to the social-security fund and become insured, and after considerable study over several months, this bill which I am introducing, I think, makes many other amendments to the basic law that will greatly improve our entire social-security program.

First. Schoolteachers: Of all of the professional people in America, the schoolteachers over the last half century have been the worst of the underpaid group. Their salaries have not kept pace with modern times. Although they perform one of the most essential functions for all American people in helping to educate the youth of America, yet most professions and many occupations that do not require the long years of training and which are not nearly so important to the people of this country receive much more in compensation than do the schoolteachers.

Under our present social-security law, unless an entire group of schoolteachers in some State or political subdivision votes and elects to come under the social-security program, then a teacher in this profession cannot have the benefits and protection of social security.

We have recently amended the social-security law so as to make it possible for individual businessmen to make their contribution to this program and to come under the protection of social security. It is my opinion that each individual schoolteacher should have the right and be allowed to make the choice of contributing to the social-security fund and receive the benefits of social-security insurance on an individual basis. This should be allowed without any deductions whatsoever from any retirement fund that the teacher may be entitled to on a State level. The amendments in my bill which I am introducing today will provide for all of these things for schoolteachers.

Second. Up to the present time many of the professions, including attorneys, doctors, dentists, ministers, architects, public accountants, engineers, and the like have not had the privilege of coming under and participating in the benefits of the social-security program. When you think about these very large groups of professional people here in America, there can be no sound basis for discriminating against them, and it is my opinion they should have the same privilege, on an individual basis, to voluntarily contribute to the social-security fund just as a businessman is now allowed to do, and if these professional people desire to come under the social-security program they should be allowed to do so.

However, it is my opinion that these professional people, just like the schoolteachers, should be allowed to make their election upon an individual basis. The bill which I have introduced will enable all of these professional people mentioned above and several other professional groups mentioned in the bill to come under the social-security program, pay their individual contributions to the fund and receive its benefits like other American citizens that are now under the program.

Third. In thinking over basic ways to improve and enlarge the benefits of the social-security program for the American people, I have concluded that one of the most glaring defects in the present law is the failure to protect the man or woman who has paid into the fund and becomes fully insured but who, on account of accident or sickness, has become permanently and totally disabled and a charge upon his or her family or society, sometimes many, many years before reaching the retirement age of 65.

I feel sure that every Member of Congress has on many occasions known industrious, hardworking people in their home district who had for several years paid into the social-security program but who, before reaching 65 years of age, became permanently and totally disabled. This creates a very pitiful situation and one that this great country of ours should remedy. When a person has paid into the social-security program long enough to be fully insured under the present rules and regulations, if that person really becomes permanently disabled and cannot work, then I think he should receive social security insurance benefits immediately regardless of his age.

The payments of social-security insurance benefits to the totally and permanently disabled who are fully covered by their contributions to the fund should not depend upon any enabling act of any State legislature. It should be a part of the fundamental law that when these conditions exist, a person should be entitled to begin to receive his insurance benefits from the social security fund immediately and without any roadblock that might be put in the way on account of some State not passing enabling legislation to enable its disabled citizens to participate in the benefits of the fund. The bill which I have introduced provides for this protection for the permanently and totally disabled people.

Fourth. There is another far-reaching, and I think beneficial, provision in the bill I have introduced to amend the social-security law. That provision eliminates the restriction presently existing upon the amount of money a person can earn after he becomes 65, retires, and becomes entitled to receive social-security benefits.

When the social-security program was initiated many years ago, it had the foolish provision in it that if a person receiving social security earned as much as $15 per month, then that would cut him out of receiving social-security payments. Later on this work clause permitted such persons to earn $50, and there has been progressive changes for the better permitting our older citizens to work and earn money and at the same time receive their social security that they had paid for out of their past earnings along with contributions from the Government.

The unsoundness of a limitation upon the earnings of people after they become entitled to receive social-security benefits becomes more apparent as time goes on. This roadblock to earnings on the part of our older citizens has been contained in many of our pension plans, such as railroad retirement and so forth, as well as in our social-security program. In all of these instances, we have improved the situation by increasing the amount that a person who is retired can earn without losing their retirement benefits.

Although we have improved the situation, we have not entirely removed the evil. There is no basic cause why there should be any work limitation clause in the social-security law at all. If we continue to deny our older citizens the full and free privilege of working, earning, and creating wealth for themselves and the American people, we will continue to do this country a great disservice. There is no reason why a man or woman of 65, and in reasonably good health, should not continue to work and earn all they can. It helps their morale, it will enable them to live and enjoy living more, it is beneficial to their families, helpful to the community in which they live because they do many useful services, and if we could free our older citizens from this work limitation clause several million people past 65 could work and help to create wealth and prosperity for our people.

My bill provides if a man or woman becomes fully insured, has paid in all the contributions required for the number of years required, when they reach retirement age, they can receive social security and work, if they desire, and earn money without handicaps or limitations. The present administration, through the great Committee on Ways and Means that has jurisdiction of the social security and old-age assistance laws, is now and has been for several weeks engaged in a profound study of our social-security system. It is my belief that this great committee will come up with a very much broader and greatly improved social-security law.

The bill which I am introducing today upon these vital subjects, of course, will be referred to this committee for its consideration. It is my opinion that the new bill to be considered later on in this session by the Congress will provide for larger payments of social security and old-age assistance and that the fund will be more secure and rendered more nearly solvent and that the people who have paid into and rely upon social security will be greatly benefited by the new act, when passed.

I hope and believe that the members of the committee will take into consideration the improvements included in my bill and that when the new bill on social security comes out from the committee for debate upon the floor of this House, that we will find the 4 or 5 amendments contained in my bill incorporated in the general bill.

TARIFF LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State and of the whole Northwest are also gravely concerned with several other aspects of tariff legislation. I trust Congress will give serious consideration to our problems when it undertakes any revision of our tariff structure.

A great number of our important industries and their employees are dependent on the production of goods and products which are being driven from the domestic market by cheap imports, made possible largely by low wages paid abroad.

Among these are the raising of tulips, iris, and daffodils; the tuna and Pacific ground-fish industries; the hardboard and plywood producers; and the Northwest tree-nut growers. And now imports of cheaply produced red raspberries from abroad are beginning to threaten red raspberry growers in my district.

The thousands of people directly dependent on these industries for their livelihood face critical times unless this Congress faces up to its responsibilities and realistically revises our foreign trade and tariff structures to afford them needed protection.

Just let me cite a few examples.

The two States of Washington and Oregon are the center of the production of daffodils, iris, and tulips in the United States. In my district, alone, are grown some 30 million King Alfred daffodils annually—more than are grown in all of Holland. But faced with growing imports of foreign flowers, produced at the low-wage rates prevailing there, the growers of the Northwest are facing bankruptcy. An excess of foreign bulbs are being dumped on the United States market at prices below the cost of domestic production.

As a result, in 1952, domestic growers, even after selling most of the crops below cost, were forced to destroy their unsold surplus amounting to about 25 percent of all their iris and 20 percent of their top quality narcissus.

The reason for this depression is not hard to find. A March 1953 report by the United States Tariff Commission showed that between 1937 and 1952 the import duty on narcissus bulbs from the Netherlands was lowered from $6 per thousand bulbs to $3, and the number of bulbs imported jumped from 6 million to more than 28 million. Likewise, between 1950 and 1952 the ad valorem duty on iris bulbs was reduced from 10 to 7½ percent, and the total of bulbs increased from 50 million to nearly 70 million, or about 40 percent.

Another important industry to the Northwest which is being seriously hurt by cheap imports is the manufacturing of hardboard. Six of the nine domestic producers of this vital national defense item are located in Washington or Oregon, and of seven more domestic plants under construction under the target expansion goal set by the Defense Production Administration, three are in Washington and three are in Oregon.

Now, at the very time that this tremendous Government-encouraged expansion of domestic hardboard capacity is being completed, and when current domestic markets are shrinking and a buyer's market is being encountered, the domestic industry is facing constantly increasing imports of foreign hardboard from Sweden, Finland, and Canada.

Particularly the Scandinavian hardboard has been coming into more and more ports and is being sold at lower and lower prices—far below the prices domestic producers can afford to charge.

As a result of the reciprocal trade agreements program, the United States duty on foreign hardboard was reduced from 30 percent ad valorem in 1930 to 15 percent in 1936, and since 1947 has been cut to $7.25 per ton, or not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent, ad valorem.

Census Bureau figures I have recently seen indicate that through the first 8 months of 1953 imports of hardboard increased 65 percent from Canada over the like period of 1952, that they were 3 times greater from Finland and 8 times greater from Sweden.

These vastly increased imports have already had a serious impact on the domestic industry. Our producer has been forced to lay off more than 350 employees; another reports production cutbacks of 50 percent, and others have gone on 2- to 4-day workweeks or have cut down on shifts.

Another industry in the forestry field which is of prime importance to the people of the Northwest is the manufacture of plywood. The industry, likewise, is suffering from a lack of adequate protection, and plywood made in Japan, at wage rates drastically below those of our own workers, is now coming into this country in greater and greater volume.

Another great and vital industry to the Northwest, as well as to the whole west coast, is the taking and processing of fish. This includes the taking and distribution of tuna, salmon, halibut, and otter-trawl and drag fisheries. There are several thousand ships and an estimated 20,000 or more fishermen employed directly in the taking of these fish, plus many thousands more who make a living from the processing and distribution of them.

And, yet, with imports from Japan and South America growing at an alarming rate, these American ships will be driven from the seas and the American factories closed up unless relief is granted soon.

In 1953, more tuna was imported from Japan than was produced domestically. Other import threats are comparable, and will continue to become more dangerous unless protection is granted the domestic producers.

It is simply impossible for American fishermen or processors to compete with the Japanese. The average American fisherman, for example, in order to live must earn at least two times as much as the Japanese fisherman is paid. Cost of boat construction, gear, repairs, and so forth, are all much higher in this country. Foreign competition has already forced a number of fisheries and processing plants out of business or compelled them to greatly reduce operations. With many of our seacoast towns depending on the fisherman and his earnings, this depression in the fishing industry has a far-reaching and serious effect on entire communities.

The groundfish fleet in the Pacific Northwest has shrunk from some 250 boats a few years ago to only about 40 today, and imports have increased 1,100 percent since 1940, from 9 million pounds in 1941 to 102 million pounds in 1952.

Canadian fishermen and processors earn an average of 98 cents an hour, while their American counterparts make an average of $2.04 per hour.

The industry must have immediate tariff and quota protection if it is to survive, and its thousands of workers continue to earn a living.

There are many other industries, such as the raising of tree nuts including filbert which are important to the Northwest, where tariff and trade policies are critically hurting Americans.

The nut industry has consistently sought relief from the Tariff Commission under existing provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and under the countervailing duties and antidumping laws from the Treasury Department. But this relief has just as consistently been denied them.

We in the great Northwest believe firmly in trade and commerce among the nations. We will encourage it whenever it is fair trade and in the best interests of America. But we do not believe this Nation should deliberately follow a trade policy that forces American businesses to close and puts American citizens out of work; that opens up our domestic markets to goods produced at substandard wages which would be illegal in the United States.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to bear these facts in mind when it comes time to consider revisions of our foreign trade and tariff legislation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY—BILL INTRODUCED INCLUDES RULES OF FAIR PROCEDURE

Mr. JAVITS. 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. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, to those who are devoted to a bipartisan foreign policy for the United States and to a dynamic and progressive domestic policy, alike, the question of congressional investigations of communism and subversion and how to conduct them must be definitely settled or we will be completely bogged down and our attention diverted from the settlement of other issues vital to national security and prosperity and world peace. Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the New York Times of last Saturday,

February 27, calls this the "No. 1 issue in American political life." Such a situation could effectively play into the hands of those who are opposed to the administration's legislative program and must have the urgent attention of those who are for the administration's program.

It is for these reasons that I am today introducing a bill to establish a Joint Committee on Internal Security to replace in the field of investigating subversion and communism the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subcommittees on Internal Security and on Investigations of the other body having as their principal activities this kind of investigation. Rules of fair procedure are specified in my bill to be followed by the joint committee.

A vital aspect of my bill provides that the joint committee may, under conditions it specifies, delegate these investigations to other standing committees or may recommend commissions for particular investigations to be created by law. A joint committee will avoid duplication and competition between the investigating committees of each House, will better discharge the responsibility which is that of the whole Congress, will make more likely the adoption of rules of fair procedure to govern these investigations and legitimately the rights of individuals, and will best correct excesses in such investigations which have been occurring.

Congressional investigations of subversion and communism have shown such wide ramifications having a direct effect on the foreign policy of the United States, the morale of Federal employees, and the discipline of the Army, as well as involving materially industry, religion, and higher education, and almost every other phase of thought and learning, as to call for the considered responsibility of the Congress which can be best expressed through a joint committee. Nor can we overlook many right fringe and so-called native hate movements which seem to have taken a new lease on life lately, endeavoring to trade on the strains of the day.

The power to investigate is a vital part of the power of the Congress under the responsibilities apportioned to the three branches by the Constitution. It is an essential element of our freedom, and it is very important that the Congress take measures to insure that the people's confidence in it will be unimpaired.

The rules of procedure for the joint committee provide for a clear statement of the legislative objectives sought in the investigations; a major investigation to be undertaken only as approved by a majority of the committee; executive hearings to establish witnesses' credibility before public hearings which are likely to result in charges against individuals; the right of witnesses to counsel; the right of the witness or one adversely mentioned by a witness to have notice of this fact to make a reasonable statement in his own defense and to an opportunity for reasonable cross-examination and presentation of affirmative testimony to rebut testimony affecting his reputation adversely; a requirement that no individual member of a committee or employee may release reports or charges or material from a committee file except what is authorized by a majority of the whole committee; the broadcasting and televising of witnesses whose reputation is at stake or those whom they call in defense be permitted only with the consent of the witness; and that committee members or their staffs do not write or speak about investigations in process for compensation.

The bill provides for a joint committee of 14, 7 each from the House and Senate, appointed respectively by the Speaker and Vice President, and bipartisan in nature.

An additional advantage of a joint committee is that the rule of seniority need not apply in the selection of a chairman, and therefore the committee has much more flexibility in its operation. The joint committee is given the power of subpena, the right to have a staff, and all other necessary powers, all subject to the rules of fair procedure referred to above.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore granted.

FURNISHING OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained unanimous consent to address the House today for 30 minutes. My subject will be "I Do Not Believe the Material You Have Suggested Would Be Useful"—An Outrageous Refusal by the Secretary of the Treasury To Furnish Information of a Nonconfidential Nature to a Member of Congress.

To those who may not be able to be on the floor this afternoon because of the press of other official business, I respectfully make the request that you take time to read my remarks, believing that they will be of interest to each individual Member.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL AND PINK-BOLLWORM-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. WILLIS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, southwest Louisiana, including the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent in this body, is one of the largest sweetpotato-producing areas in the United States. The State of Louisiana, as is well known, also produces great quantities of cotton.

An adequate sweetpotato weevil-control program and a continuation of the pink-bollworm-control project are vital to these two important agricultural industries.

SWEETPOTATO WEEVIL-CONTROL PROGRAM

The program is a cooperative project between the United States Department of Agriculture and the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. Its purpose is for the protection of the sweetpotato farmers and the industry from heavy losses due to the weevil, which is the most destructive pest affecting this leading horticultural crop; and to likewise prevent the spread of the insect to weevil-free areas within these States and to other sweetpotato-growing States. The States involved are now expending approximately $409,000, or 70 percent, of the current budget program, and their ratio of manpower is 3 to 1. The States have maintained this percentage contribution for several years.

The Federal budget for the fiscal year 1955 provides for $50,800, a 76-percent reduction in funds currently available for this work, which is entirely inadequate to maintain the program in an effective manner. This problem, which is interstate in nature, requires Federal participation in program planning and coordination between States relating to surveys, quarantines, educational information, assistance in eradication and control procedures and research.

With a reduction in cotton acreage there will be a substantial increase in acres devoted to the production of sweetpotatoes, which also means additional work will be required to keep the weevil infestations to the minimum.

If the proposed budget of $50,800 is adopted it will result in the collapse of this program, causing great losses to an industry in the States now producing more than 60 percent of the total production of sweetpotatoes in the United States, which has an estimated value of more than $88 million for 1953.

This project has been successful in eradicating the weevil from some 50 counties and from many thousand farms in the affected States. In some years losses to farmers have been reduced by $2½ million or approximately four times the average annual program cost.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that a minimum Federal appropriation of $250,000 be provided for this project in order to bring about a more equitable distribution of the workload by increasing Federal manpower and equipment to assist the States in the effective control, eradication, and prevention of spread of the sweetpotato weevil.

PINK BOLLWORM CONTROL PROJECT

The pink bollworm of cotton is one of the most destructive of all insects. The amount of damage done to cotton will vary according to intensity of infestation, conditions comprising natural control and artificial control measures practiced. Probably the only reason that it does not do more damage in the United States than the cotton bollweevil is because the cotton-producing States have not become as generally infested by this pest. However, grave concern has been

expressed concerning the potential danger to the cotton industry of the United States should the pink bollworm become firmly entrenched.

This pest is now present in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Arkansas, which was found infested for the first time in 1953. It is likewise present in Mexico. In 1952 this insect was responsible for the loss of $34 million to the cotton industry of 39 counties in south Texas.

It is estimated that an additional sum of $280,000 to the present proposed Federal budget of $1,070,100 will be needed to effectively conduct this expanded project.

During the 1953 season new infestations were found in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The cotton-producing South is now being threatened, and any relaxation in this program will result in severe losses to the cotton farmers. Additional funds must be provided for personnel, equipment, and travel expenses to enforce the control and quarantine regulations in the newly infested sections of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Traffic inspection on roads leading out of the heavily infested areas of Texas and at stations along the Louisiana-Texas and Arkansas-Texas boundaries must be strengthened. The limited amount of work conducted on this phase of the program during the last 2 crop years has shown great value in intercepting large quantities of live pink bollworm, especially in baggage and cotton-picking sacks of migrant picker crews moving to noninfested States.

In 1953 an infestation of pink bollworm was found on the west coast of Mexico which definitely presents a serious threat to the cotton-growing areas of Arizona and California. Additional funds must be expended for an increase in the inspections for incipient pink bollworm infestations on the west coast and Lower California cotton-growing areas of Mexico.

In recent years sufficient funds have not been provided for making the necessary surveys in Florida for wild cotton. This is an essential phase of the program and additional funds are needed to satisfactorily conduct this work.

Therefore, it is urgently requested that the sum of $1,350,000 be provided by the Federal budget for this project. The infested and some noninfested States are now and have been providing funds for this project.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL PAY PROPOSALS

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an address I delivered before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I made the following statement at the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee public hearing on pending postal and Federal pay proposals, March 1, 1954:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you at this time for the purpose of presenting my views as to the Withrow-Rhodes proposal to increase postal wages $800 per annum. These hard-pressed loyal employees of the postal establishment have not had an upward wage adjustment since July 1, 1951. At that time, the former chairman of this distinguished committee, and later Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. Robert Ramspeck, testified that it would require a 21-percent increase in wages to bring postal and Federal employees in line with the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index in regard to the cost of living.

The actual increase granted by Congress in July 1951 fell far short of the mark and averaged somewhere around 13 percent. Since 1951, living costs have continued to rise and there appears to be no immediate relief in sight. Moreover, the Bureau of Labor Statistics representatives who appeared before this body some 10 days ago readily agreed that the wages in private industry had increased about 16 percent since July 1951.

If the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures are correct, and I believe they are in line with similar studies on the overall cost of living—then the postal and Federal workers are most certainly entitled to the modest amount proposed in the Withrow-Rhodes measure (H. R. 2344) and similar pending bills.

While expressing approval of the horizontal $800 wage-increase proposals, I am, however, constrained to withhold approval of the recommendations made by the Postmaster General on what is known as the Fry report. A complete reclassification of the postal wage structure is, of course, necessary, desirable, and long overdue. However, any proposition that affords a 35-percent wage increase to the postmaster at Chicago, Ill., and a meager increase of less than three-tenths of 1 percent to letter carriers and postal clerks in grade 3 ($10 per annum) is absurd.

If I am correctly informed, the postal authorities spent some $50,000 for the Fry & Associates report, which was hastily prepared in about 3 months. I am reliably informed that none of the representatives of the postal organizations or employees unions were consulted. Let me say that the distinguished and able members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, along with the leaders of the various employee organizations, could have done the job more effectively and without additional cost to the taxpayers.

In the absence of a proper reclassification measure, I suggest, therefore, that an immediate across-the-board increase will relieve present hardships among postal and Federal employees.

I shall be pleased to join with my colleagues in supporting the Withrow-Rhodes bill when it reaches the floor of the House of Representatives.

Again I thank you.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today, and to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday, March 8, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MARCH: NATIONAL SECURITY MONTH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on this first day of March, I would like to take note of the fact that this month has been designated by the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Arthur J. Connell, as National Security Month.

And at the same time, I wish to call attention also to the fact that during this month of March the American Legion will observe the 35th anniversary of its founding. This outstanding occasion, which will be officially celebrated on March 15–17, comes as the Legion boasts the greatest membership in its history.

Mr. Speaker, the patriotic and ever-vigilant activities of the American Legion need no extended comment—they are so well known and applauded that additional praise here would be superfluous. During the month of March when the American Legion will specifically observe National Security Month, however, I feel sure that the entire Nation will take note of and support the continuing efforts of this great veterans' organization to make our Nation secure from her enemies both within and without America.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. ANGELL. 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. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most menacing problems facing the world today is the spread of communism throughout the world. It is reported that the Soviet Union has brought within its control behind the Iron Curtain some 800 million persons. We have sent thousands of our young men overseas in the Korean war—many of whom paid with their lives—and other military operations in an endeavor to halt the spread of communism and to prevent it from taking over the entire world.

I know of no one in public service who has rendered more outstanding and effective service in tracking down Communists and Communists saboteurs and Communist fellow travelers in the United States than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He speaks with authority on this subject. I was particularly interested in the factual and interesting discussion by Mr.

Hoover which recently appeared in the American Legion magazine in the March 1954 issue, on the subject, Where Do We Stand Today With Communism in the United States? and I include Mr. Hoover's remarks as a part of this discussion:

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY WITH COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES?

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS THAT PUZZLE MANY AMERICANS

Question. Has there been a decline in recent years in the number of Communists in the United States?

Answer. Yes. In January 1947, there were approximately 74,000 members of the Communist Party in the United States. In July 1948, the top 12 Communist Party leaders were indicted on charges of violation of the Smith Act. This was the first legal action instituted against the top leadership of the Communist Party. In January 1949, party membership was approximately 54,000. On October 14, 1949, the Communist Party leaders were found guilty. As of December 31, 1949, party membership numbered less than 53,000. On June 25, 1950, the war in Korea began; and on September 23, 1950, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which called for the registration of all Communist-action organizations, went into effect. By December 31, 1950, party membership in the United States numbered less than 44,000. On June 4, 1951, the Smith Act was upheld constitutionally, and during the summer of 1951, additional Communist leaders were indicted under this act. By January 1952, party membership totaled less than 32,000; and as of September 30, 1953, it numbered approximately 24,000. That is a decrease of 50,000 members, or about two-thirds of the total membership, since January 1947.

Question. Has there been a corresponding decline in Communist influence in the United States?

Answer. I would not say that Communist influence has declined in direct ratio to the decrease in members. The influence of the Communist movement can never be determined in terms of members. Many of the members who have dropped out of the Communist Party are still sympathetic with some of the aims of the party and can still be counted on to assist in certain phases of party work. The large number of members who have defected or have been expelled in recent years does not represent the most influential or the most devoted members. Those who now remain in the Communist Party are essentially the real nucleus of hard-core Communists who are devoted to Marxism-Leninism and are willing to obey any party instructions. Essentially they are the members who were the most influential 6 years ago. The party still has its publications, its schools, and its fellow travelers. On the other hand, the prosecution and incarceration of the leading functionaries have forced the current leadership underground, which has hurt their effectiveness. Public exposure has neutralized the influence of many other members. These factors have been a damaging blow to the overall influence of the party.

Question. What has been the greatest blow suffered by the Communists in this country in recent years?

Answer. Unquestionably, the greatest blow they have suffered has been the successful prosecution by the Government of over 60 of their leaders for violation of the Smith Act. This has deprived the party of much of its most powerful leadership, disrupted many of its operations, and heavily drained its financial resources. It has thrown confusion, uncertainty, and fear into the rank-and-file membership. It has made them realize how thoroughly they have been investigated for a long period of time and how closely their activities have been observed, with the result that they have gone underground and have invoked such strict security measures among the membership that they cannot operate nearly so effectively as in past years. It has revealed to them that some of their most trusted comrades were actually informants for the Government, which has created suspicion and distrust of their associates. It has caused many of the less devoted Marxists to drop out of the party, and some of them to make a full disclosure to the FBI of their knowledge of Communist activities. It has turned the spotlight on the Communist conspiracy against this country, so that the American public has now seen it in true perspective and has taken an enlightened stand against this foreign-inspired menace. This positive action by the Government has been and continues to be a staggering blow to the Communist Party.

Question. What is our greatest present danger from American communism?

Answer. So long as public opinion is aroused and there is widespread resistance to Communist infiltration the greatest danger lies in the moment of great emergency which would arise should the Soviets try a Pearl Harbor sneak attack. Then, by disrupting our defense program, they could do us the most damage. It is of utmost importance to the security of our Nation that we maintain a constant state of preparedness to repel successfully any attack and to deal swiftly and effectively with any aggressor. Any breakdown in our productive ability would imperil our national security now, and would create a crucial situation in the event of open hostilities. For that reason we must take every precaution to safeguard our productive might.

Question. Do you think the public has been getting a fair picture of the danger from Communists within this country?

Answer. I feel that the press, radio, television and congressional investigating committees have done much in recent years to educate the public as to the nature, operations, and objectives of communism; and the educational program of the American Legion has been particularly effective.

Question. Do you think the public now understands and appreciates the danger?

Answer. Those who are interested in learning about the Communist menace have certainly had the opportunity to become better informed during recent years; but, of course, there are many people who are apathetic about the danger and consequently have little or no understanding of it.

Question. Because of the Korean war most Americans now recognize the overall menace of armed aggression. They also know that Soviet spies have been at work in this country. However, is it not true that most Americans are hazy when it comes to Communist fronts, how they operate, and what should be done about them?

Answer. The fact that there are so many Communist front groups now operating in the United States leaves no doubt that many Americans have not checked into the underlying purpose and nature of such organizations before becoming affiliated with them.

Communist front groups are organizations of a disguised character which the Communist Party uses to further its aims. They would appear on the surface not to be under Communist control, and their ostensible objectives would seem to be entirely legitimate. Only in this way can they attract the support of many individuals who would not openly uphold a known Communist Party program.

Front groups are particularly valuable to the Communist Party as a recruiting field for potential party members, as a source of funds, as a pressure group advocating a particular Communist program and as a means of disseminating Communist propaganda. They are established either by actually organizing a new group around a particular issue or by infiltrating a legitimate existing organization. Among those who participate in front groups are open Communist Party members, concealed Communists, fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers.

Legal action has been taken with respect to such organizations. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that organizations determined by the Subversive Activities Control Board to be Communist front organizations, and officers of these organizations, must register with the Attorney General; and certain restrictions are placed upon such organizations and persons. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been holding hearings on certain organizations on the Attorney General's list, to determine whether they are Communist front organizations within the provisions of this act.

It is highly important that any person "Stop, look, and listen" before he allows his name to be used by any newly created organization with whose aims he is not completely familiar.

Question. You have often predicted that the Communists would go underground when things became hot. With public resentment increasing, hasn't there been a general movement from open Communist organizations to more or less nebulous front organizations?

Answer. Very definitely. Almost all Communist Party activity is being carried on in a disguised manner. Many of the top leaders and most trusted members of the party have gone underground, and the rank-and-file membership carry on party activities through Communist front organizations and even through infiltrating legitimate organizations. For example, under party instructions they have joined parent-teacher associations, church, civic, and similar groups in which you would not expect to find them. They are transferred to different sections of the country where they assume fictitious names and backgrounds and infiltrate unsuspecting groups and right-led labor unions in order to further the Communist program. Therefore it will be increasingly difficult for unsuspecting citizens to detect Communist influence in organizational activities.

Question. This, then, means a tougher problem for Americans since the fight moves into a twilight zone. Issues are confused, and the public is confused. How can communism be fought most effectively in America today?

Answer. I have always felt that an alert, informed citizenry is our most potent weapon against communism. The vast majority of Americans are patriotic, loyal citizens. They abhor treachery, deceit and any forces which would deprive us of our freedom and democratic liberties, and will not long tolerate the perpetuation of such evils. Through the schools, churches, press, and radio, the public should be given the facts about communism. Not through demagogy or appeal to their prejudices and fears, but through a clear, factual, truthful presentation, the public should continue to be informed of the real purposes, objectives, loyalties, and methods of operation of the Communist Party. Because Communist strategy is based on deceit and its true motives are concealed, communism cannot flourish under the spotlight of truth. The more fully it becomes exposed to the public eye, the more limited becomes its area of effective operations and the more restricted the number of people who will be duped into serving its evil purposes.

Along with informing the public of the truth concerning communism, and publicly exposing it as the foreign-inspired conspiracy

that it is, another effective method of fighting communism is by prosecuting Communists for violations of Federal law.

Question. Where can the private citizen go to get authentic information about organizations and individuals he suspects?

Answer. To determine the organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, one should either contact the Department of Justice or refer to issues of the Federal Register dated May 12, 1953, July 21, 1953, and October 6, 1953, which contain all designations by the Attorney General up to September 25, 1953. The fact that a particular organization does not appear on the Attorney General's list, however, does not necessarily mean that the organization is clear of subversive influence. Actually that organization may be under investigation, and an individual should be careful of what organizations he joins and should keep his eyes open to detect Communist influence. With regard to obtaining authentic information about individuals he suspects as being Communists, there is no one single source to which he can go to obtain complete information. The FBI must necessarily keep the contents of its files confidential.

Question. How can the individual assist the FBI in its investigation of subversive activities?

Answer. By voluntarily furnishing any information he may have concerning subversive activities to the FBI, and by cooperating in any way he can when requested to by the FBI, the individual is not only rendering valuable assistance but is also measuring up to the responsibilities of good citizenship.

Question. Specifically, if a person feels he has valuable information, how should he go about offering it?

Answer. He can write to me personally; he can go in person to the nearest field office of the FBI; or he can call the nearest field office and arrange for a special agent to contact him. The telephone number of the appropriate FBI office is listed on the first page of all telephone directories. He can be certain that his assistance is appreciated and that his identity will be kept confidential if he so desires.

Question. There is a certain amount of confusion in the public mind concerning the functions of the FBI. Some people feel that "we should not permit Congress to go after alleged subversives since this is a function of the FBI." Others maintain that the FBI could round up all the subversives in the country on short notice; therefore, what are we worrying about?

For the record, will you explain just what the FBI can do and what it is not permitted to do?

Answer. By Presidential directives, legislative enactments and instructions of the Attorney General the FBI has the responsibility of investigating espionage, sabotage, subversive activities and related domestic intelligence matters and of serving as a coordinating agency for the dissemination of domestic intelligence information to other Federal agencies authorized to receive it. The FBI is a fact-finding agency and does not institute prosecutive action on the basis of its investigative findings. Information reflecting a violation of Federal law is referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion as to prosecution. Any information received which pertains to the responsibilities of some other Government agency is transmitted directly to that agency without recommendation or evaluation.

While the FBI for years has exposed the Communist conspiracy, it cannot divulge the confidential details of its files as to specific individuals. A congressional committee having the power of subpena and contempt citation is able to focus public attention on specific situations.

Question. Can a person who believes that the FBI has wrongly pegged him as a Communist present his side of the case so the record shows his version?

Answer. Not only can he present his version, but the FBI welcomes any such person's coming in and relating his story. We are a fact-finding organization and we are just as zealous to protect the innocent as we are to detect those who pose a threat to the internal security of our country.

Question. Ex-Communists are held in low regard by some people who maintain that they shouldn't be trusted and their testimony is worthless. What is your experience with ex-Communists in this respect? Have these people to any great extent redeemed themselves by the help they have given you?

Answer. The assistance which ex-Communists have given to the FBI has been invaluable. Having had their eyes opened to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, many of them have reevaluated the privileges of American citizenship, have realized the duties inherent in such citizenship, and, through making a full disclosure to the FBI of the information they possess, have made contributions of great value to the internal security of this country. The truth of their testimony has been verified by corroborating evidence. Many ex-Communists have been tested by vigorous and searching cross-examination, and their opponents have been unable to contradict their testimony. Many of them have suffered ostracism, public rebuke, and social distrust as a result of their breaking with the Communist Party and testifying against it. All religions teach that redemption is possible for any man who sincerely repents and seeks to make amend for his errors. The sincerity of a former Communist can be judged by his willingness to stand up and be counted and by taking positive action to attempt to rectify his wrongs. I am always glad to see ex-Communists make their change of conscience and philosophy a matter of record, assume earnestly the responsibilities of good citizenship and join in the fight against the evil they formerly espoused, and I welcome the information which they can furnish.

Question. We have asked about past and present dangers. Can you indicate what the Communists are planning for 1954 and later?

Answer. The Communist Party has three primary plans for future action. One is the infiltration of labor. In this respect the party is concentrating on the infiltration of right-led unions, or non-Communist-dominated unions, and labor unions in the basic industries. Its vicious purpose is both to influence the trade union movement in this country and to be on the ground floor in the event the labor movement ever forms a third major political party in the United States.

A second diabolical plan is to infiltrate and strengthen its ties within the two major political parties in this country, in order to advance more effectively the interests of the Communist Party within the existing political framework and to bring about a new political realinement in this country on the basis of which the Communist Party hopes ultimately to be the dominating force.

A third and probably the most important plan is the continuation of the so-called peace offensive. Here the Communists are attempting to capitalize on the deep desire of the American people for peace. They would lay sole claim to any real efforts to achieve that goal; yet it is their Soviet masters who make the achievement of world peace so difficult. In order that we may not be misled by Communist peace propaganda, it is important that we understand the Marxist-Leninist distinction between two kinds of peace—lasting peace, obtained only after world revolution; and temporary peace, regarded as a tactical necessity as the tide of revolution ebbs and flows. In short, the peace which figures so prominently in Communist propaganda today is a temporary tactical peace designed to strengthen the Soviet Union and to stupefy its adversaries.

Question. The lone individual often feels he can do nothing to fight communism, and in most cases there is not a great deal he can do. However, there are some things open to him. What are they?

Answer. Every loyal American citizen can and should join in the fight against the Communist menace. These are some of the things each person can do:

1. Learn the facts about communism—its history and objectives, its program and techniques in this country. The better informed one becomes, the more rapidly he can detect Communist influences and the more intelligently he can fight communism.

2. Through such media as the press and radio, keep up with Russia's stand on matters of foreign policy. The Communist Party in America will take the same position, and the party line will fluctuate as Soviet foreign policy changes. Sudden reversals in Soviet policy will cause members of the party to make sudden similar reversals in their pronouncements, which is one of the best ways to spot Communists.

3. Become familiar with the names of organizations publicly cited as Communist fronts, and refuse to join such groups, to sponsor their causes or to contribute to their fund drives.

4. Be alert to Communist tactics in unions and other organizations. Outmaneuver them. Keep them under control and in the minority at all times and attempt to eliminate or neutralize their effectiveness. Openly oppose their efforts to promulgate pro-Communist activities or resolutions.

5. Keep Communists out of official positions in schools, churches, and other institutions where they can poison the minds and influence actions of youth.

6. Exercise your privilege to vote and keep Communists and their sympathizers out of public office.

7. Develop an intelligent, participating interest in civic affairs and programs for social improvement. Don't let Communists claim a monopoly in such matters or move in and direct established programs.

8. Report to the FBI immediately any pertinent information relating to subversive activities.

9. Conduct no private investigations of suspicious persons or organizations, but leave that to trained investigators who are authorized to perform such investigations. Do not become involved in the Communist movement for whatever worthwhile motives without first discussing the matter thoroughly with the FBI and establishing a cooperative relationship.

10. Learn as much as possible about America—its history, government, culture, laws, and heritage of freedom; and make the practice of democracy its own bulwark against subversion. Speak up for America and work for America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 18]

Abbitt	Burleson	Dawson, Ill.
Battle	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Blatnik	Campbell	Dorn, S. C.
Bolling	Chatham	Durham
Bosch	Chelf	Gamble
Brownson	Clardy	Gary
Buckley	Corbett	Gwinn

Hart	Morgan	Robeson, Va.
Hillelson	Moulder	Robsion, Ky.
Kearney	Osmers	Roosevelt
Kelley, Pa.	Patman	St. George
Keogh	Patterson	Scrivner
Kirwan	Pillion	Scudder
Kluczynski	Powell	Sheehan
Krueger	Price	Short
Lantaff	Prouty	Sutton
Lesinski	Radwan	Taylor
Lipscomb	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
McCarthy	Richards	Weichel
McConnell	Riehlman	
Merrill	Rivers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 7339, a bill to amend certain phases of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act.

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

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAY CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS QUARTERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CITY OF CHANDLER, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TANKERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national-defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3413) to grant oil and gas in lands on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont. (44 Stat. 101), is hereby granted to the Indian who, on the date of enactment of this act, holds the surface rights of such land. If on such date the surface rights of such land are held by any person other than an Indian, the oil and gas therein is hereby granted to the last Indian who prior to such date held such surface rights or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs.

SEC. 2. No oil and gas lease which covers in whole or in part land allotted on or after March 3, 1927, is entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, and is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any rents, royalties, and other money payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by the first section of this act, shall be paid to such Indian.

SEC. 3. This act shall not apply to (1) oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of enactment of this act, is unallotted or otherwise undisposed of and (2) oil and gas in land, the surface rights of which are held on such date by a person other than an Indian, if the last Indian owner of such surface rights was the Fort Peck Tribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the oil and gas in land located within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., allotted on or after March 3, 1927, which is now reserved to the Indians having tribal rights on such reservation by the first section of the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1401), relating to oil and gas in certain tribal lands within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., is hereby granted to the allottee of such lands, or, if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees: *Provided*, That if the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished such allotment and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil and gas hereby granted shall be only that in the land in the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. If on or after March 3, 1927, the allottee or his heirs or devisees, relinquished an allotment made prior to March 3, 1927, and received a lieu allotment of other lands in the said reservation or transferred title to such allotment to the Fort Peck Tribe and, in exchange therefor, received an assignment of the same or other lands in the said reservation, the oil or gas in the land in such lieu allotment or such exchange assignment is hereby granted to the holder of the lieu allotment or the exchange assignment, as the case may be, unless the allottee or his heirs or devisees reserved the oil and gas in the lands transferred or relinquished.

"SEC. 3. Title to the oil and gas granted by this act shall be held in trust by the United States for the Indian owners, except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is granted to Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within the Fort Peck Indian Reservation has heretofore been issued, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title is hereby granted to the Indian owner, and except where the entire interest in the oil and gas is hereafter held for Indians to whom a fee patent for any land within said reservation has heretofore or hereafter been issued or who are determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be competent to manage their own affairs, in which event the unrestricted fee simple title shall be transferred to the Indian owner by the Secretary.

"SEC. 4. If the Secretary of the Interior determines that the entire interest in land, including land held under an exchange assignment, on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation is owned by Indians who are the grantees of oil and gas under this act and who are competent to manage their own affairs, he is authorized and directed to issue fee patents to them for such interest.

"SEC. 5. No oil and gas lease which was entered into pursuant to the first section of the act of March 3, 1927, which covers in whole or in part the lands referred to in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and which is in effect on the date of enactment of this act, shall be affected by reason of the enactment of this act, except that any royalties and other moneys payable under such lease after such date of enactment, which are attributable to the oil and gas granted to an Indian by sections 1 or 2 of this act shall be payable to such Indian, or if such Indian is deceased, to his heirs or devisees.

"SEC. 6. This act shall not apply to oil and gas in tribal land which, on the date of the enactment of this act, is otherwise undisposed of.

"SEC. 7. Any and all moneys collected by the tribes as advance rentals, bonus, and royalties of oil and gas leases after March 3, 1927, and prior to the transfer of said oil and gas rights pursuant to this act to said individual Indians may also be paid by authority of said executive board to the individual Indians to whom said oil and gas rights are transferred pursuant to this act.

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act shall not be effective unless approved in a referendum by a majority of the members of the Fort Peck Tribe actually voting therein: *Provided*, That the total vote cast shall not be less than 30 percent of those entitled to vote. This referendum shall be conducted on not less than 60 days' notice under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant oil and gas in lands and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., to individual Indians in certain cases."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED ENLISTED AND WARRANT OFFICER PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1433) to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That enlisted men and warrant officers heretofore advanced to commissioned rank or grade on the retired list under the said act of July 24, 1941, as amended, and who were restored to their former retired enlisted or warrant officer status, as the case may be, pursuant to section 3 of the act approved June 19, 1948 (Public Law 709, 80th Congress), shall be entitled to receive enlisted or warrant officer retired pay as appropriate, from November 1, 1946, or from the date of advancement on the retired list, whichever date is the later, to the date on which they were so restored: *Provided*, That no such retired pay shall accrue to personnel mentioned in this section for periods during which such personnel received commissioned officer retired pay.

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

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to entitle enlisted men and warrant officers advanced to commissioned rank or grade who are restored to their former enlisted or warrant officer status pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 505), to receive retired enlisted or warrant officer pay from November 1, 1946, or date of advancement, to date of restoration to enlisted or warrant officer status."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2683) to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The authority of the administrator under this act to provide public works and to enter into agreements with applicants in connection therewith shall terminate on June 30, 1959, or on the date he obligates for such purposes the total amount authorized to be appropriated hereunder, whichever first occurs."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Administrator" and insert "Secretary."

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.

AMENDMENT OF HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2848) to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 89. WHARVES AND LANDINGS.—The wharves and landings constructed or controlled by the Republic of Hawaii on any seacoast, bay, roadstead, or harbor shall remain under the control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii, which shall receive and enjoy all revenue derived therefrom."

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.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5627) to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I take this opportunity, since this bill relates to research, to call the attention of the House to the fact that in our armed services, particularly some of the branches of our armed services, there is a very unfortunate situation existing in connection with our scientists. To me, the field of science, basic and applied, is a matter of vital importance not only to the peacetime activities of our country but particularly in connection with our national defense.

One of those scientists might conceive something that would save the lives of 100,000 American boys wearing the uniform. One of them might conceive something of great benefit to our country that would be revolutionary in nature not only in connection with our domestic economy and situation but particularly in connection with our national defense.

I have a great deal of respect for our scientists. They are quiet men, most of them unassuming, but they contribute greatly. Not only have they contributed greatly in the past but their future contributions will also be of great benefit to our country.

I have ascertained that many of our scientists in the armed services are very much distressed with the conditions under which they are working, where some of the military, and I shall not mention individuals, are undertaking to dominate their activities rather than to cooperate with them, each cooperating with the other.

My purpose in rising today is not to be critical, but to call to the attention of my colleagues this situation which I have been following for the past 3 or 4 years. It is not anything new. I had taken it up with former President Truman. He made some improvements. I have discussed it on the floor of the House in the past. So my remarks have no application to any particular administration, but are solely to call to the attention of my colleagues that a very sensitive situation exists. Many of our scientists have left the service of our country, and there are many others who are going to leave the service of our country because of the conditions under which they are employed and under which they are serving. You cannot apply military rule to a scientist. Some of the military have undertaken to dictate to and to attempt to dominate them. I think that is harmful to the best interests of our country. My observations are more in the nature of a warning to my colleagues, and particularly to the military, that they ought to look into the situation and ought to try to create the harmonious

relationship between the military and the scientists in the service of our country who are working with the Department of Defense so that there will be a situation consistent with the best interests of our country. So, I repeat, this is not the time to criticize. But I am very much disturbed and alarmed at the potentialities. I hope the military will recognize that while the scientists must cooperate and they will cooperate, the military cannot dominate men of that type.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, pertinent to the observations made by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it is well for me to call the attention of the House to one point at this time, which is of deep interest to the country and to the world at large regarding scientists, and that is the fact that we have men in the National Institute of Health who are invited by other countries to visit those other countries—not at the expense of the United States, but at the expense of the foreign country. Their transportation and their keep is paid for by the foreign country. All that these men are asking is that they be allowed to travel at the expense of these foreign countries, but that they be not deprived of their wages and that the time consumed in making the trip not be charged to their annual leave. They ask that they be continued on the active payroll because they are not being paid for their time while they are abroad. While they are abroad, they are simply having their expenses paid. I know of one case in particular where one man is supposed to go abroad to lead a symposium on one of the very critical diseases. I am not going to identify the man because I do not want any repercussions. His application has been pending now for 6 months, and unless action is taken very promptly, he will not be able to get reservations to go abroad and lend his experience to this symposium on this particular disease in which all of us are vitally interested. I took up this question with the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education on a general scale about a year or so ago. I was told then that, of course, such leave could be granted and that the man would not lose his pay while abroad. But, no action has been taken on this particular case. Unless some action is taken very shortly, I intend to publicize this matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the few guarded remarks and observations that I have made, I 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 section 6 of Public Law 472, 81st Congress, is amended to read "The total of the sums expended pursuant to this act, including all sums expended for the payment of salaries or compensation to employees on leave, shall not exceed $100,000 in any fiscal year."

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.

INCLUSION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPRESENTATIVE AS A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7541) to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 271, 63d Congress, approved March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 930; 50 U. S. C. 151a), as amended, be amended by striking out "the chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "one representative of the Department of Defense, from the office in charge of research and development."

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.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO COOPERATE WITH THE STATE OF KENTUCKY TO ACQUIRE NONFEDERAL CAVE PROPERTIES WITHIN THE AUTHORIZED BOUNDARIES OF MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY OF TUCSON, ARIZ., AND TO ACCEPT OTHER LAND IN EXCHANGE THEREFOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1160) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that tract of land situate in the county of Pima, State of Arizona, described as that portion of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz., more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south line of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of said section 24, distant three hundred forty-five and nine-tenths feet westerly from the southwest corner of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter; run thence westerly along said south line, a distance of one hundred forty-four and one-tenth feet to a point; run thence northerly and parallel with the east line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet to a point; run thence easterly and parallel with the south line of said northwest quarter of the northwest quarter, a distance of one hundred forty-three and fifty-five one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence southerly a distance of two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet, more or less, to the point of beginning;

and to accept in exchange therefore a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the city of Tucson, Ariz., a municipal corporation, of the following described real property situate in Pima County, Ariz.:

The east one hundred and ninety feet of the south two hundred ninety and four-tenths feet of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 14 south of range 13 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Pima County, Ariz.

SEC. 2. The deed of the land conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the first section of this act shall contain express conditions—

(a) that the city of Tucson shall agree, upon the receipt of the deed from the Secretary of the Interior, to demolish the existing structure on such land; and

(b) that all salvage therefrom may be removed by the Papago Council of the Papago Tribe of Indians without the council paying for the same.

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

LEASING OF LANDS FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1570) to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 50 years.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in the first section of the act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That the Territory may, by general law, provide for leasing said land in area not to exceed one section to any one person, association, or corporation for not longer than fifty years at any one time:".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational

purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 55 years."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADMISSION OF CITIZENS OF THAILAND AND BELGIUM TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

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

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, 2 persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304; 10 U. S. C. 1092c).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to permit within 1 year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit within 1 year after the enactment of this joint resolution, upon designation of the President of the United States, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

"SEC. 3. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Army, in the case of persons attending the United States Military Academy, or the Secretary of the Navy, in the case of persons attending the United States Naval Academy, the said persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy or midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army or the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy or the United States Naval Academy.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said persons to the provisions of section 1320 of the Revised Statutes or to section 3 of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 304)."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: On page 2, line 20, strike the last word of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the word "instruction."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7402) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the city of St. Joseph, Mich., upon payment by such city of $3,300, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lot No. 112 in such city (being a portion of the property which was formerly known as the St. Joseph Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., and which was conditionally conveyed to such city by the Secretary of Commerce under the act of May 28, 1935), notwithstanding any conditions or limitations imposed by section 17 or section 36 of such act (49 Stat. 307, 311) or by the deed of conveyance issued thereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "city," insert "for use as a parking lot."

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.

CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF INDIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 232) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Indiana, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as Federal land) situated in Marion County, Ind., together with all fixtures and improvements thereon. Such land, which is surplus to the requirements of the United States, comprises a part of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, Marion County, Ind., known as Tent City, and is more particularly described as follows:

(1) Beginning at the southwest intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northeast corner of the tract of land herein described, thence running south along the western right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running in a westerly direction along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of hour hundred and fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a point in the east right-of-way line of a fifteen-foot alley; thence running north along said east right-of-way line of said fifteen-foot alley a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue; thence along said south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of four hundred fifty-five and twenty-three one-hundredths feet to a place of beginning and containing four and seventy-eight one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 1);

(2) Beginning at the southeast intersection of Wade Avenue with Main Street as shown on plat of Thurston Place Addition, said point being the northwest corner of the tract of land herein described; thence running south along the eastern right-of-way line of Main Street a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue; thence running east along the northern right-of-way line of Bradbury Avenue, a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to a point in the west right-of-way line of Holt Road, thence running north along the west right-of-way line of Holt Road a distance of four hundred and fifty-seven feet to a point in the south right-of-way of Wade Avenue, thence running west along the south right-of-way line of Wade Avenue a distance of nine hundred twenty-five and forty-six one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning and containing nine and seventy-three one-hundredths acres of land more or less (tract 2); and

(3) All the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all streets, highways, alleys, ways, and rights-of-way which may or do adjoin or abut the said land—the land described in this section is the same land that was acquired by the United States by deed dated December 7, 1942, recorded in the land records of Marion County, Ind., in volume 1103 at page 599, and shown as tracts 1 and 2 on the military real estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The conveyance of the Federal land provided for in the first section shall be made upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth as follows:

(1) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall

have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the Federal land, for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the State of Indiana shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or improvements thereon (hereinafter referred to as State land) comprising Stout Field, situated in sections 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, Marion County, Ind., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point at the center of section 17, township 15 north, range 3 east, second principal meridian, said point being the intersection of the center line of Minnesota Avenue and Holt Road; thence south along the north-south center line of section 17 and the center line of Holt Road three thousand four hundred ninety-three and fifty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point, said point being the intersection of the center line of Holt Road and Wade Street; thence in a westerly direction along the center line of Wade Street extended three thousand four hundred forty-five and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in a northerly direction nine hundred thirty-two and thirteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of Raymond Street extended, said point being two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet east of the east line of Denniston Street; thence in a westerly direction along the north line of Raymond Street extended two hundred nineteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet to a point in the east line of Denniston Street; thence north along the east line of Denniston Street one thousand one hundred sixty-five and twenty-one one-hundredths feet to a point; thence in an easterly direction along a line parallel to Lagrand Avenue eight hundred fifty-nine and thirty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Roena Avenue; thence north along the east line of Roena Avenue one thousand four hundred ninety-three and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east-west center line of section 18; thence in an easterly direction along the east-west center line of sections 18 and 17, and the center of Minnesota Avenue two thousand seven hundred ninety-one and eight-tenths feet to a point of beginning; containing two hundred fifty-eight and ten one-hundredths acres, more or less; and being the same land under lease to the United States from 1942 to December 31, 1946, covered by lease contract numbered W2215-ENG-69, between the State of Indiana and the United States, executed April 7, 1942; shown as tract 4 on the military real-estate map of Stout Field, numbered 1627, approved July 6, 1945, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers.

(3) In time of war or of national emergency heretofore or hereafter declared by the President or the Congress, and upon the request of the Secretary of Defense to the State of Indiana, the United States shall have the right to the exclusive or nonexclusive use of all or any part of the State land for the full period of such war or national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such war or national emergency the use of the State land shall cease in favor of the State of Indiana.

(4) In the event that the State of Indiana shall at any time sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, or shall attempt to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of, all or any part of the State or Federal land without the consent of the Secretary of Defense, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Indiana from granting leases of said lands and rights and easements therein and thereon without the consent of the Secretary of Defense providing any such leases, rights, and easements are made subject to the right of use thereof by the United States during war or national emergency.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 9, after the word "land", insert the words "and all improvements thereon."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "land", insert the words "including any improvements thereon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. This completes the bills on the Consent Calendar today.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 355, amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461–1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 19]

Battle	Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff
Bentsen	Durham	Lesinski
Bolling	Gamble	Lipscomb
Brownson	Gary	McCarthy
Buckley	Gwinn	McConnell
Byrne, Pa.	Hart	Merrill
Campbell	Hillelson	Morgan
Chatham	Holifield	Moulder
Chelf	Kearney	Osmers
Clardy	Kelley, Pa.	Patterson
Corbett	Keogh	Pillion
Coudert	Kirwan	Powell
Dawson, Ill.	Kluczynski	Price
Dingell	Krueger	Prouty
Radwan	Roosevelt	Vursell
Richards	St. George	Wainwright
Riehlman	Scrivner	Weichel
Rivers	Sheppard	Wharton
Robsion, Ky.	Short	
Robeson, Va.	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HILLELSON (at the request of Mr. SHEEHAN), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the legislative program and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include resolutions.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernment Relations.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a great many Members are not familiar with the fact that there are at present high-level negotiations going on between the Mexican Government and our Government regarding Mexican labor coming across the border. I cannot understand why this particular resolution is called up today.

At this very hour a friendly nation—Mexico—is now trying to negotiate with United States representatives the very thing that this resolution seeks to accomplish. Before the Rules Committee last week it was revealed and admitted by one of the proponents of this legislation that you might term this bill a weapon with a little weight in it in order to try and pressure Mexico in the negotiations with our country regarding some of their so-called wetback farm labor. My definition of a weapon with a little weight is what is known as a blackjack.

I wonder if the Members of this House realize that last year over 580,000 illegal immigrants were sent back across the border, and most of those illegal immigrants were caused by this so-called wetback situation.

With the exception of maybe 5 States that are interested in this cheap labor, I would like to ask the Representatives of the 42 or 43 other States what they are going to say to their people about reports of unemployment which appeared in last week's papers? On February 25 of last week the Washington papers said there were 59 critical areas of unemployment in this Nation. Why should we let down the bars now to have legislation passed that will eventually this year mean thousands of workers from across the Rio Grande border coming into this country to take over jobs that millions of unemployed Americans are entitled to? Why this resolution is up here today I do not know, because this dispatch from this morning's paper states:

> The Mexican Embassy announced today that an agreement has been reached in Mexico City for provisional 6 weeks' extension of the terms under which farm workers from south of the border may accept jobs in the United States. The Embassy statement said that an understanding has been reached on almost all points under consideration on a continuing bilateral agreement.

If the agreement is signed this bill is absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I cannot yield at present; I will later if I have time.

Let me read from a February 25 newspaper article, and this article appeared in the Washington newspapers.

> These groups promised to work to facilitate an agreement by their governments. They were the Associacion Nacional de Cosecheros of Mexico and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Grange. The National Farmers Union was represented by its president, James Patton, at the Tuesday morning conference but did not participate in later meetings.
>
> Allan B. Kline, AFBF president, is also president of the IFAP and presided at the sessions.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farm organizations, the labor organizations are cooperating to bring about an agreement between our Government and Mexico on this labor question. The passage of this bill may jeopardize the success of these high-level negotiations.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Not right now.

The press this morning states that our Secretary of State today is down in South America with a very delicate and difficult international task to perform. I can almost read the headlines in South America tomorrow morning. They will say that our Congress passed a resolution in order to pressure the Mexican Government to sign a contract on an agreement that concerns their nationals.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. COOLEY. I think my chairman was about to ask the gentleman whether he meant to say that the farm organizations were opposed to this resolution.

It is a fact that the farm organizations—the Grange and the Farm Bureau—submitted a very feeble and a very brief endorsement of this legislation when we were having hearings. But the gentleman is calling the attention of Members of the House to the fact that last week the big farm organizations had a 3-day meeting in Washington and everyone came out against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. They came here and they met with the labor organizations of Mexico and came out against it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I would like to read for the benefit of the Members of the House what Attorney General Brownell stated in an interview held at San Francisco, and this is chronicled in the New York Times of August 17, 1953. Brownell stated at that time:

> In San Francisco, as in San Diego, Los Angeles and the San Joaquin Valley, Mr. Brownell said he had talked with scores of Californians intimately acquainted with the yearly "invasion" of Mexican nationals.
>
> "It develops from the conferences," he said, "that the problem is increasing. The number of wetbacks entering the country is at an all-time high. Rackets are developing in the importation of labor. It has all the earmarks of developing into a number one law enforcement problem, and it is going to take the coordinated efforts of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials to combat this problem."

Now, I wish you would listen to this. It was only 2 years ago that the Congress knocked three-million-some-odd-thousand dollars out of an appropriation to give us sufficient protection at the border, to keep aliens from coming across the border unlawfully.

Here is what Attorney General Brownell said:

> The Attorney General said that, in his opinion, congressional economies that cut the United States Border Patrol from 1,627 to about 1,100 members were penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Just 2 years ago this Congress committed that act.

The Attorney General went on to say:

> For every dollar saved in that way, $20 must be spent later in American law enforcement.

Let me tell you something more. In the city of Chicago the Immigration Department is having trouble with thousands and thousands of illegal immigrants who have infiltrated into Chicago by reason of this so-called cheap labor across our border.

Let me call your attention to what Mr. McBee, who is in charge of immigration out in California, said:

> One smuggler, his men captured near El Paso broke down, confessed he was part of a nationwide ring headquartered in Chicago.

If they are headquartered in Chicago, they are headquartered in Detroit, Los Angeles, Seattle, New York, and other places.

Mr. McBee went on to say:

> He named names, even told authorities of a restaurant on Chicago's South Halstead Street, in the city's Skid Row, where he delivered aliens for employment in industrial plants.

These aliens that are being admitted under this program are infiltrating into every industrial area in America. With 59 critical areas of unemployment in America today, I think it is about time to call a halt to this fiasco that goes on every year with regard to these wetbacks and cheap labor from across the border.

Mr. Speaker, February 7, 1954, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, S. T. D., archbishop of San Antonio, Tex., member of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, sent the following telegram to Chairman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of the House Agriculture Committee:

> House Joint Resolution 355 is calculated further to embitter our relations with Mexico. There are more than 2 million unemployed bread winners in our country today. There are thousands of unemployed Puerto Ricans in Chicago who are American citizens. In south Texas we have tens of thousands of Mexican Americans who will gladly work in agriculture for decent wages. When the Federal Government recruits illegal aliens for employment, it posts a reward for crime against the United States. We hope that Congress will not attempt to legalize lawlessness.

Similar protests were filed by the Federal Council of Churches and other civic and welfare groups, and also by the AFL and CIO, and Labor, railway labor is also opposed to this measure.

I also wish to include with my remarks the following telegram received by me from the State chairman of the American GI Forum of Texas:

> DEL RIO, TEX., *February 27, 1954.*
>
> Honorable Representative RAY MADDEN,
> *Democrat, Indiana,*
> *House Office Building:*
>
> The American GI Forum of Texas, Mexican-American Veterans, and civic organization, dedicated to the betterment of the Southwest's 3 million Spanish-speaking citizens, highly praises your sincere and truthful stand on the proposed bracero resolution.
>
> No one knows better about the welfare of our Texas farm laborers, the majority of whom are Americans of Mexican descent, than Archbishop Lucey, who has seen their poverty and squalor caused by the unfair and illegal competition of wetbacks and braceros, who provide a vast reservoir of cheap, and I mean cheap, farm labor for the greedy farming interests who have become rich overnight through use of alien labor.
>
> We are thousands of voters, thousands of Americans who depend upon farm wages for our daily tortillas. We cannot be heard in our Congress because we do not have the money to send delegations to present our

side. We hope you will help our people, many of whom in the thousands are unemployed.

Failure of the administration as well as Congress to adequately provide for border patrol and detention facilities is congressional and administration blessing to cheap-labor subsidy for southwestern farmers and ranchers, as well as utter disregard for Nation's security in allowing a wide-open border to exist.

Our Government should spend money in marshaling our own farm labor pool. Domestic farm labor needs employment and our retail business needs their farm dollars. It is high time Congress thought of our own workers and their welfare, and not favoring minority Southwest agricultural interests with cheap labor.

Border recruitment will not stop wetbacks. Denial of employment to wetbacks is solution. Wetback business has produced rackets of employment agencies in illegal labor.

Suggest Congress read our report, What Price Wetbacks.

CRISTOBAL ALDRETE,
State Chairman, American GI Forum of Texas.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, before you can begin a discussion, quite often it is well to have a definition of terms. We have been using the term "wetback" here rather indiscriminately. To me a wetback is a Mexican national who comes into this country illegally, one who comes across the border without proper authorization by this Government and by its Immigration Service.

This bill does not deal with wetbacks except indirectly. The bill, if passed, will certainly have a very distinct effect upon keeping wetbacks from coming into the United States. These people come over here because there is work to be had. They want the work. No matter what anybody says about the unemployment situation in the East, the fact still remains that, according to the figures of the United States Employment Service, there are not enough agricultural workers in the States of Arizona and California. Any unemployed persons in those States are certainly given the opportunity to apply for these jobs. But they do not want this particular type of work. It is stoop labor; it is the type of worker who goes into the vegetable fields and pulls weeds and thins vegetables, pulls cotton, picks cotton. We just do not have that type of person available to do the work that is required, and it has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and it is true, that without some legislation of this type there will be a lot of crops in the great West that will not be harvested.

The people from Mexico who come into those States legally under this bill are known as braceros; they are not wetbacks. They are recruited by the United States Government and the Mexican Government under the present agreement with Mexico. They are brought into this country and they are given contracts with farmers providing for them to receive the prevailing wage, providing for their living conditions, even providing for insurance for them while they are here. They are well treated. This is not slave labor. These people get the prevailing wage which is paid in the area in which they are going to work for the type of work they do.

So, I just want to make this point very clear. This is not wetbacks we are dealing with. This bill has a twofold purpose: One is to provide for this type of labor to come into the United States, which is so badly needed, and the second one is by allowing these people to come in legally, to deter them from coming in illegally. This will help the United States border patrol to do its work rather than hinder it. Under this law it will become necessary, in the event we cannot make an agreement with Mexico, for the United States to recruit this Mexican labor at the border. But what happens if this becomes law? It does not mean that these Mexican workers will come over here with no protection whatsoever. It means rather that they will be recruited at the border. They will receive the same contracts they now receive under the present existing arrangement with Mexico. They will receive the prevailing wage, and all the other benefits which they are now getting. The only difference that this makes is that if we cannot perfect an agreement with Mexico we will then be able to recruit at the border instead of recruiting inside of Mexico, and we will be able to bring these people over to do this work which has to be done, and they will be very well treated.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is it not a fact that we have had this program in operation a number of years and it has worked satisfactorily in the States where it has operated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes. It was in effect in World War II; that is, this agreement was in effect, not in this particular form, during World War II, and in this form since 1948, and under this agreement it has worked out very well as the gentleman from Colorado has stated, and we have had a lot of these people come into the country. They have been well treated, and actually I think that the relationship between the United States and Mexico has been improved because of this contract's existence rather than hindered by it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing out the fact that this legislation will help solve the wetback problem.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It very definitely will.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Instead of aggravating it, it seeks to eliminate it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman tell the House, if he has information, how many Mexican farm laborers have been brought into the United States annually during the last 3 years?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think in response to the question of the gentleman, Mr. Siciliano of the Labor Department stated that under this program there have been 200,000 brought in in the past year.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The difficulty in getting the number of workers is that they go back and forth across the line. But the point I wanted to bring out with that no single worker could be brought in under this program, and I ask this as a question, if there were not a certification that there is no United States labor available.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct. The United States Employment Service has to certify that this labor is needed in a particular area before anybody can get any Mexican braceros. If there are American laborers available to do this particular type of work, then no Mexican can be brought into that particular area.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. In addition to the provision in the basic law itself it is well to point out that the contract which is signed provides that whenever the Secretary of Labor or his duly authorized representative determines that United States workers are available to fill the job for which the worker has been contracted, this agreement may be terminated by the Secretary or his duly authorized representative. Is not that protection for the American laborers?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct. Even if the people are here under contract, if the labor situation changes so that there are American laborers available, then the Secretary may terminate the contract at any time and send the Mexican labor back.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman given any thought to the question of the extent to which the absence of such Mexican labor would affect the farm surpluses of the United States?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. All I can say in answer to that is that if these people are not in my particular area we are going to have a lot of crops that are not going to be harvested. If the gentleman has anything against the farmers in my area, that is one thing.

Mr. DONOVAN. Perhaps I will have to ask that question of someone a little more familiar with the situation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have found that if I ask a silly question, I quite often get a silly answer.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. PATTEN. May I answer the question of the gentleman from New York by saying that where we have these crops that have to be harvested, it does not make any difference whether there is unemployment in some other locality.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will reject this rule. It certainly seems to me to be a most inopportune time to consider legislation which will have the effect of antagonizing a friendly nation, particularly in view of the fact that this friendly neighbor, after we have received his people, may refuse to take them back. Unless there is a bilateral agreement, there is no assurance that any of these people, once they have gotten into the United States, no matter how, will ever go back to Mexico. This bill places a premium on the ability to cross the border surreptitiously and hide. It gives to the skilled evader an opportunity to come to the United States and remain here. This is particularly serious in the case of people who are suffering from communicable diseases, who bring narcotics with them, who are felons, and who belong to Communist organizations. All protective measures of our immigration laws go out the window. After we get the people, it may well be that the Mexican Government will say, "You have given them a job, now you keep them. They are the kind of people that we do not want back in Mexico." If a bilateral agreement, which I have supported on other occasions, is reached, then, of course, this very serious problem cannot arise. It seems to me we ought to wait until such time as it is determined whether or not the United States and Mexico can reach an agreement.

I call your attention to the language in this resolution—"after every practicable effort has been made by the United States to negotiate and reach agreement on such arrangements." What does that mean? Who passes on the question of whether or not "every practicable effort" has been made? I know that the adoption of this resolution will mean the termination of all attempts to reach an agreement and that our country will be flooded by thousands upon thousands of people who will never return to Mexico. We can certainly wait until it is determined what the outcome of these negotiations are before we act upon a matter which is as serious as this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak on the rule, but I cannot refrain from doing so because of the statements which were made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] with reference to the position of the farm organizations on this legislation. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings on this legislation. In these hearings there appear the statements of Mr. Matt Triggs, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. John J. Riggle, representing the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, both of them not feebly—as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina—but strongly endorsing this legislation. Also in the hearings you will find a letter from Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, approving the legislation, and urging its passage.

In addition there are numerous telegrams, statements, and letters in the hearings from local and regional farm groups and organizations endorsing this measure. No farm organization appeared in opposition.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that it is brash and it is improvident to bring this rule up today. We say in effect to Mexico, "Treaty or no treaty, we are going to bring these wetbacks in." We just thumb our nose at Mexico. That is most rude and unpleasant. Our action in passing this bill will have improvident repercussions.

I wonder what Secretary of State Dulles is going to say to justify this kind of action when he meets with the South American and Central American delegates at Caracas in a few days.

Beyond that, I want to state that this bill ought to be called not a wetback bill but a "redback" bill. Colonel Habberton, Acting Commissioner of Immigration, said recently before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, as follows:

> It was recently discovered that approximately 100 present and past members of the Communist Party had been crossing daily into the United States in the El Paso area; also that the number of present and exmembers of the Communist Party residing immediately across the border from El Paso number about 1,500, and it has been established that there exists active liaison between the Communist Party of Mexico and the Communist Party in the United States.

Such threat to national security should at least cause us to hesitate.

Here are some other results, according to Colonel Habberton:

> Results of the mass movement of wetbacks across the border are unemployment of displaced domestic labor, depressed wage scales and living standards, and creation of serious crime, health, and sanitation problems. Complaints at these results and requests for remedial action come from all levels of population, and local governments. The aliens show a tendency to quit their former attitude of docility and to assume one of defiance, obstruction, and resistance. Farmers fear for the safety of their women and children in isolated farm homes when groups of aliens appear and demand food, where they formerly begged for it. Wetbacks are making heavy contributions to the local jails, public hospitals, and even relief rolls. Their depredations range from harvesting food crops at night for subsistence, to robbery and rape. The Los Angeles Police Department reports that their officers apprehended last year 4,503 aliens who were turned over to the Service for processing as illegal entrants, which figure does not include many wetbacks who were arrested for criminal offenses and prosecuted in the courts instead of being merely booked for this Service. One thriving farm community near Los Angeles reports 4 out of 5 of the defendants in its police court are wetbacks.

This is indeed a novel procedure. We give the green light for Mexican workers to come across, treaty or no treaty. I think Congress is being used as a catspaw for the ranching, cotton, and fruit tycoons principally from Texas and California. We close the borders and ports in the North against possibility of subversives entering but along the Mexican border we deliberately leave the gates open. And now we do not even have the restraint of a treaty with Mexico. That country will say: "Since there is no treaty, we disavow responsibility for saboteurs entering the United States. We shall not take them back. They are your responsibility." Thus these Communists remain with us.

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

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how this jibes with President Eisenhower's labor policy and our unemployment figures and how Governor Shivers feels about this. The Governor at his ranch is a notorious employer of illegal wetbacks at starvation wages. The present determined attempt of his Republican leadership to force this bill on us is passing strange.

Mr. CELLER. Certainly in view of our unemployment, especially farm-labor unemployment, and relief demands, bringing in Mexican wetbacks, who will accept substandard wages, is, to say the least, most ill-advised. Why the Republican leadership does all this is, as you say, passing strange. The voters will remember next November. Assuredly President Eisenhower could not reconcile his desire for friendly neighbors and this attitude of thumbing our noses at Mexico. As to Governor Shivers, he must answer for himself. If he employs illegal wetbacks, I hope the voters of Texas will find out and put "finis" to his political career.

Why should we not wait and see whether an agreement can be reached with the sovereign State of Mexico before we take this most unusual step of holding a gun to Mexico's temple and saying, "Stand and deliver; you will give us what we want; we will take nothing else."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio have their share of problems. But I am not an authority on their problems and I have never taken up the time of the House to try to impose on its membership what I believe to be the solution to their problems. But several of the Members from these States are representing themselves as experts on the problems of my district, in particular, the wetback problem. This is a most difficult problem and one that I have lived with all of my life on the border. It is a problem I know must be solved.

This legislation, although certainly not perfect, is a step in the direction of cutting down the number of wetbacks illegally entering our country. If we provide a simple, fair contract to farmers and employees alike there will be no incentive for the use of illegal labor. The labor contract provides a stable, legal force which will be available only in times of local labor shortages and will be returned to Mexico when sufficient

local labor is available to take care of our harvest problems. Certainly, the farmer would be encouraged to use legal labor and would find it to his advantage to abstain from the employment of wetbacks which are subject to being picked up in the fields, and therefore, a most unreliable source of labor from his standpoint.

We have tried for many years to keep out illegal aliens by enforcement measures and have not been successful. The condition in Mexico is such that in some places we find men who are unable to support their families because of lack of employment. No enforcement official is going to be able to keep them from coming into this country where jobs are available at pay scales far above those of Mexico.

There has been much talk here of the need for a bilateral contract and in this I am in accord but for years we have had a contract which has been bilateral in name only because Mexico has virtually dictated its terms. They have taken advantage of labor shortages during peak harvest and our Government has had to accept the terms as laid out by Mexico. If we are given the authority to take unilateral action in writing a contract for the protection of those who come legally into this country seeking employment then Mexico will be more amenable to entering into a bilateral contract which is fair to both countries.

It must be stressed that this legislation provides protection for local citizens who desire to do this type of labor. No man will be imported to do this labor unless the Secretary of Labor certifies that there is a labor shortage in the area. To protect local labor from having this measure used to cut their wages it also provides that these men should not be paid less than the prevailing wage.

Mexico has gone so far as to demand that these imported laborers be paid not a prevailing wage but a minimum wage and I do not believe that imported labor should be given rights that are not as yet afforded to our own citizens.

I hope that some of the people here who seem so concerned with Mexico will show the same concern toward citizens of these United States who are trying to protect its economy.

It is my conviction that much of the opposition in Mexico to this program stems from wealthy farmers in northern Mexico who resent seeing their labor paid the relatively high wages paid in this country in comparison to those they pay in Mexico.

It is quite true that in some sections of our country and in particular some categories of work we have a labor surplus. But I can cite a last week's newspaper article from my home town of McAllen, Tex., which shows farmers in that section have placed applications for hundreds of laborers with the Texas Employment Office guaranteeing a minimum wage of 50 cents an hour and that they had been unable to fill these applications with local citizens.

Frankly, I think it is fortunate that in the times of peak harvest we do not have sufficient local labor to gather the crops for if we did, these same citizens would be unemployed throughout the rest of year. From the standpoint of local citizens it is far better that they have year around employment and that labor be imported only during the peak harvest to be certain that the crops are not allowed to rot in the fields.

I assure you that if we are successful in working out a fair contract to the farmer and employee that the combination of the stable supply of labor resulting from it to take care of our peak harvest and the expected increase in appropriations for the border patrol will result in a great deal of progress in solving our wetback problem by cutting down the incentive for the employment of illegal aliens. Legal entrants will have the full protection of our laws whereas wetbacks are subject to exploitation with no legal remedy available.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear from what has been said that if some of the Members had the time to read the hearings that were presented in support of this resolution many of the objections that have been raised would not have been raised.

A good example was the completely unfounded argument just advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. He said he is opposed to this resolution because thousands of Mexican nationals would be processed to work in this country and then the Mexican Government would probably not permit them to return to their homeland. If he had made an inquiry, or if he had read the hearings, he would never have made such an argument. On page 5 of the hearings Mr. Siciliano—Assistant Secretary of Labor Rocco C. Siciliano—stated:

> It is against their constitution to try to prohibit the entry or exits of their people. That is what they maintain when we ask them to try to keep their wetbacks back.

They have raised the old argument about wetbacks, when any one who is interested in the facts can read the RECORD and know that this bill has no connection whatever with the wetback problem except that it would aid the immigration officials in dealing with them. It is easy to understand why any one who is in favor of freedom of wetback movement would be opposed to this resolution. It is easy to understand why those who do not want aliens who come across the border screened so as to better prevent Communists and subversives from coming in would be opposed to this legislation. Apparently the opponents do not want any control or any processing or any screening of those who enter from Mexico. I favor such screening and such processing and I am therefore naturally in favor of this resolution.

I assume the rule will be readily adopted, and I wish to address myself briefly to the merits of the pending resolution. It is of the utmost importance that it be promptly approved by the Congress.

If the urgency of this measure is fully understood I have no doubt of its prompt approval. Therefore, I shall discuss the facts, the background, and the necessity of this legislation. I first call attention to the fact that the resolution was reported by the Agriculture Committee, after exhautsive hearings, with but two dissening votes.

It is strongly supported by the Department of State, by the Justice Department, by the Labor Department, and by the Department of Agriculture. It is endorsed by the American Farm Bureau, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Grange, and by scores of other farm and grower organizations.

I am sure the purpose of the legislation is understood. I shall briefly refer to that. Public Law 78 of the 82d Congress begins as follows:

> SEC. 501. For the purpose of assisting in such production of agricultural commodities and products as the Secretary of Agriculture deems necessary, by supplying agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico (pursuant to arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Mexico), the Secretary of Labor is authorized—

That law then spells out the general terms and conditions under which an international labor agreement can be negotiated and carried out with Mexico.

Public Law 78 does not expire until December 31, 1955. But the migrant labor agreements last but a year at a time. The last one expired on January 1, 1954. It was extended to January 15 by mutual agreement while negotiations for a new agreement were going on. But no new agreement was made and since January 15 there has been none. Following the expiration on January 15 this Government began unilateral processing of Mexican nationals who presented themselves at our border recruitment stations. Then the question arose concerning the authorization for money to be expended in pursuance of the special recruiting procedures set forth in Public Law 78. The Comptroller General on January 18 ruled that procedures contained in Public Law 78 could be used only when an international labor agreement with Mexico was in force and effect. The border recruitment stations were then promptly closed.

The purpose of House Resolution 355 is to amend Public Law 78 so as to permit the special recruiting procedures therein set forth to be usable regardless of whether an international agreement is or is not in effect. In other words, it would permit the use of the special procedures contained in that law in carrying out unilateral processing of Mexican farm workers who present themselves, legally, at border recruitment stations in the United States.

WOULD ALLEVIATE WETBACK PROBLEM

I repeat that in debating this legislation it must be kept in mind that this is not a wetback bill, except that its passage would alleviate the wetback problem by enabling Mexican farm workers to be processed and gain a legal status and thereby enjoy much more desirable wage guaranties and working conditions than they would have as illegal wetbacks.

That arrangment would, of course, tend to deter the movement of wetbacks who cross the border and would reduce the number and enable our immigration officers to maintain better control over them. That view was expressed by the Department of Justice in its report to the Agriculture Committee. The Deputy Attorney General stated:

It is the view of the Department that enactment of such legislation is of urgent importance to the efficient administration of the immigration laws of the United States, and to the needs of a substantial part of the agricultural economy of the western and southwestern United States.

So this legislation has nothing to do with the wetback problem, as such, except that it would reduce the number of illegal entrants and better enable our immigration officials to cope with them.

NEGOTIATIONS HAMPERED BY MEXICO

Let me now give you a little of the background of our prior negotiations of labor agreements with Mexico and some of the perplexing difficulties that have arisen in the application. For 12 years we have had migrant labor agreements with Mexico whereby Mexican workers come across and work in agriculture in areas found to be suffering from labor shortages. Throughout the history of the program these imported workers have not been permitted to work in a county or an area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that there is insufficient domestic help available and unless it is shown that diligent efforts have been made to recruit American workers elsewhere than in the immediate locality.

But for some reason or other in recent years it has become increasingly difficult to work out acceptable agreements with Mexico. During the past few years our friends in Mexico have engaged in delays, stalling tactics, bickerings over interpretations, and indulged in other tactics that have been almost intolerable at times. That fact was confirmed by Robert G. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, in his testimony, when he referred to tactics used by Mexican negotiators during proposed labor agreements. Mr. Goodwin stated:

We feel that we have reached agreement in the past at considerable cost to our own interests. The pattern that has been followed regularly on the part of Mexican officials is a delaying tactic until we get into a position where the labor is so desperately needed here that we have to agree to whatever conditions are put forth. You can take the experience, the history of the negotiations with Mexico each time that they have been conducted in the past, and the pattern has been exactly that. The reason we do not have an agreement this time is because we have taken a firm position against that, including a firm position against delays.

But since, as Mr. Goodwin indicated, many of these actions arose at times when, without such Mexican labor, millions of dollars worth of crops would rot in the fields without the use of that only source of labor, our Government and our employers have buckled under the extreme emergencies and demands of the occasion. As is often true with appeasement, it has seemed that yielding at one time on one issue simply served to encourage more unreasonable and almost unconscionable demands to be made subsequently.

The simple fact is that our Government has yielded, appeased, and given in to the point that a showdown became virtually inevitable as to the making of agreements and good faith respect for them after they are made. Our Government is to be commended for taking this forthright and proper stand, and this Congress should without equivocation support that realistic policy.

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

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Since when has this country become so weak that we have to turn to other nations to tell us whom we are going to send out, what aliens we are going to admit, or what aliens we are going to send out?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes; the gentleman is so correct about that. To listen to some of the arguments that have been made against this measure you would think we are incapable of doing our own legislating on domestic legislation—and this is a domestic issue, pure and simple. This deals with conditions under which we in this country will employ aliens from Mexico who enter this country legally, through regular ports of entry. It applies to them only after we have assumed sovereignty over them. As the able gentleman from New Mexico has so properly pointed out, we should be able to determine our own policies with regard to those we permit to come in and those we desire to send out.

Mr. Speaker, in order to fully understand the necessity for this legislation and to comprehend the problem from our Government's standpoint and the need for a showdown, it is important that we be apprised of some of the difficulties we have faced in the execution of the agreements in the past. Let me talk about that for a moment.

One development had to do with Mexico summarily closing the recruiting center at Monterrey, which was the only one within a reasonable distance of the border. Other centers were located several hundred miles deep in the interior of Mexico, very inconvenient to our people who found it necessary to go to them. Our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but to no avail. It was closed by the unilateral action of the Mexican Government.

Now, that action by Mexico not only added to the inconvenience of American citizens but aggravated the problem of our border officials in controlling the entry of wetbacks. The reason for that is obvious. There are tens of thousands of unemployed, poverty-stricken people in northern Mexico, living in the proximity of the northern border. In order for them to come in legally they had to travel hundreds of miles into the interior of Mexico to the recruiting centers. If they went there they might or might not be accepted. So, faced with that dilemma, thousands of them, with hungry families to feed, evidently crossed the border and sought employment. It is obvious that the further into Mexico the recruiting centers are located, the more inaccessible they are to the Mexican workers in the border area, the more tempted they are to cross the border illegally. Therefore, our Government protested the closing at Monterrey, but, as I have said, to no avail.

Another development had to do with wages. Article 15 of the last migrant-labor agreement, which expired on January 15, provided:

The employer shall pay the Mexican worker not less than the prevailing wage rate paid to a domestic worker for similar work at the time the work was performed and in the manner paid within the area of employment, or at the rate prevalent in the work contract, whichever is higher. Determination of the prevailing wage rate shall be made by the Secretary of Labor.

Despite the provision in the agreement to the effect that wages paid to Mexican workers had to be the prevailing wage, determined by our Secretary of Labor, on May 8, 1953, the Mexican Government announced a scale of minimum wages for all workers contracted in the future. That was directly contrary to the international agreement, which I have quoted. Here is the wording, a pertinent part of the announcement made in a note from the Mexican Government:

In view of the foregoing and based on the statistical data and salary graphs of the wages received in the year 1952 by the Mexican contract laborers, compared to the averages of the prevailing wages in those regions where American laborers are employed for the same agricultural task, the Government of Mexico has arrived at the following conclusions. First, every request from employers who wish to engage Mexican workers must be refused when the offered salary is lower than the minimum initial rates of $2.75 for the first hand picking of 100 pounds of cotton, the minimum wage rates being proportionately adjusted for picking under different conditions as well as for other types of agricultural laborers, and, second, that as a general rule it is proper to establish for all agricultural regions which employ Mexican laborers an increase of the hourly wage fixing an initial minimum of not less than 65 cents for the States of the Southeast, of 75 cents for the Middle West, and of 60 cents for the Western States.

That quotation is from an official translation by the Foreign Office of the Mexican note. It is directly contrary to the international agreement.

Here is another one. Although the agreement contains no authorization for Mexico to fix the subsistance rate for the workers recruited on contract—that being determinable under the terms of the agreement by our Secretary of Labor—in Arkansas, western Texas, and New Mexico employers were coerced into paying a subsistance rate fixed by the Mexican consul as a condition of obtaining workers. These illegal demands had to be met or the employers were faced with great crop losses.

UNILATERAL BLACKLISTING

Another of those many developments had to do with blacklisting—unilateral blacklisting, of American employers or of areas or counties, by the Mexican Government, again directly contrary to the plain and unambiguous wording of the international agreement. Under that agreement if a complaint arose the

exact procedure was set out whereby a joint hearing would be held before any blacklisting could take place. It did not outlaw blacklisting, but simply required a hearing before it could take place. But completely ignoring that agreement, Mexico engaged in repeated unilateral actions of summarily blacklisting counties, areas, and individuals, without any sort of hearing and without any warning whatever.

Another arbitrary and unauthorized interpretation of the agreement on the part of Mexico had to do with insurance. Here is the wording of a pertinent part of article 6 of the work contract on that subject:

> No deduction shall be made from the Mexican worker's wages except as provided in this article. The employer may make the following deductions only: For insurance plans when authorized by the Mexican Government under an insurance plan covering nonoccupational injuries and diseases, when such plan has been approved by that Government.

It was developed during the hearings that for 2 years from August 1951 to June 1953 this provision was interpreted to be permissive, rather than mandatory on the part of the employer. In June 1953, just 6 months prior to the expiration of the agreement, and after a Mexican official from the Foreign Ministry had spent considerable time visiting employers and insurance companies on this side of the border, the Mexican Government suddenly announced that they construed article 6 to be mandatory and that employers were required to make the necessary deductions when authorized to do so by the Mexican Government.

The Mexican Government did not stop there. Employers were told that they must take that insurance from certain companies selected by the Mexican Government, and no others. Mr. Goodwin told the committee:

> There seems to be no logical basis for the manner in which these insurance companies were selected.

Mr. Goodwin went on to tell the committee that in some cases the rates of the approved companies were higher than those of companies not approved. Some of the unapproved companies with lower rates had been previously commended by the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Affairs for the fine service they had rendered to Mexican workers and the promptness with which they paid their claims.

Here, Mr. Speaker, was what appears to me to have been a rather highhanded solicitation of insurance for certain companies—only 2 or 3 of them—to the exclusion of all others. It was completely unilateral on the part of Mexico.

Another example can be cited of a demand made by a Mexican consul that employers in Dona Ana County, N. Mex., as a condition of extending the contracts of Mexican workers then and there employed, that they purchase and pay for life insurance for these workers. The agreement authorized no such requirement. And when the employer replied that there was no contractual obligation to pay for such life insurance, the employers were notified that they would be blacklisted because of their uncooperative attitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt at some length on the developments wherein the Mexican Government has, time after time, unilaterally and summarily made interpretations and demands under the migrant-labor agreements. From this I think you can readily understand what I meant when at the beginning of my statement I said a showdown with the Mexican Government became inevitable.

POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

I shall now refer to a few of the points of difference between the two governments which the negotiators could not agree upon. First, our negotiators very properly insisted that some concession be made by Mexico with respect to the location of the Mexican recruitment centers. Our representatives felt that at least some of the recruiting should be possible within a reasonable distance of the border. But Mexico made no concession.

Secondly, our Government insisted that Mexico's demand for a fixed, minimum wage could not be granted because it is unauthorized under American law. But Mexico nevertheless persisted in that demand.

Another problem was that of subsistance allowance for the Mexico workers. After the unhappy experience some of our employers had been subjected to in respect to illegal and exorbitant demands from Mexican officials under the old agreement, it was very proper and indeed imperative that a detailed, spelled-out, precise agreement on that point be inserted. But Mexico would not yield on that point.

Another difference had to do with insurance. Our Government insisted on limiting the Mexican Government to approving the coverage desired for nonoccupational insurance and the full cost paid by the worker. On this Mexico made no concession.

Still another difference had to do with worker responsibility. It is known from experience that about 15 or 20 percent of the braceros who are processed leave their jobs without cause. They are known as "skippers." This practice has resulted in considerable financial loss and inconvenience to the employers. Our negotiators very properly insisted that the employer be allowed to withhold several days of the workers' pay until he finished his contract. That would help deter the worker from violating his work agreement. But again our negotiators were rebuffed in that very reasonable suggestion.

BORDER RECRUITMENT NEEDED

After weeks and weeks of negotiations, from last October to January, not a single major concession was made by Mexico on these various points of disagreement. After January 15 our Government did a very proper thing: Processing centers were opened on this side of the border. Mexican nationals legally in this country were processed there until the program was closed down due to the Comptroller General's ruling. The passage of this resolution will enable that border recruiting to be resumed. It is hard to understand why there should be any objection to that. It has to do with a domestic problem—that of processing laborers who are legally in this country. To listen to some of the opponents of this legislation you would think these people are to be processed to work in Mexico and that we are therefore invading the jurisdiction of that country. This is an American problem. It does not deal with anything in Mexico. It does permit Mexican nationals to be processed—but only when they are legally in the United States as our guests and with our sovereignty extending over them while they are here.

CIO OPPOSES

It is true that the CIO and the AFL, or certain segments of those unions, have raised objections. But the CIO frankly announced through R. J. Thomas that it is opposed to any workers whatever coming over at this time, legally or illegally, agreement or no agreement. Apparently the CIO either does not know, or is not interested in, the fact that except for imported Mexican labor, American dinner tables would be denied thousands of tons of food.

UNILATERAL PROCESSING

It has been contended that this legislation is bad because it would permit unilateral processing—meaning processing of Mexican labor without consultation with Mexico. So what? This is our country, is it not? We have immigration laws which authorize unilateral processing of foreign labor. It is already the law without passing this measure. The Attorney General has pointed out that the general immigration laws might be invoked to meet this problem. But he says the specialized procedures contained in Public Law 78 are more desirable and their application would be much less expensive and more feasible than resort to the facets of our general immigration laws that apply to importation of farmworkers. Yes; the Attorney General has authority to process Mexican workers now, under existing immigration laws, and do so unilaterally. I have not heard that the existence of this law has disrupted international relations to any extent. Just who, Mr. Speaker, are we representing here today—the United States or Mexico?

Our Mexican friends, for whom I have great respect and admiration, are quite capable of looking after themselves. I have not heard of any Mexican congressmen objecting to the passage of laws in Mexico City which deal with domestic problems and which might not be to the liking of certain Americans. And I do not blame them a bit.

I do not recall that the United States was consulted when the Mexican Congress passed a law to expropriate property of great value owned by American oil companies a few years ago. I doubt that there was a single Mexican congressman who stood up and represented the United States on that occasion. And I do not blame him. That was Mexico's business. She acted in accord with her sovereign rights.

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

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman or I sought employment down there in Mexico we would be employed under the Mexican law, would we not?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And the United States would have absolutely nothing to do with terms and conditions or wages, would it?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And neither the gentleman nor I nor any other Member of the American Congress protested that action because we recognize that Mexico was a sovereign nation and it had the right to do as it pleased in its own territory.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

What about the bill passed by the Mexican Congress a few years ago which expropriated valuable property owned by American oil companies? That was a unilateral action. It was directed primarily at American citizens. When that drastic measure was being considered not a single Mexican Congressman arose to represent the United States, and I do not blame them one bit. Whether we agree with the wisdom and propriety of that action or not, the fact remains that it was an exercise of a right and a prerogative of a sovereign government, and I would defend them to the end in the right to exercise that right.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time that more people assume the responsibility of speaking for the American Government when we are dealing with domestic issues that affect our own sovereignty and our own country instead of spending so much of their time speaking here in behalf of foreign countries whose citizens, while guests in the United States, become the subject of regulation and control by laws which this American Congress seeks to enact.

Nor did any Mexican Congressman represent us when the Mexican Congress passed a law a few years ago which limits the right of American citizens to have gainful employment in Mexico. That comes under the head of Mexico's business. So far as I know, not a single Mexican Congressman represented us when a law was passed down there which prohibits a foreigner from purchasing real estate within 100 kilometers of the border, and limits and restricts the ownership of other property elsewhere in Mexico. Again, I do not blame the Mexican Congress. That was an action by a sovereign government, and even though many Americans were adversely affected, I certainly did not expect a Mexican Congressmen to represent us. The Mexican Congressmen did what you or I would have done: They looked after their own country without regard to the incidental and adverse effect the action might have on Americans.

MEXICO ACTS UNILATERALLY

But if you are going to say that it is bad to do things unilaterally, let us take a leaf from Mexico's book on that score. What about Mexico unilaterally blacklisting our citizens and our counties and areas?

What about Mexico unilaterally setting minimum wages, directly contrary to the migrant labor agreement?

What about Mexico, contrary to the agreement, unilaterally and summarily, setting a subsistance allowance for Mexican workers above the amount previously arrived at in accordance with the agreement; and which, by the way, was determined by our Government to be exorbitant and unreasonable as well as illegal?

And what about Mexico unilaterally and summarily demanding that our employers purchase certain insurance for Mexican workers, to be taken with companies named by the Mexican Government? And remember this was contrary to the wording of the international agreement.

I could go on and on, but time is short. Again I ask: Who are we representing here today—Mexico or the United States? The Mexican people are good traders. They are sharp and crafty, and from their standpoint I say "Power to them." They have been having their way, pretty well, in these agreements for years. When they have agreed to something they did not like they just unilaterally and summarily interpreted it to fit their own desires. And they have been getting by with it. Now their hand has at last been called, and here today we can sustain our own Government in having all this "monkey business" on the part of Mexico cut out.

When our Mexican friends find they must do business with us on a different basis from what they have been, you will see a little different attitude. This resolution will vastly improve the chances for a new agreement to be arrived at. It will place our negotiators in a much better position. The fact is that in regard to these workers Mexico needs us as much or even more than we need the Mexican workers. And they know it. It means more than $150 million a year of American money pumped into the economy of Mexico. And that is a lot of money anywhere, more particularly in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, appeasement has been tried on other occasions between nations and has failed. As a general rule too much of it, whether between individuals or Nations, simply does not work very well. And we have a good example of it here.

Again, I ask what is there so wrong and evil about unilateral processing? It is our own business. We have been practicing it for years, and are doing so now, with respect to Canadian workers who come across by the thousands to work in our lumber camps of the north woods. It was practiced for decades by this Government along the Mexican border prior to a few years ago when this international agreement fad got into the picture. And it can and will work very well right now.

I am sure we all hope an acceptable international labor agreement can be negotiated with Mexico. One probably will be eventually, particularly if this resolution is enacted. But right now it is imperative that this amendment to Public Law 78 be passed. We are faced with an emergency in the Southwest. This is planting time. It is lambing time and shearing time on the ranches. It is harvesttime in many of the vegetable fields. And there is not even half enough labor available to meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is a very important principle involved in this simple joint resolution which is before us, or which I hope will be before us upon the adoption of the rule. This principle has very little to do with much of the subject of the debate as it has gone on in this last hour.

The principle involved is simply this: Shall we, the Government of the United States, continue to exercise jurisdiction over the entrance of foreigners, aliens, into our country? I do not think that this particular problem has ever actually been debated in the Halls of Congress before. I think it has always been taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, that the United States runs its own business with respect to who may be admitted inside our borders. A few years ago the Congress passed a bill which gave to the Republic of Mexico the courtesy of joining with us in an agreement regarding the admission of people who would perform labor in this country under certain conditions. We extended the Government of Mexico the courtesy of making an agreement with us. It was purely that and nothing more. We were not bound in any way to have done it; it was not necessary that we do that, because people are entering our country under our laws right along without any such agreement. But we did make that arrangement in the statute enacted regarding this labor program. Now the Government of Mexico appears not to be willing to recognize this courtesy and to deal with us in a manner which would seem to our people to be reasonable and mutually satisfactory. I see nothing except a good, forthright American principle in the idea of passing this joint resolution, which simply says, "Unfortunately, if we cannot have a satisfactory arrangement with you, we must withdraw that courtesy."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us merely asserts the right of the United States to have control over the entrance of people into our country—nothing more.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is passed here today, we will have an agreement with Mexico satisfactory to our authorities, and we will have that agreement before this bill gets to the President for signature. If we do not have this bill passed, we can have an agreement with Mexico only if we capitulate to the ever-growing demands of Mexico. If this bill is not passed and we do not have an agreement with Mexico, then the result will be that we will take a step backward to the prewar days when the wetbacks came over without any control, without any agreement, and without any regulations, and when the Mexican laborer was exploited, and through the exploitation of the Mexican our own labor was exploited. So, this bill is not only necessary; it is imperative that we pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will vote for this rule and let us present to the House the arguments for the necessity of this bill. We already have a law that permits these agreements, but Mexico is coming to realize that by that law we placed ourselves in a straitjacket where they can dictate the terms and we can agree or go without. We want to get along with our good neighbors, but for months now we have been unable to come to an agreement because our authorities do not have anything to bargain with, they do not have the alternative that this bill would give them. The sooner we take them out of their straitjackets, the sooner they can negotiate effectively.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is regretted that this legislation provoked such a controversy. We have been having it almost every year since the war, call it agricultural labor, braceros, wetbacks, or whatever it is. This bill should have the support of every Member of this House. It is not a partisan bill, it is not a labor bill, but this bill is for the good of the United States, and everybody, I think, in America would support it if they understood it, except maybe a few farmers right along the border who are not concerned. They might just as well continue employing illegal Mexicans, but this is to make the employment of Mexican labor legal. We need them not only in Texas, Arizona, and California, but I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] know that last year 27 States of the 48 employed Mexican labor, because we do not have stoop labor any more in the United States. We have to get it from some source, and of all those unemployed he referred to, you will not get one of them to pick cotton, potatoes, sugarbeets, or do the necessary menial jobs that these Mexicans are willing to do in coming over here and earning these Yankee dollars.

I hope the entire House will support this legislation despite the fact that there a few farmers on the border who would be very happy to continue without legislation. This unilateral agreement that is proposed here will enable the Labor Department to enforce certain regulations that have been in force since 1948, legalizing these Mexicans rather than letting them come over illegally.

I was surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] would repeat such a ridiculous statement as that about 1,200 Communists coming across at El Paso. He knew there was nothing to that. He is too smart a man to fall for that kind of baloney. An irresponsible man made that statement while he was acting as director of a service here. I am surprised the gentleman from New York would even use it in his talk, because it is so utterly ridiculous.

I am also surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I usually think he does a marvelous job on immigration affairs. But this bill merely makes it legal so the Department of Labor can continue to operate as it has been doing in the last several years in the legal process of handling these Mexicans rather than the illegal method of letting them come across and get work without being properly processed, which in turn might promote the entry of Communists and some of the other ill things it has been suggested might happen.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], who is unable to be here today, to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the migratory farm worker remains the greatest social problem in the United States. Twice, during the 6 years I have been in Congress, the Congress has passed legislation establishing conditions under which agricultural workers might legally be imported from Mexico. The second of these acts is still in effect.

I have opposed this legislation each time that it has been presented to the House of Representatives; first, because of the inadequacies of the legislation; second, because it completely ignored the problem of the migratory worker who is a citizen of the United States; and third, because it did little or nothing to stop the flow of illegal workers crossing the border from Mexico. The legislation which we passed in the last session of Congress still has 2 years to run. What is proposed here today is a further weakening of an already inadequate piece of legislation. This legislation, and all similar legislation, should be rejected until such time as a reasonable effort is made to meet the problem of the migratory worker.

The international contracts previously agreed upon by our Government and that of Mexico have stipulated a minimum wage and included requirements regarding housing, health, unemployment, and death. No such safeguards are granted to American migratory workers. Citizens in the United States working in the same fields, or displaced by imported labor, do not have even a minimum of protection by social legislation. When I proposed last year that American citizens working in competition with imported labor on crops that are supported at 90 percent of parity or subsidized under the Sugar Act be paid at least 90 percent of the minimum wage, my proposal was rejected by the chairman of the committee handling the migratory labor bill on a point of order. It seems only fair that this provision should be written into law, so as to give at least a minimum of protection to American citizens competing in this labor market. As the system now works, the influx of both legal and illegal labor from Mexico into southern Texas sets up a chain reaction which results in the displacement of farm workers throughout the West and Southwest. For 3 or 4 months of the year these people have uncertain employment, and, in turn, themselves become migrants. The present situation, marked by disorder and neglect and, in some cases, by exploitation, verges on the scandalous.

Rather than pass this legislation, Congress should give attention to passing legislation to establish a Federal Committee for Migratory Labor as recommended by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor and should work with State legislatures, farmers associations, agriculture labor unions, and religious organizations, and other groups, preliminary to passing legislation to establish some order in the field of migratory farm labor.

Mr. WIER. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, this Mexican labor problem comes before us today under circumstances much worse than ever before when we were giving consideration to legislation to amend, clarify, and approve agreements that had been reached between our Government and the Government of Mexico regarding our use and conditions under which at least limited numbers of screened and approved Mexican agriculture workers would be permitted legal and limited entry into this country during the Southwest harvesting season.

Today the problem is at its worst for the reason that no agreement has been reached between the two Governments and, of course, can result in a terrible state of exploitation and illegal entry of a million of nothing more or less than what we have termed in the past as wetbacks. No method of screening them as safe risks, no check on them for return to their homeland, and with no contract to cover their pay, their care and housing, transportation and policing, what a mess it will create for everyone except the industrialized farm owner and grower who, of course, has always sought their cheap labor. Without a contract this Mexican labor will be used to drive down labor costs in our present surplus labor market.

Like myself, I am sure many of the Members have received a copy of the very graphic and enlightening book put out last summer by the Texas State Federation of Labor on this subject and problem. I read every page of it and surely if anyone has to live with this problem day in and day out the labor movement of Texas ought to be qualified to speak with a lot of knowledge and authority on the subject.

In addition to that, I have just read over again and refreshed my memory on the facts presented in the President's Commission Reports on Problems of Migrant Workers, which I am briefly cutting down and making a part of my remarks at this time:

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION REPORTS PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

WASHINGTON.—For the first time an official United States Government commission has put on the record the discriminations, persecutions, and sufferings imposed on the migrant farm workers of America.

Almost everyone of these problems has been depicted and decried by the AFL National Farm Labor Union and the AFL but now they are verified and confirmed officially by President Truman's Commission on Migrant Farm Labor. Here are highlights from the Commission report:

LARGE GROWERS, UNITED STATES BLAMED

The report deals with the plight of 1 million migratory farm workers, of whom half are domestic migrants. The other half is made up of 400,000 illegal Mexican wetbacks (persons who cross the border by swimming or wading or just walking) and 100,000 Mexicans legally here under contract, and a small number of British West Indians and Puerto Ricans.

Some of the evils which the Commission says it found during its 8 months' investigation were pinned on the large industrial growers, many of whom deal with so-called contractor and crew leaders. These last-named bear no direct responsibility to the migratory workers.

The Commission, too, discovered an anomaly in the employment conditions of migratory farm workers. Alien workers, such as those who come here from Mexico, for example, are, by intergovernmental treaty, guaranteed employment, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, medical care, housing, and sanitation standards. But domestic migrants not only have no protection through collective bargaining but employers refuse to accord to them the guarantees they extend to imported alien farm workers.

It was emphasized by the Commission that the problems under study were not primarily those of the poor little farmer, but were largely confined to conditions on about 125,000 farms which amount to 2 percent of the farms of the Nation and produce crops equal to approximately 7 percent of the value of all farm products.

IMPORTS NOT NEEDED

The conclusion that it is not necessary to import aliens in large numbers during the present emergency is supported broadly by this argument:

Estimated farm output for 1951 is 3.6 percent above 1949. If this additional output were to require an equal percentage increase in man-hours then we would need about 700 million additional hours to produce the 1951 output.

These additional man-hours could be supplied by the present domestic labor force, including farm family labor, if each worker put in 6½ more days per year. And, even at that, they would be working 3 days fewer per year than in 1945. The average hired farm worker who in 1949 was getting only 90 days of farm work—23 fewer than in wartime—would be willing, if given the opportunity, to contribute this amount and more.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS ANNUAL EARNINGS

Comparing the hourly earnings of farm laborers and factory workers the commission reported that during 1910–14, the period designated by Congress as the base for the farm parity price system, farm wages were two-thirds of factory wages. Today they are a little more than one-third.

Actual average hourly earnings of farm workers in 1950 was 55 cents and those of factory workers $1.45. In 1910–14 the comparable figures were 14 and 21 cents.

Notwithstanding prerequisites furnished by employers such as housing and transportation, the commission finds that farm workers' annual earnings, compared with the pay of factory workers are even worse than is suggested by relative wage rates because factory employees get more work than farm employees.

Whereas average cash earnings of factory workers in 1949 were $2,600, average earnings for both migratory and nonmigratory farm workers were only slightly more than $500.

BARGAINING NEEDED

The commission said it was convinced that balanced organization and effective collective bargaining would be of great assistance not only to farm workers but that it would also contribute to more orderly management of labor. Adoption of the system would, for instance, eliminate the labor contractor and middleman and the "sweatshop conditions that are frequently associated with them," the report said.

It was recommended that the Taft-Hartley Act be amended to cover employees on farms having a specified minimum employment.

UNITED STATES RELAXES VIGILANCE

The official vigilance during World War II that provided for temporary admission of alien farm workers was abandoned in the postwar years, the report points out.

Since then, responsible Government administrative agencies have ceased putting forth efforts to preserve national immigration policy, the report continues.

The Commission, in fact, found that the importation of alien farm workers since the war had been on a larger scale than during the war.

The result is that temporary foreign laborers have come to furnish "the very competition to American labor that it is the purpose of the immigration law to prevent."

PHONY SHORTAGE CERTIFIED

The report describes what the Commission considers the inadequacies in the method of ascertaining whether a farm labor shortage exists.

The farmers, it was pointed out, meet at the beginning of the season and decide unilaterally what the prevailing wage is to be. The rate is usually low before the season begins, and so, the report finds, it is possible that insufficient domestic labor is attracted. Therefore a "labor shortage" can be said to exist "at that price."

Since foreign workers cannot be imported until the United States Employment Service certifies that a shortage exists, this apparent lack of applicants becomes the basis for the necessary certification.

To safeguard the interests of domestic farm labor and to avoid, so far as possible, discrimination that favors imported alien contract labor, the Commission proposes that "no certification of shortage of domestic labor should be made unless and until continental domestic labor has been offered the same terms and conditions of employment as are offered to foreign workers."

NO WORKER SPOKESMEN

The Farm Placement Division in the United States Employment Service, according to the Commission, is more sucecssful in winning the confidence and cooperation of employers than of the migratory workers.

"This seems to be due to the fact that in practice the service places greater emphasis on its function as a recruiting agency for farm employers than it does on the equally important function of a work-finding agency for the migratory farm laborers," the Commission points out.

These practices "have convinced the Commission that the employment service conceives its functions as rather narrow and limited. Moreover its activities are marked by a certain onesidedness in favor of corralling supplies of migratory farm workers to meet growers' labor demand regardless of the effect on the workers."

The general attitude of the Farm Placement Division which impressed the Commission as "one-sided" was that although Congress, in establishing the United States Employment Service, provided for a Federal Advisory Council representing workers, employers and the public, the Farm Placement Service (a part of the Federal Employment Service) has disregarded this tripartite principle. Instead, it has organized and depended for advice on a Special Farm Labor Committee, composed wholly of farm employers and their representatives.

WETBACKS AND THEIR GREEDY EMPLOYERS A DISGRACE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they sneak across the Rio Grande from Mexico, aided and abetted by large farmers, ranchers, and growers associations, to work for starvation wages.

That is why they are called wetbacks.

It is easy for thousands of them to slip through the long boundary between Mexico and the United States because our border patrol is kept at skeleton strength with the connivance of agricultural employers in the United States who want to fatten themselves by exploiting cheap labor.

The tragedy and the treason of this situation is that it is being encouraged by every devious practice at a time when unemployment is mounting among our people. There is no need whatsoever for imported farm help, when there is a growing surplus of American labor.

Those who encourage this modern slavery in the Southwest wrap themselves in the American flag whenever there is a bill to liberalize immigration from Europe that would bring skilled refugees to our country. They shout about the dangers of communism when we are trying to provide sancutary for a few more of communism's victims. But they flout every consideration of security when they smell the profits that will accrue to themselves by opening the borders to migrant Mexican workers. They ignore the warning by the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that more than 100 Communists a day are coming in through our back door. Our whole security setup becomes a farce when the precautions we exercise along the Canadian border, and at all west coast, east coast, and gulf ports, are abandoned along the 2,000-mile Mexican border, because special interests here put selfishness above patriotism.

It is to the credit of the Mexican Government and evidence of its concern for the welfare of its own nationals that it wants to engage in joint supervision of this problem. There was such an agreement, but it expired on January 15, 1954. Mexico will not renew this pact unless it contains minimum guaranties covering wages and conditions of work.

Meanwhile, irresponsible farmers, ranchers, and growers—and there is a growing suspicion of collusion between them and the United States Government—have been recruiting wetbacks legally and illegally to reap "grapes of wrath" all over again.

The shameful conditions under which these migrant laborers live endanger the public health, undermine educational standards, lower the level of economic activity, and provoke social tensions. The wages paid them by their slave mas-

ters in the United States degrade them to an animal-like status. This is a threat to farmers and ranchers in other parts of the United States who pay legitimate wages. As these migrant wetbacks spread through the country, they are used by other exploiters to wreck our own labor standards. And the minimum-wage law becomes a travesty on economic justice.

Under these conditions, more people are apt to wonder whether the Communists or these greedy employers are doing more to sabotage the confidence of Americans in their Government.

The scope of the problem, in numbers alone, is revealed by the Government's admission that there were about 500,000 apprehensions of illegal entrants in 1952 as against 839,000 in 1953.

From these figures it is safe to assume that the number of those who were not apprehended is large. This invasion could not be successful without a conspiracy to evade the laws of the United States.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must crack down—and hard—on those Americans responsible for this deplorable condition.

The present bill would enable the Department of Labor to handle this problem in a unilateral manner, which would be an arrogant attitude, tending to break down the good-neighbor policy between the United States and her friends to the south of us who are rightfully sensitive on this point.

I do not claim that the Mexican Government is without fault on this issue.

Behind the whole question of negotiations between the two governments, and disagreement as to terms, is the much larger and more difficult problem that has never been resolved.

The bootleg traffic in wetbacks is a practice that will not be tolerated by American public opinion. It is an affront to human dignity and a menace to our labor standards.

You can never validate a continuing injustice no matter how you disguise it.

Unilateral recruitment of Mexican farm labor is un-American to begin with.

Furthermore, it is an insult to our unemployed, and to the absence of any constructive help for them.

House Joint Resolution 355 is a mask that fails to conceal the exploitation of human misery. All the rationalizing in the world cannot conceal the ugly facts.

The reputation of the United States should not be sullied by this type of legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include two telegrams in my remarks on the rule.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this legislation and I hope this rule is adopted. The importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural work in this country has worked out very successfully for a number of years. This type of labor is absolutely essential to the beet-sugar industry in Colorado and other States where sugar beets are raised. I understand that about 3,000 of these nationals were employed in Colorado last year to harvest our crops. While this number is small as compared to the total number imported, this labor is a very important element of our economy. Without this labor, it would be impossible to harvest certain crops.

I am, of course, very anxious to use local labor wherever possible. This resolution provides that the nationals cannot be used where local labor is available. No one has any intention of taking any work away from citizens of this country. However, it has been demonstrated year after year that this type of labor is not available in the United States.

I feel that it is essential to the economy of our Nation that this legislation be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we may proceed to the adoption of this rule and the adoption of the legislation which will be before us pursuant to the rule. My understanding is that the great Committee on Agriculture by almost a unanimous vote has brought this matter to us for our consideration on the floor of the House. Before I talk about the merits involved here, I want to say I do not know whether or not I understood correctly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said. If I understood him, he was at least trying to create the impression that the great President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was for this legislation as a result of some social visit which he made with Governor Shivers, of Texas. We have heard a few things around here lately about name calling, but I want to say I resent that sort of implication and there certainly should be no one in this Chamber who would take any stock whatsover in such a statement. Now, let us not get all mixed up about illegal wetbacks, a name applied supposedly to people wading across the Rio Grande River. I have seen the Rio Grande River a few times, and I do not know whether you could get wet in it or not. But at any rate they walk across illegally. Here we are dealing with the question of legal admission to this country. In order that there be no question about it, and apparently much of this opposition is centered around some sort of contention that the Department of State and the Department of Labor and the Department of Justice do not want this legislation or that the administration does not want it, let me set your minds at rest about that because I can assure you that this legislation would not be here before us today if such were the case. On the contrary, this legislation is desired. It is desired because it is in the national interest and those people having primary charge of the conduct of our foreign affairs as well as the conduct of our affairs here at home favor this legislation and want it to be brought to enactment.

As some of you may have read in the papers, we have certain Monday morning meetings in the city, and as recently as this morning this matter was again discussed. So I say to you, set your minds at rest about that.

Referring again to wetbacks, this is no wetback bill. Somebody said something about stopping the illegal entries at the Mexican border. I just want to say, if some of you will follow certain leadership operations that might be exerted here, we will begin to do something about it. That is one thing that is not involved here unless it can be fairly said that by the adoption of this legislation, which will provide for the legal entry of people needed here, we will avoid, at least in some measure, the problems incident to the wetbacks coming into this country. As a matter of fact, there are about 40,000 of these Mexican workers now in the western part of the country, and if they have to leave it will create a vacuum which will persuade more wetbacks to come in here to meet the situation. Furthermore, some of the gentlemen, who have such a great solicitude for labor in this country, should consider that if these crops are not harvested, then the workers in the sheds, and so forth, will not have jobs, because they will not have anything to work on. Whatever there is in that, I hope they will consider it.

As a matter of fact, my information is that it costs the producers in this country more to hire these Mexican laborers than the prevailing local scale; but you cannot find local people to do the work.

It has otherwise been urged here that what we need is an agreement with Mexico. I concur in that. That is what we want—an agreement. We have been trying to work one out for months and months and months. I am not so certain but what the fact that this resolution has been reported and that action on it is imminent has brought us to the point where, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out in the paper, it now looks as if an agreement will be worked out. That is what we want. No one disagrees with that. But the question then arises, How best do you get the agreement? I will tell you that one way not to get an agreement is to defeat this rule and this proposed legislation, because just as surely as you do, you are not going to get any agreement, unless it is one that perhaps would ask us to do so much that we would not want to enter into it. That is not the sort of thing that should be talked about here too much, because I realize that we have to maintain friendly relations with everybody.

Do you not have confidence in the people in the executive branch of the Government, who have the primary responsibility for maintaining those relations? I think I can assure you on the best authority that if there were anything destructive or bad to come from the adoption of this resolution, the people in charge would have said so and I would not be here urging its adoption. But because that is not the situation, I am here urging its adoption.

Reference has been made to the farm organizations wanting an agreement. Of course they want an agreement.

Everybody, as I said, wants an agreement. But there again, the fundamental thing is how best are we going to get an agreement? I would hazard a little guess. Let us pass this resolution here today. I trust that some of the Members in opposition to it will be willing to proceed and debate the matter and get a vote on it so that we do not have to call the roll too many times, because we have lots of work to do, and this is one thing we are going to have to conclude because it is a part of the program and needs to be done.

If we can, let us get up to the vote and approach it on its merits and as a starter. I believe you will find these negotiations will be proceeding quite expeditiously and that very shortly we can look for an agreement that will be satisfactory to the Mexican Government and satisfactory to the Government of the United States and will help out in this critical situation which confronts us. I do not know whether any of these people will come to my State of Indiana or not, but it does not make any difference. Here is a proposition that has been urged at the hearings. We have been acting on it for years, going about the same thing, so why not proceed toward action and get on with other business before us.

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

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

RECESS

At approximately 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m. a demonstration and the discharge of firearms, from the southwest House Gallery (No. 11), interrupted the counting of the vote; the Speaker, pursuant to the inherent power lodged in the Presiding Officer in the case of grave emergency, after ascertaining that certain Members had been wounded and to facilitate their care, at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. declared the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Members wounded were: Mr. BENTLEY of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FALLON of Maryland, Mr. JENSEN of Iowa, and Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1954, 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:

1308. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending September 30, 1953, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1309. A letter from the Achivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1310. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Third Annual Report by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics on Operations, pursuant to Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1311. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66, 'Unclaimed moneys' of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1312. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14, 'Discharges, when granted,' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended and subdivision (b) of section 58, 'Notices' of the Bankruptcy Act as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presenting a plan for a single-purpose irrigation development in the basin of the Pecan Bayou, a tributary of the Colorado River of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1314. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Operation of the Fort Peck project for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 8 (c) of the Fort Peck Project Act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 25, 1954, the following report was filed on February 26, 1954:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report pursuant to section 5 (a) of Public Law 304 (79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 1, 1954*]

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. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4481. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7339. A bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 8116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to increase the income tax exemptions allowed a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, and his dependents to $700 for the taxable year 1954 and to $800 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 8117. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 8118. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to the donation of food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 8119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of admissions to certain rodeos, community shows, and festivals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8120. A bill to make it unlawful for any person having a wife and children dependent upon him to flee to another State or foreign country for the purpose of avoiding his responsibility to provide for their support and maintenance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 8121. A bill relating to the administration by the Secretary of the Interior of section 9, subsections (d) and (e), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 8122. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8123. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees and certain widows of employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 8124. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 8125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for certain deduc-

tions for taxpayers and dependents who are physically or mentally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8126. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 8128. A bill to modify the requirement for an oath in certain cases in attachment proceedings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8129. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 8130. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona or on the Navaho Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico for religious, educational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8131. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain widows and widowers of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8132. A bill to increase the personal-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $750; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8133. A bill to provide that certain payments to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities shall be measured by average daily membership in the schools of such agencies instead of being measured by average daily attendance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 8134. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) from $600 to $800 for 1954, and to $1,000 for 1955 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8135. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 8136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to admission taxes on intercollegiate rowing regattas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 8137. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution providing for the coinage of a medal in recognition of 30 years of the distinguished public service of John Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution authorizing the formulation and carrying out of a program for sending freedom messages behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in a certain tract of land to the Board of Education of Irwin County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution designating the lake to be formed by the completion of the Texarkana Dam and Reservoir on Sulphur River, about 9 miles southwest from Texarkana, Tex., as Lake Texarkana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Internal Security; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Colorado General Assembly urging the President of the United States to defend the freedom and decency of the free world by continuing firmly to oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a joint resolution expressing support of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 8138. A bill for the relief of Ruben Barrow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 8139. A bill for the relief of Stanley Fiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 8140. A bill for the relief of Domenico Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8141. A bill for the relief of Friedrich Jakobus Stech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 8142. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Sciarrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8143. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Archibald Pabarue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8144. A bill for the relief of Glenn J. McAllister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 8145. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Merkouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8146. A bill for the relief of Palmira Smarrelli (nee Lattanzio); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 8147. A bill for the relief of George W. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8148. A bill for the relief of Dominick Cardo; 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:

534. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 39 residents of Slippery Rock, Pa., opposing the sale of liquor in Army camps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Lithuanian Council of Lake and La Porte Counties, East Chicago, Ind., requesting the United States to use its power and influence to help Lithuania and other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. Also, petition of the chairman, Lithuanian Americans of the City of Racine, Racine, Wis., expressing gratitude to the United States of America for its favorable attitude toward the Lithuanian Nation in its struggle for liberty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

537. Also, petition of the president, Linden, N. J., branch, Lithuanian American Council, Linden, N. J., expressing appreciation for continued encouragement of the ultimate liberation of Lithuania from Bolshevik enslavement, and for the creation of the Kersten committee which investigated seizure and forcible Soviet annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

538. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Lithuanian Council of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted at special commemoration ceremonies marking the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

539. Also, petition of the chairman, American Lithuanians of the City of Portland, Portland, Oreg., pledging full cooperation with the present Government of the United States in its efforts to resist the forces of Communist imperialism and achieve international peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

540. Also, petition of the deputy, Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego, San Diego, Calif., opposing the adoption of Senate bill 2749, which provides for the termination of Federal supervision over trust and restricted property of Indian tribes and individual Indians in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

541. Also, petition of the clerk, County Commissioners of Allegany County, Cumberland, Md., requesting the issuance of a commemorative stamp marking the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

542. Also, petition of the mayor of Cumberland, Md., relative to the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 200th anniversary of the founding of Fort Cumberland; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Letter Mail Rates Should Not Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to reduce the current postal deficit, the Post Office Department is bent on a course of action which, if carried through, promises to boomerang.

I speak of the bills in both the House of Representatives and the Senate—H. R. 6052 and S. 2836—designed to raise first-class mail postage from 3 cents to 4 cents and air-mail postage from 6 cents to 7 cents, in the belief that additional postal revenues would thus be generated.

Such legislation is unrealistic for two major reasons:

FIRST-CLASS MAIL A PROFITMAKER

First, the Post Office Department is presently realizing a substantial profit from first-class mail and air mail at the going rates of 3 cents and 6 cents per ounce, respectively. The Post Office Department's own cost ascertainment report for 1952, the last complete year for which postal data are available, shows that first-class mail returned a net profit to the post office of $52,400,000 on first-class revenues totaling about $843 million, which represents a profit of about 6 percent.

AIR MAIL RETURNS GREATER PERCENTAGE OF PROFIT THAN FIRST-CLASS MAIL

In addition to profits resulting from first-class mail, the Post Office Department in 1952—excluding subsidy, for which the Department is no longer responsible—realized air-mail profits from the services provided by the scheduled airlines of approximately $10 million. The Department's total domestic air-mail revenues were about $120 million, so it actually made a profit of more than 8 percent on gross air-mail business.

CALIFORNIA TOP STATE IN ORIGINATING AIRMAIL

A substantial percentage of these revenues was accounted for by the State of California. Los Angeles and San Francisco alone generated domestic airmail revenues for the Post Office amounting to nearly $9 million, or more than 7 percent of total domestic airmail revenues accruing to the Post Office in 1952. Compare this figure with the year 1940, when these 2 cities returned less than $2 million to the Post Office Department in airmail revenues. Los Angeles, which ranks third among United States cities on airmail revenues, accounted for more than 4 percent of the national airmail revenue total in 1952, returning nearly $5 million to the Post Office. The importance of airmail to California is further indicated by the fact that during 1952, according to an air commerce traffic pattern study made by the CAA, more tons of airmail originated in California than in any other State in the Union—approximately 14,000 tons or about 15 percent of all airmail originating in the more than 650 cities currently on the airmail map.

As exemplified by California, there is no reason why these airmail profits for the Post Office should not continue to grow—providing, that is, that "the goose that lays the golden egg" is not killed by hiking airmail postage from 6 cents to 7 cents. Which brings me to my second major reason for opposing the proposed legislation.

HIGH POSTAL RATES REDUCE MAIL VOLUME

A sound case can be made for the conclusion that an increase in postal rates has a detrimental effect on volume—that such an increase does not raise revenue sufficiently to compensate for the higher unit costs due to decreased volume. Let us examine the record.

The beginning of scheduled domestic air transportation coincides roughly with the establishment of the first uniform airmail postage rates. Prior to February 1, 1927, airmail rates had been very complex. As a result of the Kelly Act of 2 years previous, postage rates had been established at 10 cents per ounce per contract route. On the above date, a simple blanket postage rate of 10 cents per half ounce was established between any two points in the United States. Data on revenues and expenses both before and after this rate change are incomplete; but it did result in a 15.6 percent increase in volume in the first month after the new rate was instituted.

On August 1, 1928, a new airmail rate was inaugurated. The first ounce was reduced from 10 cents to 5 cents, with all additional ounces at 10 cents. The assumption that the number if not the total weight of airmail might be increased was borne out immediately. The first month saw a 95-percent rise in the volume of airmail. The increase for the fiscal year 1929 was over 200 percent.

The first opportunity to observe the adverse effects of airmail rate increases came in 1932 when the postage rate was raised to 8 cents for the first ounce and 13 cents for each additional ounce. The results of the increase were immediate and substantial. The following fiscal year saw a 33-percent reduction in the volume of airmail. This rate increase occurred at the heighth of the depression, a fact which in part may account for the substantial increase in the airmail deficit resulting from smaller volumes. However, the period of the great depression also saw experimentation with a rate decrease. In 1935 a flat 6 cents per ounce rate was inaugurated. Volume increased 21.2 percent during the first month and the fiscal year 1935 witnessed an increase of 50.5 percent over the previous year.

The new 6-cent rate remained unchanged for almost a decade, during which period domestic airmail experienced a very healthy increase.

During the war an 8-cent rate was established, and the volume of airmail dropped severely, from 1,091,000,000 pieces in fiscal 1944 to 716 million pieces in 1946. Revenue dropped from $8,500,000 monthly in fiscal 1944 to $6,770,000 in 1945, a drop of 11.2 percent. While a portion of this reduction resulted from the decrease of military mail, a major part was clearly attributable to the high rate, because the percentage of airmail to total first-class mail dropped during this period from 5.02 to 3.68 percent.

In an effort both to promote the use of airmail and to reverse the trend in costs, a 5-cent rate was inaugurated on October 1, 1946. An immediate upsurge took place. In this 1 month some 40 percent more airmail was carried than in the previous month under the 8-cent rate. The first 9 months of 1947 saw increases over September 1946, which ranged from 42 to 53 percent. Undoubtedly the sharp increase in airmail volume which followed the inauguration of the new rate was to a large extent the result of the very considerable rate reduction effected.

In an effort to derive more revenue from airmail without disturbing this favorable trend the postage rate was increased cautiously to 6 cents an ounce on January 1, 1949. Even this modest increase resulted in a reduction in volume of the mail to which the rate applied, from 33 million pounds in 1949 to 32 million pounds in 1950. There can be no doubt but that the postage rate increase caused this reduction, because the trend of total first-class mail was in the opposite direction. While the airmail lost a million pounds, the surface first-class mail gained approximately 12 million pounds.

It is true that total airmail service, which includes airmail and air parcel post, has been increasing during the years since 1950. This overall increase results from the growth of air parcel post, which was introduced in 1949.

SIX-CENT RATE MAXIMUM AIRMAIL LIMIT

From this record it appears that Congress has already proved that the existing rate is as high as airmail postage should go. An increase to 7 cents will repeat a mistake made before with adverse consequences. It is no answer to say that in view of the general inflation the public would be willing to pay the additional 1 cent for airmail, and that for that reason no reduction would be suffered. This is disproved by the fact that even the modest increase of 1 cent in 1949 resulted in a reduction of a million pounds, to say nothing of the adverse effect the increase had on the growth of airmail service as such.

EXPEDITED FIRST-CLASS MAIL A BOON TO POST OFFICE

In addition to the profitable service which airmail is currently providing the Post Office, note should also be taken of the profit the Post Office is making by flying nonlocal first-class mail between

New York and Chicago on an experimental basis. The scheduled airlines are now well in their fifth month in providing this expedited service to the public. Postal revenues accruing to the Post Office Department amount to $2,310 a ton, of which $134.66 is paid to the airlines for services rendered. This means that the airlines receive only 5.8 percent of the postal revenues for flying the New York-Chicago mail and the remaining 94.2 percent, or $2,175.34 on each ton, is retained by the Post Office to pay ground expenses.

Regular airmail moving over this same route is sold to the public, under the existing 6-cent rate, at $4,200 per ton. The Department pays the carriers $325.80 per ton for transporting it. The remaining $3,975 per ton is retained by the Post Office Department to pay its ground handling costs, which, surely, are not greatly in excess of those incurred for the handling of surface mail.

AIRMAIL SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED BY POST OFFICE

These figures show two things. In the first place, the Post Office Department must be making a good profit out of the services of the airlines. Second, airmail is the service that should be encouraged most by the Post Office Department, because the Department receives almost twice as much to pay for its ground handling costs as it does in the case of surface mail, even though the handling of the two types of mail is very similar.

In this bill, however, the Department, far from encouraging the use of airmail, is, on the basis of the previous record of rate increases, endangering not only the continued growth of this very profitable service but even the present volume.

For these reasons, I am firm in my conviction that the increase of first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce and of airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents is not in the best interests of the Federal Government, or of the general public, and, therefore, should be opposed.

Guiding Principles in Atomic Energy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent a message to the Congress recommending certain changes in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946—see House Document No. 228, 83d Congress, 2d session, February 17, 1954. These recommendations seek to accomplish several purposes: namely, a limited sharing of atomic information with friendly nations to enhance cooperation for mutual defense and peacetime applications; a redefinition of "restricted data" to facilitate security clearance of personnel and access of industry to atomic information; and authorization for private ownership of fissionable materials and atomic reactors to promote industrial development of atomic energy.

Some of the legislative changes which the President recommends are in the nature of perfecting amendments to improve present procedures or to make progress toward mutual defense objectives which are well understood and generally accepted. Regarding such changes for improvements in existing legislation, there should be no major areas of disagreement, and I believe such changes merit support by the Congress. Of course the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on which I am privileged to serve, will make a careful appraisal of these matters and report to the Congress its findings.

Other recommendations of the President, however, are directed to basic revisions in the Atomic Energy Act which introduce the new concept of private enterprise in the atomic field. I say "new concept" because to date the United States Government is by law the exclusive owner of atomic materials and facilities even though private firms are engaged as contractors or agents of the Government. This new concept opens up wide areas of disagreement and controversy.

A substantial body of opinion hold that atomic energy development based wholly on the investment of public funds—now about $12 billion in the aggregate—should remain a public enterprise and that atomic materials and works are properly to be considered a part of the public domain.

Others believe that private industry has a legitimate and useful place in this field, but that authorizing legislation now is ill-advised and premature and, if enacted, would result in freezing the strategic monopoly position of a few large corporations which possess the technical know-how and equipment to carry on atomic operations.

Finally there are those who maintain that the existing atomic energy legislation is a brake on industrial progress; that the restrictive provisions of the law are holding under leash a great potential atomic industry ready to burst forth in all its glory, investing huge sums, and pioneering new developments, if only the Congress will say the word.

There are other divisions and shades of opinion, but I believe that these broad avenues of approach indicate the legislative situation which confronts us in the atomic field. How to resolve the many problems is a complicated and difficult task. There are no easy answers.

Those who believe that atomic energy should remain exclusively a Government monopoly and those who argue for a complete redirection of emphasis in favor of private industry, both state some fundamental truths; and yet neither position is sufficient by itself, in my opinion, to qualify as public policy. That is why I am inclined toward the intermediate position.

Wider industrial participation should be encouraged, but the time is not yet ripe for fundamental changes in the basic legislation. The President seemed to take that position when he said in his message that "the act in the main is still adequate to the Nation's needs." Therefore, I wonder whether the President is fully aware that his proposal to confer private ownership rights in atomic energy is a radical departure from the concept that has guided atomic developments to date. Legislative authority for such rights would recast the whole pattern of the Nation's atomic energy program.

There are factors to be considered which transcend in importance the providing of incentives to private enterprise in atomic energy. As I have said before on several occasions, how to wring a profit from the atom is a problem much less compelling to solve than how to save our beloved country and indeed the whole world from savage and wholesale destruction.

And even when we come to the matter of permissive legislation for private enterprise, we must consider the role of labor as well as management, of consumer as well as producer, of the public as well as the private interest. All Americans have a stake in the atomic-energy program, and any benefits to be derived now or in the future must be widely shared. If the promise of atomic energy is not belied, its impact will be far-reaching, and we as legislators must consider the consequences for all groups and all sections of the country.

On the floor of this House and elsewhere I have set forth what I consider to be the implications of legislative changes in the Atomic Energy Act proposed by the Atomic Energy Commission and by industrial spokesmen—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, pages 5853–5863 and 7029–7031. I have introduced a joint resolution outlining what inquiries I believe the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should make before any further legislation is adopted—House Joint Resolution 317, 83d Congress, 1st session. For text of resolution and accompanying statement see Atomic Power Development and Private Enterprise, hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 83d Congress, 1st session, pages 573–577. And finally, I have participated actively in the hearings held this past summer by our joint committee which explored at great length and in considerable detail proposals for industrial participation in the atomic field.

For the convenience of the Members, I may note that the recent hearings of our joint committee have been ably summarized by the committee staff and summaries are available at the committee office.

Our chairman, the Honorable STERLING COLE, always has been fairminded, objective, and considerate in the conduct of the committee hearings, and I take this opportunity to commend him again for his excellent leadership and statesmanlike demeanor.

The committee hearings, as I said before, were exploratory; we were not considering specific legislation. The committee was apprised informally of legislative proposals drafted in the Atomic

Energy Commission, but that draft was incomplete and objectionable in many points. Since the close of our hearings last July, the Commission under the chairmanship of Lewis Strauss, who succeeded Gordon Dean about that time, has been reworking the draft legislation. President Eisenhower's message now signifies apparently that the administration has made up its collective mind as to what changes in the Atomic Energy Act it considers desirable for the promotion of private enterprise.

The President's message is couched in very general terms. The Commission's followup proposals for amending the law will be carefully analyzed by the committee. If and when the proposed legislation reaches bill form and is introduced in the Congress, I presume our joint committee will hold further public hearings. Proposals of such far-reaching effect require a full-dress review in public.

It is too early to discuss point by point the Commission's legislative recommendations or to say what modifications will be made by the joint committee. However, I think it is timely and important to outline what I deem to be guiding principles for any new legislation that may be enacted relative to atomic-energy development and private enterprise. By these guiding principles I will measure any legislative proposals that come before us, and if the principles are violated in any substantial degree, I serve notice here and now that I will oppose the legislation down the line.

NONINTERFERENCE WITH INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC AGENCY

Some weeks ago the President addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations and kindled new hope among peoples everywhere by his proposal for cooperation with other nations in peacetime atomic pursuits. The hope is that nations working together on the atom for peace will be less inclined to work against each other for atomic war. At the Berlin conference Secretary Dulles entered into preliminary discussions with the Russian representatives concerning the President's proposals.

In a public address soon after the President's statement before the United Nations General Assembly, I said:

> We should put first things first, and the first task ahead in atomic energy legislation is to clear the path for the creation of the international atomic agency proposed by President Eisenhower.

Then I continued:

> Exactly what our commitments to the international atomic agency should be in the way of contributing uranium ores, fissionable materials, atomic facilities and devices, scientific and technical knowledge, and trained personnel, we cannot know in advance. There are matters to be worked out in the months ahead, if the atomic agency proposal is to become a reality. Whatever legislative changes are necessary to back up the commitments should not be hampered by the intrusion of proposals to legislate electrical utilities or industrial firms into the atomic energy picture.
>
> In a special sense we are on our best behavior before the world. Its hopes and prayers can be worn away quickly by corroding cynicism if we fail to make good with deeds our noble words. We must take care lest other nations see us preoccupied with seeking ways to make a profit from the atom instead of seeking ways to advance the welfare of mankind. There is a compelling urgency about concerted efforts for peace; no compelling urgency about authorizing Consolidated Edison or Monsanto Chemical to own an atomic reactor.

Later, in a message to the Congress recommending changes in the Atomic Energy Act, the President stated with regard to his proposal for international cooperation:

> Consideration of additional legislation which may be needed to implement that proposal should await the development of areas of agreement as a result of our discussion with other nations.

Thus, I say we are not warranted in pushing ahead with legislation for private enterprise in atomic energy before we know the legislative requirements for the international atomic agency. Our negotiations should not be obstructed in any way by domestic controversy over the handling of atomic business.

And if these negotiations, by some good fortune, prepare the way for effective international control of atomic weapons, the Government, in striving for peace, should not be tied down by vested private interests in atomic energy which conflict with our international commitments. Our Government could hardly put its best foot forward if it were faced with the burden of confiscating private atomic plants to meet requirements of an international control arrangement such as we have advocated in the past.

In the meantime, we can proceed, as the President recommended, with legislation to authorize the sharing with our allies of such tactical and training information as they need for mutual defense purposes. We can take steps, too, at this time to permit the wider dissemination of atomic data needed by American business and by friendly countries for industrial application.

CLEAR DECLARATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

If and when the Atomic Energy Act is rewritten to confer private ownership and patent rights in atomic energy, specific legislative amendments should be preceded by an explicit declaration of congressional policy stating what the Congress intends to achieve by the new legislation and what safeguards are being provided to insure that the congressional objectives will not be thwarted or dissipated by administrative interpretation.

Certainly the Congress would want to prevent monopoly, to encourage participation by small business as well as large, to insure the widest possible distribution of the benefits of atomic power and other peacetime developments, to protect collective-bargaining rights of labor in a new industry hedged in by stringent security regulations, to guarantee the priority of military requirements, and otherwise to promote the public welfare and protect the public interest.

In view of the necessarily broad areas of administrative discretion that must be left to the Atomic Energy Commission, it would be wise for the Congress not only to draft the law as carefully as possible, but to illumine its provisions with a coherent and well-rounded statement of congressional objectives.

MAINTENANCE OF CIVILIAN CONTROL

The great battle of civilian versus military control over atomic energy development was fought out 8 years ago when the McMahon Act was passed. The principle of civilian control, though bloody and bowed, emerged victorious. Despite the fact that the atomic energy program was born of urgent wartime need and its military phases have received paramount and overriding consideration in these troubled years, we have never been willing, as a matter of national policy, to let this program be an exclusive province of the military. Administrative control is vested in an independent civilian commission appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

We must be on the alert to detect and prevent any backsliding toward greater military control of atomic energy. Vigilance is called for especially in these days of the so-called new look, when atomic weapons are assuming even greater prominence in the councils of military strategy and are rapidly acquiring the status of conventional armament.

Doubtless the Department of Defense has contributed its suggestions to the legislative proposals of the Atomic Energy Commission. I dare say the military will want a greater voice in the atomic program. Proposed amendments that seem harmless on their face will have to be scrutinized very carefully to make sure that they do not carry concealed weapons to vitiate the principle of civilian control.

In this connection I wish to point out that the two most important posts in the Atomic Energy Commission's program are now occupied by former high-ranking military officers. The Chairman of the Commission, Lewis L. Strauss, achieved the rank of rear admiral for service rendered our Nation during World War II. The second most important position is the office of general manager which is occupied for the first time since passage of the McMahon Act in 1946 by a career military man, a graduate of West Point, Maj. Gen. Kenneth D. Nichols. Thus we see today a situation which would not have been feasible or acceptable on policy grounds at the conclusion of the great civilian-military legislative controversy 8 years ago. These two men possess unusual backgrounds of atomic experience, a high degree of intelligence, and administrative ability. Whether their administrative policies and legislative recommendations will preserve firm civilian control or will strengthen the military influence unduly remains to be seen.

Our duty as legislators is to maintain a clear position of civilian control. This position should be safeguarded in the law, and, in my opinion, accords with the views of the great majority of our citizens.

AN ATOMIC INDUSTRY FREE OF SUBSIDIES

Industrial spokesmen for changes in the Atomic Energy Act sound this re-

frain: Atomic power and other industrial advances in atomic energy will be brought about only by the aggressive, dynamic activity of private enterprise; progress is held back by the heavy hand of Government monopoly. It sounds good, but there is more fancy than fact in the assertion. Here is what General Eisenhower said in his message to the Congress:

> Since 1946, however, there has been great progress in nuclear science and technology. Generations of normal scientific development have been compressed into less than a decade. Each successive year has seen technological advances in atomic energy exceeding even progressive estimates. The anticipations of 1946, when Government policy was established and the Atomic Energy Act was written, have been far outdistanced.

The blunt fact is that existing atomic energy legislation—Government monopoly and all—has provided the framework for great progress in this field.

Nevertheless, industrial spokesmen argue that only private enterprise can make such progress, and they insist that the law must be changed to provide a favorable climate in which private atomic enterprise can flourish. Closer examination of the conditions demanded for a salubrious climate usually will reveal that private enterprise expects the taxpayer to offer subsidies of one kind or another to minimize the risks of private investment.

It may be a demand for rapid tax amortization, which amounts in effect to an interest-free loan by the taxpayers. It may be a demand for direct Government financing at low interest rates and lenient repayment terms. It may be a demand for a Government-guaranteed supply of fissionable materials or Government-performed technical services at favorable prices—favorable, that is, to the industry. It may be a demand for Government-guaranteed purchases of fissionable and by-product materials from private plants, again at prices favorable to the industry. In these and other ways, private enterprise undoubtedly will seek to bring about the proper climate.

It will be necessary to examine carefully the proposed legislation to determine the nature and extent of the subsidies demanded. I believe that private atomic industry should not expect to live and grow on the largess of the taxpayer. If those who say that what atomic energy needs is more private enterprise are sincere, then they should be prepared to make good on their own, to stand on their own feet and to be self-supporting. I quite agree with the statement in President Eisenhower's message that—

> It is essential that this program so proceed that this new industry will develop self-reliance and self-sufficiency.

TEN-YEAR BAN ON EXCLUSIVE PATENT PRIVILEGES

Industrial spokesmen for changes in the Atomic Energy Act argue that conventional patent privileges, now banned by the Atomic Energy Act, must be given to private enterprise as one of the necessary incentives for development. When it is pointed out that patents could become an instrument of monopoly control by a few large corporations favorably situated in the atomic energy program, they contend that the basic scientific knowledge is not patentable and that the issuance of patents on new inventions would not seriously handicap any competing firms.

Commonsense and an awareness of the history of patent monopolies combine to support the counter argument that the exercise of ordinary patent privileges is premature in this field. President Eisenhower, recognized the danger of patent monopoly when he said in his message to the Congress:

> Until industrial participation in the utilization of atomic energy acquires a broader base, considerations of fairness require some mechanism to assure that the limited number of companies, which as Government contractors now have access to the program, cannot build a patent monopoly which would exclude others desiring to enter the field. I hope that participation in the development of atomic power will have broadened sufficiently in the next 5 years to remove the need for such provisions.

The President proposed not that industrial atomic patents be banned outright, as they are in certain cases under existing legislation, but that persons or firms obtaining such patents be required to license others for a limited period to use the inventions. This procedure is known as compulsory licensing.

I believe the President's expressed hope that 5 years would be a sufficient period to broaden the base of atomic industry is unduly optimistic and unwarranted by the present state of atomic technology. It takes 3 or 4 years to build a reactor, even on the assumption that the design has been perfected. It will take at least 10 years before we can reasonably expect to see reactors of sufficient diversity in design and techniques of operation to determine the economics of the industry.

The decade ahead must be regarded as the crucial period of atomic experimentation and development. It will be a fluid period of testing and rejection, of new discoveries and rapid obsolescence. To really broaden the base of atomic industry the use of all inventions should be made readily available to all interested and qualified businesses for a period of not less than 10 years.

And when I say "made available" I mean that any business duly licensed to carry on atomic activities should automatically have access to the desired invention or discovery which is patented, upon payment of a reasonable royalty fee. There is no good reason, as I see it, why one licensed company should have the privilege and not another, or why the applicant must be subjected to burdensome justifications before the Atomic Energy Commission to gain access to any given patent when he has already met the qualifications for licensing in the atomic energy field.

Unless the licensing of patented inventions to all qualified parties is automatic, the purposes of so-called compulsory licensing may well be defeated. A clue to this possible result is provided in the testimony of Caspar Ooms, a patent attorney who was formerly United States Patent Commissioner and later Chairman of the AEC Patent Compensation Board. In his appearance before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Mr. Ooms proposed instead of automatic licensing "that each applicant for a license must demonstrate separately that the license is necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of the act. This restriction is maintained to make the invocation of this licensing power an exception and an infrequently used device. It is intended to guard against the fear that the inventor who is willing to devote his resources to making developments in this field would be compelled to share his contributions with his competitors and to insure that he will be required to give license only in the extreme and infrequent situation where that is necessary to accomplish the designs of this legislation."

It seems to me that Mr. Ooms has thrown out the baby with the bath. Whereas our objective should be to broaden the base of atomic industry by affording equal access to technical innovations, for a period of time at least, Mr. Ooms makes only a grudging concession to that objective and prefers that the limited and exceptional instance be the rule.

I am most deeply concerned with basic patents which might restrict use of processes or mechanical gadgetry and which would be of such major importance as to prohibit development of peacetime uses by others who are competent to bring to the mass of the people important benefits. I am not so much concerned with patents in a peripheral or secondary zone, which would not give to any inventor a major or basic control over the industry.

PREVENTION OF MONOPOLISTIC TRENDS

Ready access of licensed firms to all patents for 10 years is an essential element, as I have indicated, in preventing monopolistic exploitation of atomic enterprises by a few large firms. In addition to patent measures, other safeguards must be established to prevent the growth of monopolies to the detriment of small business and competitive business.

I doubt very much that the antitrust laws are a sufficient instrument for preventing monopoly growth in this new and untried field. The limitations of the antitrust laws in this regard were well stated in testimony before our joint committee by Andrew Biemiller, a former member of this body, speaking for the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Biemiller said:

> We believe that the Congress should not relieve the Atomic Energy Commission of its positive obligation to prevent or discourage monopoly in the field of atomic power. It is not enough to rely simply on the antitrust laws and to pass the buck to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Although these laws have an important function in limiting the monopolistic tendencies of big business, the protracted and cumbersome procedures for determining whether the antitrust laws have been violated in a given case may not work very well in the completely new field of atomic power.
>
> The antitrust lawyers, working in an intricate maze of judicial decisions, are accustomed to thinking in terms of degrees of market control and percentages of production accounted for by established firms. In the case of atomic power, which breaks new ground and contains no precedents for

evaluating industrial controls, it would seem more appropriate for the Atomic Energy Commission to maintain its original responsibility through its licensing powers to prevent the growth of monopoly in atomic energy. No proposals should be entertained which would weaken the positive mandate in the Atomic Energy Act to strengthen free competition in private enterprise.

WIDE DISTRIBUTION OF ATOMIC POWER BENEFITS

Although the potential peacetime benefits of atomic energy are many and varied, our primary concern in this context is with atomic power. How to harness this vast new source of energy to perform the daily tasks of mankind and to further industrial progress is the problem that intrigues our scientists, engineers, businessmen, legislators, and administrators of Government.

The Atomic Energy Commission, perhaps because of its preoccupation with atomic weapons, has not shown great imagination or ingenuity in fostering the development of atomic power, except to propose that private industry take over the responsibility.

For years the Commission has been devouring enormous amounts of electricity from conventional sources to run the various atomic installations, even while the energy potential of atomic fission has been allowed to go to waste. The Commission today is the largest single consumer of electricity in the United States, accounting for possibly 4 or 5 percent of the total electrical-power demand of the Nation.

One would expect the Commission to be enterprising in figuring out ways and means of cutting down its huge power bill and working toward self-sufficiency in power requirements by utilizing atomic power. In fact, the Commission has not only been lacking in such enterprise; it has entered into agreements with private utilities in some areas to supply a large portion of its power needs for the next 25 years. And the utilities, in turn, have asked for—and received—Government guaranties of compensation in the event the AEC power demand falls off and eliminates the need for the utilities' output.

When the Atomic Energy Act was passed in 1946, the Congress contemplated the possibility that atomic power would be generated. Section 7 (d) of the act authorizes the Commission to use and sell electricity derived from the atom. But the Commission is not a power-minded agency; it does not like to think of itself as a producer and marketer of atomic power. Perhaps other agencies of the Government are better equipped for this task. In any event, the Federal Government has an important responsibility in atomic-power production and distribution.

After the investment of billions from the Public Treasury in atomic energy, and the glowing promises of its ultimate contributions to human welfare, how short of expectations would be our atomic power program if the only end results were to build up the power supply position of a few private utilities without any noticeable effect on the prices that consumers pay for electricity or the availability of power to areas and populations now denied its blessings.

The cardinal principle—though it may sound old-fashioned in the "giveaway" age, still remains, namely, that the benefits created by public investment should be widely distributed throughout the national economy.

PROTECTION OF LABOR'S RIGHTS IN ATOMIC INDUSTRY

Greater freedom of enterprise in atomic energy carries with it the commensurate obligation of insuring the like freedom to labor. Management-labor relations in this field have been handicapped by onerous security requirements. Legislative safeguards must be written to prevent the abuse of secrecy to evade collective bargaining.

IMPARTIAL REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

If opportunities are to be opened up to private enterprise in the atomic-energy field, Government controls necessary for maintaining security, health, safety, and other basic measures should be administered in a fair and impartial manner. I deem it essential that persons or firms who may have grounds for believing fair treatment has been denied them in regard to licensing or other actions should be accorded the right of appeal to an independent review board or tribunal apart from the Atomic Energy Commission itself.

To minimize further the possibilities for arbitrary administrative action, I believe the Commission should exert the necessary controls only at strategic points in the atomic industrial process without suffocating the whole industry by bureaucratic redtape. Thus, a leasing system for fissionable materials, with title remaining in the Government, would provide an intelligent control mechanism, eliminating the need for a complicated licensing procedure for atomic production facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to outline some of the more important considerations that must guide our approach to new legislation in the atomic-energy field. Our joint committee will make an intensive study of proposed legislation and in due time report to the Congress.

The Problem of Trieste—Italy's Historical Right to the Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the head of the Adriatic Sea lies Trieste, a city which currently is a powder keg in Europe. Italy and Yugoslavia both make historical and geographical claims to Trieste.

The history of the Trieste problem ought to be better known by the American people. It would then be understood why Italy's claim is much more than a sentimental attachment to the city. Trieste was Italian for centuries—under the Romans, then under Venice and later as a free Italian "Commune" within the framework of Austrian feudalism. Trieste has always maintained her Italian character. The predominance of Italian people in this area has been confirmed over the years by successive censuses of the population.

Italy intervened in World War I on the side of the Allies, in large part for the purpose of unifying Trieste to Italy; this war cost Italy more than 600,000 dead. At the end of the war Italy's request for Trieste was accepted by the Allies at the London conference; by the Yugoslavs with the Rome pact; and was acknowledged by President Wilson. Then, some 25 years later, toward the end of World War II, Italy many times brought to the attention of the Allies its anxiety over Trieste. In spite of assurances to Italy by the Allies, Marshal Tito occupied the city. At the peace conference following the war, American officials proposed the line most favorable to Italy; unfortunately this line was not accepted. To please Russia the Allies found it necessary to agree as a temporary measure to a Free Territory of Trieste, by which Trieste was divided into Zones A and B to be supervised over by Italy and Yugoslavia, respectively. This arrangement has never been acceptable, either to the local population, or to the people and Governments of Italy and Yugoslavia. Numerous times Italian officials have presented proposals for a settlement of the Trieste issue. Recently Italy has proposed a plebescite in harmony with the democratic principles of the right to self-determination; but these overtures have been rejected by the Yugoslavs. It has been increasingly evident that Italy is anxious for a settlement of this issue by an agreement with Yugoslavia, but today there appears to be little chance for an immediate solution. It is to be hoped that Italy's legitimate claims in this area will be realized soon.

Mr. Speaker, Italian-Americans are vitally concerned with the actions of our Government in this matter. They have expressed themselves as favoring a speedy solution in Italy's behalf. The oldest Italian-American fraternal organization in the United States is the Columbian Federation of Italian-American Societies. Three units of this great organization are quartered in Springfield, Mass.—they are Loggia Figli del Lavoro, No. 188; Loggia No. 221, Societa' Unione e Fratellanza Italiana; Societa' Venezia Italiana, No. 229. I am proud of these societies, their members, and their accomplishments. All three recently passed resolutions calling for the return of Trieste to Italy. Under unanimous consent, I include the resolutions in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY LODGE FIGLI DEL LAVORO, NO. 188, OF THE COLUMBIAN FEDERATION OF SPRINGFIELD, MASS., ON JANUARY 8, 1954

Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

Whereas that our Government in April 1948 pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return the city of Trieste to Italy; and

Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste are crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy; be it

Resolved, That the pledge will be enforced with facts in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN TATTY,
President.
AUGUSTO DAGRADI,
Secretary.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Resolution passed by Lodge Societa' Unione e Fratellanza Iaiiana, No. 221, of the Columbian Federation of Springfield, Mass., on January 7, 1954:

"Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

"Whereas that our Government in April 1948, pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return city of Trieste to Italy; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Lussino, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

"Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste are crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

"*Resolved,* That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the pledge will be enforced with facts, in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Respectfully submitted.

FRED PEZZINI,
President.
RENZO VEDANI,
Secretary.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution passed by Lodge Societa' Venezia Italiana, No. 229, of the Columbian Federation of Springfield, Mass., on January 5, 1954:

"Whereas the great majority of inhabitants of the city of Trieste are Italian; and

"Whereas our Government in April 1948 pledged publicly to use its moral force in order to revise the Italian Peace Treaty and to return the city of Trieste to Italy; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of people of the Italian cities and towns of Istria, such as Fiume, Pola, Parenzo, Lussino, Zara, etc., left their belongings and escaped from the dictatorship of Tito in order to live in a free and democratic country are now refugees in Trieste; and

"Whereas in supporting these refugees the economic, financial, industrial, and health structure of the city of Trieste is crippling the town forever if the present situation will endure: Be it therefore

"*Resolved,* That the members of this organization, American citizens of Italian extraction, support the policy of our Government in pledging the return of the territory of Trieste to Italy; be it

"*Resolved,* That the pledge will be enforced with facts, in future meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, or through our delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations."

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH MARCHETTI,
President.
RENZO VEDANI,
Secretary.

We Should Speed Up Work on the Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, California is one of our key agricultural and industrial States. More people have moved to California since 1940 than now live in many of our Midwestern States. The heartland of California is the Central Valley, which includes a third of the total land area of the State.

The growth of industry and population in the State has greatly advanced the demands for food and electric power. To keep pace with these demands it is only natural that the people turn toward the Central Valley. Here lies one part of the State where appreciable amounts of agricultural land can be improved. Here are the principal sources of developed and undeveloped power.

Water falls in California in the wrong places at the wrong times. In the Central Valley two-thirds of the water supply originates in the Sacramento Valley, while two-thirds of the agricultural lands are located far to the south in the San Joaquin Valley. The rains fall in the winter and spring, but the land needs water in the summer long after the spring runoff from the western slopes of the Sierras has ceased. Therefore, the great Central Valley exists almost entirely by irrigation.

The irrigation water is provided by the Central Valley project, which was authorized in 1935 as a Federal undertaking in the interest of power, reclamation, flood control, navigation, and related uses.

The basic plan of the project was proposed decades before the project actually took definite form. It was originally authorized by the legislature to be constructed through the sale of $170,000,000, worth of State bonds. The authorization act was taken to a referendum by certain private utilities who spent large sums of money in almost invalidating the authorization.

I remember the campaign very well. In southern California the voters were urged by the project's opponents not to saddle themselves with a debt of $170-million to finance a northern California project. I am proud to say that I was one of a small group of southern Californian volunteers who worked hard to save the project. Incidentally, the now famous public relations team of Whitaker and Baxter managed the campaign in favor of the project and won out in spite of the much better financed campaign of the opposition. Having seen them in action, the private utilities promptly engaged their services. They went on to become the highest paid public relations firm in the Nation, when they represented the American Medical Association.

Actually, the State bonds were not used to start the project. Considerable time has elapsed, but if I remember correctly, the project encountered opposition from Secretary Ickes as head of the Public Works Administration. It was initially gotten under way by President Roosevelt through a grant for relief of unemployment. The project provided a sound and proper means for stimulating employment then. It still does today. This is one of the reasons why the proposed purchase of the project by the State has proved infeasible and should be abandoned. To continue the negotiations for the purchase may result in needless confusion and delay, while we should be speeding the project toward completion.

The Federal Bureau of Reclamation has spent over $400 million on the Central Valley project, which is now about 50 percent completed. Although all the initial features of the project have been placed in operation, a significant construction program is now under way and proposed for continuance in fiscal year 1955.

To be more specific, the minimum program which I consider justified to continue work on the Central Valley project in fiscal year 1955 will require an appropriation of $26,600,000, about $3,100,000 more than the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget. This is the amount recommended by the Water Project Authority of my State which has worked closely with the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies in behalf of the people of the valley and the State.

The largest single item in this sum is $10,000,000, which is primarily for continuing construction of the Friant-Kern and completion of the Madera distribution systems.

Other large items are $7 million for Folsom power facilities to complete the powerplant to a point that all units will begin generating in 1955, and $3 million for completion of Sly Park Dam and conduit.

A significant item is $4 million for the Sacramento Valley Canals. This is a large development item, and time is, of course, required to solve some of the complex problems arising in connection with the water contracts. I am glad to state, however, that it is expected that negotiations will advance to the point that work on these canals can be initiated in the current fiscal year and can be greatly accelerated in 1955. I fully concur in the recommendation of the Water Project Authority that expenditure of funds for the Sacramento Valley canals be contingent upon organization of public districts with adequate power to enter into contracts with the United

States for the delivery of water and for repayment of the construction costs of the works. This is only sound procedure.

And last, a number of less costly but equally important items primarily concerned with finishing work on power and irrigation systems, provision of Delta fish-protective facilities, and clearing up water rights are estimated to cost $2,600,000.

The Federal cost of the Central Valley project is estimated at approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars—a tremendous sum even in these days. But I am happy to state that close to 90 percent of this amount will be returned to the United States Treasury. In fact it is estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1955 about $100 million will have been repaid from power revenues, irrigation, and municipal water payments.

Today our people are greatly concerned about growing unemployment. There are several million persons without jobs. Many of them are getting by for a short time on meager unemployment benefits or through use of accumulated savings.

The Government of the United States has an important responsibility to prevent economic depression. That responsibility was written into law under the Truman administration through passage of the Employment Act of 1946.

It is now the responsibility of the Federal Government to use all means at its disposal to maintain our economic well-being. One of the most important means for use in the growing State of California is to speed up necessary work on the Central Valley project through the provision of adequate funds in 1955.

This is a fitting time to vigorously push the Trinity River, San Luis, and Santa Maria projects. Only a dynamic, expanding economy can provide increasing opportunities for our expanding population. Speeding up work on the Central Valley project offers one ideal method for combating unemployment through sound economic expansion.

Discriminatory Restrictions Imposed by Germany Against American Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a recent action of the Bonn government of Germany.

While the architects and advocates of the so-called Randall Commission report seem quite concerned over having the United States lower its tariff barriers to permit extensive importation of foreign products into our country, the Bonn government of Germany recently arbitrarily acted to impose a discriminatory restriction against American coals.

As if enough harm is not being done already to injure the American coal industry, and particularly in my own State of West Virginia, through the unrestricted flood of foreign residual oil into east coast markets, now we are faced with restrictions on our own export activities. West Virginia coal mines supply the great preponderance of overseas coal exports.

This is a serious matter. What the Bonn Government of Germany has done is place a quantitative restriction on the import of American coals into Germany by refusing to issue licenses to her coal importers to purchase United States coals, except in very limited quantities. But, and I call this to your attention especially, no such restrictions have been issued against English coals coming into Germany, although fine quality American coals can, and were being laid down in Germany at a cost of from 4 to 5 United States dollars a ton under English coal.

While coal is being produced today at a rate slightly in excess of 400 million tons annually, in the war years we were geared to an output of 600 million tons, and the uninformed in our midst seem to think, should we get into a hot war again, this excess tonnage would be forthcoming much as water would from a faucet when the tap is turned from two-thirds to full. This is not the case, however, because a mine which is idled by loss of markets, exports, or otherwise, cannot be brought back into immediate capacity production. This situation is a matter of grave concern to the coal producers and miners, to the railroad and shipping companies, and certainly to the general public. Every ton which can be exported helps; every ton which is shut off hurts.

The discriminatory restrictions imposed by Germany against American coal set a dangerous precedent. If our Government acquiesces in them, other countries might be encouraged to take similar steps—and not only against coal. This arbitrary action is typical of some of the restrictions placed against America—who has liberalized her tariff regulations—by other countries.

While Europe must be helped to full recovery, this cannot be done entirely at the expense of the American economy, a vital and basic segment of which is our coal industry.

After 20 Brilliant Years in the Congress, Hon. Edward J. Hart, of New Jersey, Will Retire at the End of This Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding lawyer, Democrat, and Member of Congress has just announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this term. It saddens us that this distinguished, brilliant, brave, and warm-hearted friend of man, that beloved fighter, the Honorable EDWART J. HART, representing the 14th District, in Hudson County, N. J., will leave us at the end of this session.

The 14th District of New Jersey is a most unusual district, Mr. Speaker. So is its Congressman. The booming, golden voice with a brain of Congressman HART will not only be missed here on the Hill, on the House floor, in committee, but on the stump as well.

Up and down the State of New Jersey, year in and year out, Congressman ED HART sparked and racked up victory after victory for the Democratic Party. When the going was toughest, and times were tightest, it was Congressman HART who smashed through the line, yard after yard, time after time, scoring gain after gain for the little man, his wife, and child—scoring gains for the triumvirate of life, the trilogy on earth, the family unit, symbolized by a man, his wife, and child.

The race each of us runs, Mr. Speaker, is at best 60, 65, 70, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95 yards down the field. Born alone, running down the field, crossing the 20-, 25-yard line, one gains a mate, a beloved wife. On the 30-, 35-, 40-yard line, the couple runs interference for the children that follow. As he peels off on the 60-, 65-, 70-, 75-yard line, Pop throws a lateral to Mom. She keeps going. The kids follow. Mom laterals. The kids score.

It seems the goals of life we set for others, they generally reach. Those we set for ourselves, we rarely reach. Setting none for himself but all for others, to laugh, and love, and lift, Congressman HART today roams in acres of diamonds, aglow with the light of pathways he has pointed out for others to follow, in health, in happiness.

One of the most glorious letters of my life, Mr. Speaker, was the one I received in November 1950 in North Korea, above the 38th parallel in Hamhung. It was from Congressman HART. He told me that it was his pleasure to join with Mrs. Sieminski from one end of Hudson County to the other to score one of the most sensational congressional elections of the day against one of the hardest fighting political machines in the United States. Sparked by that magnificent leader, the Hon. John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City, Congressman HART and Mrs. Sieminski smashed the Hague opposition—tore it to shreds, in that terrific, sensational November congressional election.

Congressman ED HART's letter to me in North Korea telling of my wife's victory on my behalf shows the kind of a man ED is, shows his regard for the trilogy of life—for a man, his wife and child—for Alfred, Marie and Christine, as he has shown for others all through his Godly life.

You see what it is, Mr. Speaker, to come down Hudson County, to represent it here in the Congress? It has been the gateway to the Nation—streams on streams of people have passed the Statue of Liberty, landed on our Jersey shore, hammered out their living; since 1609, when the *Half Moon* and Henryk Hudson cast anchor off our shore there

was laid down a fighting, warm-hearted, good and brave tradition for us to follow and pass on to others. That's Hudson County, Mr. Speaker; that's ED HART, Congressman, brilliant Representative of our country, Nation, State, county, city, community, friends, and fellowmen. A salute to you ED, coach, father, brother, uncle and friend.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, cited below is an editorial on the announced retirement of Congressman HART as it appeared in the February 23, 1954, issue of the Jersey Journal:

TWENTY YEARS IN CONGRESS

Now it is official. Months ago, this newspaper was first to publish the news that Representative EDWARD J. HART would retire at the end of his current term. Yesterday, in Washington, the veteran of two decades in Congress announced he will not seek another term. He will take his pension, perhaps practice law. There is a good chance that his years of experience will be put to use somewhere in the State government.

His 20 years in Congress have seen great changes in the Nation and at home. When he went to Washington for the first time, the Nation was fighting its way out of the depression and was in the first term of Franklin Roosevelt's momentous era. In the ensuing years, Congressman HART grew in seniority in the controlling Democratic delegation and played a larger and larger part in public affairs.

In the same period, fundamental changes occurred within the Democratic Party at home. His public career continued through all that without becoming enmeshed in the deep bitterness which marked the battle within the party.

For years Congressman HART has been noted as the legislator with the shortest biography in the Congressional Directory. It says simply, under the Fourteenth District caption: "EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, lawyer, Jersey City." In a volume which includes some extravagant autobiographical articles, this is a refreshing change.

It tells much more than its brief recital of facts. Its simplicity and freedom from conceit go far to explain the reasons for a long career in Congress.

J. Edgar Hoover: 30 Years As Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1954, J. Edgar Hoover will have completed 30 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and today I am introducing in the House a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be struck a gold medal for presentation to this distinguished American and public servant.

"It is altogether fitting and proper," to quote the words of the immortal Lincoln, that we single out and honor this fine, patriotic American, who for 30 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has so ably devoted himself solely to the interests of the Government.

J. Edgar Hoover is a man who is not only incorruptible, of high character and integrity, but he has stayed on in this office and continued to devote himself to the public service despite tempting offers of hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly for his services in private industry.

He has served this Nation under seven Presidents, and built the FBI, from a few agents, appointed largely on a political basis, without automobiles, without authority to carry firearms, without jurisdiction over kidnaping, bank robbery, or subversive activities, and with no laboratory or fingerprint system or teletype machines, into an organization of thousands of well-trained agents, detecting and waging war on crime, corruption, and communism.

Our entire citizenry has a high admiration and respect for J. Edgar Hoover because of his devotion to the cause of America, and in introducing this resolution, and in what I may say, I feel that I am expressing the wishes of the Nation in pointing out our indebtedness to him for the distinguished public record he has achieved in organizing and firmly establishing as an agency of the executive branch of the Government the Federal Bureau of Investigation, about which there has never been a breath of scandal, as it has quietly gone about rendering efficient public service.

The FBI is universally regarded as the most efficient organization of its kind anywhere in the world and we cannot think of the FBI without thinking of J. Edgar Hoover and the able staff of assistants which he has built up and trained. He has the complete confidence of the American people, and I think the time has come, upon the completion of his 30 years of service as director, that we show our gratitude in an official manner to such an outstanding and honorable public servant.

This act of recognition will be an inspiration to the young people of America.

Improvements Needed in Civil-Service Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I favor amendments to the retirement system for Federal employees under civil service which would make two necessary improvements. H. R. 5556, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], provides full retirement benefits after 30 years of service at the age of 55.

H. R. 3936, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], would permit all civil-service employees to retire after 35 years of service, regardless of their age, and without deduction of any kind due to age of the person retiring.

At present retirement is permitted after 30 years of service at the age of 55, but an employee who exercises this right loses 3 percent of his retirement for each year under the age of 60. This means a reduction during the years of 55 to 60, when he has the option to retire, of 15, 12, 9, 6, and 3 percent of his retirement. The reduction, particularly in the earlier years, is too steep for most of the civil servants to afford to exercise this right. These employees have made their contributions for 30 years and the Government has matched them. If it is right to plan retirement for long-service employees, they should not then be penalized by a deduction from their modest retirement checks.

Even though servicemen make no contribution to a retirement fund, they are entitled to retire after 20 or 30 years of service without deduction for any years under 60. On the other hand, employees in the civil service, from whom deductions of 6 percent of their salaries are taken, which accumulates in interest more than the contributions during the 30 years, cannot receive their retirement payments unless a substantial deduction is made if they are still under 60 years of age.

The provision for full benefits without reduction of any amounts for any of the years under 60 is not limited to pension plans for service personnel, but exists also in the systems for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for the Public Health Service, for investigative and Foreign Service employees, and for policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia.

I am not questioning the wisdom of the provision which has been made in these systems. I think, however, that other civil servants who have put in 30 years in Government service and who have reached the age of 55 should be permitted to retire and receive the retirement pay to which they would then be entitled by length of service—amounting usually to less than half of their earnings while at work. Deductions up to 15 percent for those under 60 make such retirement impractical.

The other bill which I favor to improve the civil service retirement system, H. R. 3936, would make it possible for an employee to retire if he or she has worked in the civil service for 35 years. The age requirement after a person has served all of 35 years in the Government seems to me to be purely formal and perfunctory. Persons who have worked for the Government for at least 35 years are not young persons. It is the years of service and the contributions which have been made which are the true basis for an equitable claim to retirement. As already indicated, the retirement systems of the military services and the Public Health Service and Coast and Geodetic Survey are based on service and not age requirements, and the service requirements vary from 20 to 30 years. When they are entitled to benefits they receive full benefits, without deductions because they may not have reached a certain fixed age.

Two States have followed this example—Ohio permitting retirement at any age after 36 years of service and Colorado after 35 years of service. This principle is also commonly used in many

municipalities for policemen and firemen, with terms of required service much less than 35 years.

The average age of retirement of Government employees in fiscal 1953 was 61½ years. The overall average years of service of these employees was 23½ years. This is broken down in the following categories under which retirement is permitted by the present law:

Basis of retirement:	Average years of Government service
Disability	17.7
Mandatory (at 70, at least 15 years of service)	29.2
Optional, 60 to 70 years (at least 30 years of service)	36.6
Optional, 62 to 70 years (at least 15 years of service)	21.8

While we have no exact figures on the number now employed who have had 35 years of service, the sample of retirements in 1953 suggests that a comparatively small number of long-service employees would be involved.

There Was a Shooting in the House Chamber Today, Mr. Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this noon, when the House met, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it was my intent to discuss here the origin and the development of the grand jury, the full appreciation of which might serve to ease our tensions and give us that public calm needed for the proper maintenance of law and order.

An inflamed people can hardly be expected to enforce their laws with balanced scales. Since the Congress adjourned last July a mounting pitch of emotion has risen in the country. This, in inverse proportion to truce developments in Korea.

Last August, on active duty with the Sixth Army, at the presidio in San Francisco, under the command of Lt. Gen. Jos. M. Swing, it was my high honor to meet several POW ships as they slid up the bay. Bands played. Fire hoses sprayed. "Welcome home, boys, welcome home." Soldiers double timed down gangplanks, into the arms of weeping relations, into stalls for final processing. Chow. Then home. After Korea, peace and quiet was theirs. To what extent?

For the last 6 months of 1953, Congress was not in session. Charges flew. Here and abroad, on most all continents, accusations filled the air, man against man. England, Canada, Australia, alone, seemed unaffected.

In the first 2 months of this year, the pitch mounted. Last week, in America, it reached its crescendo.

Today, there was a shooting in the House Chamber. Five of our colleagues were felled.

The question is, will our beloved colleagues and friends pull through, again alive and alert, able in body, mind, and spirit? They must. Our deepest sympathies go to their brave and beloved families, their wives and children, their loved ones, and their constituents. Each of us feel the hurt.

What now? Close the Chamber? Deny the galleries? Secret service men at the portals? America, an armed camp? What is best for America will be done. Scalping and the tomahawk did not stop our hearty pioneers. Since 1776, eight generations of Americans have eight times shed blood for the love and glory of America, the beautiful and the free. Blood on the House floor today was in that line of march.

In 1922, Mussolini marched on Rome. Communists, gangsters, racketeers, and Socialists were blamed. Black Shirts, "Viva Duce—Viva Duce," war, desolation, and the Communist threat followed.

In the thirties, the German Reichstag was burned. A Dutch Communist was tried and executed. Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Ribbentrop, and Von Papen rode the crest. Storm troopers "Seig Heiled," marched, fought, and died. Germany went up in flames, one-half of it Communist-ruled today.

Earlier, in Russia, Rasputin terrified the court. Then the Bolsheviks slaughtered the Czar and his family.

Fear, slaughter, conquest. Then communism. Are these the four horsemen of our century?

What horse do we ride? None. Our foot is not even in the stirrup. Thank heavens. It must never be.

I shall always remember today, Mr. Speaker. The shooting was so strange. Just before it started, I phoned Mrs. Sieminiski to say there would be a roll-call or two, to hold supper. I would call back. I took a seat in the center of the last row, on the Democratic side, just in front of the page's desk.

Then the Speaker called for a standing vote. We were on the so-called wetback bill. Those in favor of the rule rose to their feet. It seemed as though an overwhelming majority of the Members stood to be counted. Speaker MARTIN seemed to be nearly finished with his tally. I was in my seat. Then, the shooting started.

I stayed in my seat, eyes glued to the black guns in the hands of the assassins who were directly opposite me in the gallery, across the Chamber. As the shooting continued the membership took more and more cover, got down behind the benches.

In front of me, to my left—I saw Congressman ROBERTS fall. To my front right Congressman FALLON grabbed his thigh. More and more Members got down. As if hypnotized, I stayed in my seat, eyes glued to muzzles of the weapons. I looked at the ceiling, saw a hole. Then a man came through the gallery door—smashed into, grabbed, and lifted one of the shooters off his feet, up and out of the gallery. Just before that, one of the shooters ran out. Just then, a woman unfurled a flag, red and white, and seemed to shout "Viva —ico."

To my right rear, a bullet hit the wall, just between the heads of two pages. Just over my head, another bullet lodged in the wall, over the page's desk.

I went forward, Congressman ROBERTS was down, blood on his trouser leg, tourniquet on his thigh. Congressman FALLON held his thigh and left the Chamber. Moving forward, toward the well of the House, over on the right, sat Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee. He was hit in the leg, sitting upright. I moved on, forward, on the Republican side, in the well Congressman BENTLEY was on his back. His eyes open, his face ashen. He had been hit in the chest. His shirt sopped up blood like a blotter. Over him kneeled the House Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp.

Near me stood Congressman FULTON, of Pennsylvania. He was telling someone how he moved toward the door with Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, following him. BEN got two slugs in the back and dropped.

People in the gallery seemed frozen in their seats. The membership milled about, comparing notes, who was where, and how close each was to a colleague who was hurt, or a bullet that had hit. Congressman BONNER had a close call. Sat right next to Mr. ROBERTS. Congressman BARDEN kept his eyes glued on the killers all the time. There was Congressman HERLONG—and over there was Mr. CANFIELD. Judge RUTH THOMPSON, Congresswoman from Michigan, and Mrs. CHURCH, in her seat, calm, possessed. Everyone was there. Calm. The phone booths were filled.

In came the plainclothesmen. Some cushions were removed. One was slashed open for a sample slug, which had embedded itself in the leather upholstering.

I met Russell Saville, House librarian, told him I had thanked the Almighty for a few more precious moments here on earth, not so much for myself as for a chance to try to do a little more for my wife Marie, and daughter Christine and Isabella who had only recently come through the Iron Curtain from Poland. Alone, the three of them would have had a bit of a go of it. I was thankful to God.

I phoned home. Isabella answered. She had not heard. We spoke Polish. I told her to reassure mother who had gone to fetch Christine at school.

Then John Murphy, my able and outstanding assistant called. All was well. His young son was ill. They were at the doctor's. I spoke to newsmen.

When I arrived at the office Mrs. Sieminski, Christine, and Isabella were there. We embraced. Christine was pale. Came over, sat on the arm of my chair, kissed me and said, "Daddy, I'm glad you're all right."

In the outer office, I gave a statement on the above to crack reporter, Washington representative of the Jersey Journal and the Newark Star Ledger, Tom Buchanan. Then I said good night to Miss Connie.

Our dinner was quiet. News has just come in, all colleagues are alive. Ben is gaining in strength. They will operate in the morning. Alvin is holding on.

May the lesson of this day, O Lord, grow clearer and clearer.

Sixty Days of Accumulated Annual Leave in the Federal Government Service Should Be Reinstituted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the concerted cry from many sources for relief from the so-called Thomas rider, Congress enacted Public Law 102, 83d Congress, approved July 2, 1953, for the purpose of overcoming some of the criticisms of it.

After a closer view of the new leave law, many students of civil-service reform and personnel administration came to the conclusion that for most employees in the Federal Government Public Law 102 is not a betterment of the bad situation, but that in reality the situation is probably worse, even if unintentionally so. A careful analysis reveals that the new leave law goes even further than the Thomas rider in curbing employee leave benefits. The only employees benefiting from the new law are those who had less than 30 days of accumulated leave. Under the Thomas rider they could not accumulate any more leave, but these employees now can save up to 30 days. For the great majority of Federal employees who have in excess of 30 days' leave, the new law hurts them even more than the old one.

Congress has decreed in this new law that all employees must reduce their accumulated leave to 30 days within a reasonable length of time. The new law also prevents departing employees from receiving cash payments for unused leave for any current year. They are entitled to cash payments for the amount of leave they had accumulated at the beginning of the year, but all unused leave of the current year will have to be taken as vacations before they depart from Federal service. Survivors of deceased employees are discriminated against even more, for now they are not entitled to cash payments for the unused leave of the current year left by an employee.

This is the way Congress answered the impassioned plea of many Government employees and employee unions for some relief to the inequities which had crept into our annual leave law.

It is imperative that we now reexamine the annual leave picture and make some drastic changes in the annual and sick leave law with a view to restoring to this group of loyal and devoted employees some of the rights which they have enjoyed historically in our Nation.

The privilege of receiving annual and sick leave benefits as Government employees is not a new idea; the first legislation providing sick and annual leave for Government employees was passed in 1893, over 60 years ago. Prior to 1932, however, Federal leave statutes made no provision whatsoever for accumulation, but the Economy Act of June 30, 1932, made annual leave accumulative without limit. The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936, preserved the right of employees to leave which they had accumulated under restrictions of the Economy Act, and authorized future accumulations in amounts up to 60 days. During World War II, Federal employees were requested by the President to limit annual leave to a period of 2 weeks a year, except in emergencies. Because of this stipulation, the accumulation limit was increased, to a total of 90 days. Since wartime, however, Congress has constantly been chipping away at this reserve by various acts.

Public Law 239, 80th Congress, returned to the 60-day accumulation limit. Section 1212 of the General Appropriations Act, 1951, required that all annual leave earned in calendar year 1950 be used or forfeited by June 30, 1951. Section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1952, required that all annual leave earned in calendar year 1951 be used or forfeited by June 30, 1952. The basic law regulating annual and sick leave rights was rewritten in 1951, repealing section 601 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act. This act also provided a 60-day limit on accumulation—except for a 90-day limit for certain categories of overseas personnel—and protected existing accumulations, although providing for a gradual reduction of such accumulation to the 60-day level through normal use. Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953, ordered as permanent legislation forfeiture each June 30th of all unused annual leave earned in the preceding calendar year. This was the so-called Thomas rider.

It is my honest opinion at this time that we in Congress must enact legislation as rapidly as the legislative process will allow restoring to the loyal body of Federal employees the right to accumulate annual leave to an unrestricted maximum of 60 days. In my mind, the justice of such an action would be unquestioned. Think with me for a moment if you will of the many reasons which necessitate such an action on the part of Congress in the name of fairness, equity, and even good business and personnel management practices.

First, Government workers have no financial protection against unemployment. Almost all employees in private concerns now are covered by unemployment insurance, and in addition many of them receive severance pay as well. Federal employees alone among the Nation's major groups of wage earners have absolutely no unemployment insurance or severance-pay benefits to buffer them against any possible personnel action in the future which separates them from their jobs. Under the provisions of the old laws which allowed accumulation of up to 60 days of annual leave, Federal employees were at least given an opportunity to save their leave so that they would be assured of transitional pay in the event of a sudden separation from Government service.

Second, the accumulation is imperative for effective and equitable Federal personnel management. Under the present graduated leave system, new employees earn only 13 days annual leave a year. All of this amount is not likely to be available for vacation purposes, since every absence for necessary personal business also must be charged to the employee's annual-leave account. As a result, many new employees working in locations distant from their homes, such as in California, have difficulty in returning home for vacations when they cannot accumulate enough leave to make the long trip possible and financially practical. This provision tends to hamper recruitment of needed workers in Washington and discriminates against citizens from Western States such as my own State of California. In short, the denial of leave accumulation is unfair, creates additional recruitment problems, and results in poor employee morale.

Third, leave accumulation makes possible more efficient administration. Reasonable leave accumulation allows needed flexibility in personnel utilization. Government agencies often find it necessary to ask employees to restrict or give up annual leave for given periods of time, particularly during emergencies. In this situation, if leave cannot be accumulated, administration officials are left with a poor choice of forcing employees to lose earned leave, which is obviously very unfair; or granting leave to employees when they cannot be spared, which results in loss of production, replacement cost, and additional work at overtime rates.

Last, but not least, the ban on accumulation of annual leave is not in reality an economy measure. It does not reduce the amount of annual leave earned in any 1 year. The morale of public employees has been seriously impaired by this enactment by these provisions.

I would like to point out to all the Members of Congress that the efficiency of our Government depends in the long run upon the caliber of our Federal employees. We cannot expect to recruit and retain the best qualified persons in Government service unless we treat them justly and fairly. We should assure them that we are concerned sincerely in their best interest and that we recognize the economic facts of life well enough to allow them this accumulation of leave to serve as a buffer against any eventual separation from their employment. Moreover, it is in the interest of this Government to reward faith and loyalty in service with just consideration. Such practice is in the tradition of American standards, which are as valid in day-to-day affairs as in great matters of state.

Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1954, and with the unanimous consent of the Members of the House, I inserted a questionnaire in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was my intention to give that questionnaire wide circulation in the Third District of Ohio, but because of the heavy legislative schedule and almost daily committee hearings, it was not possible to complete the necessary mechanical production details at that time. I have been amazed and highly pleased, however, that a considerable number of people from widely scattered areas of the United States read this questionnaire in the RECORD, clipped it out, answered it, and sent me some very complimentary and helpful letters of comments along with the completed questionnaires.

This has proven to me again beyond a doubt, Mr. Speaker, the very great help it is to me as a Representative in Congress to known the grass roots opinions of people.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in my former remarks on this matter, I pointed out that, "it is my constant and sincere effort, Mr. Speaker, to represent all the people in our very important Third District of Ohio to the very best of my ability" and called to the attention of the Members of the House that after the adjournment of Congress, during the past 2 years, I returned to the Third District of Ohio and initiated the holding of grass roots conferences throughout the Third Ohio District. More than three times as many people attended in 1953 than in 1952, and our personal discussions of the problems facing our Federal Government were extremely helpful to me in guiding my consideration of these questions as they are presented here in Congress. I have also maintained a District congressional office in the District and each time I can return to the District for even a day or two, during the session of Congress, when legislative sessions are not scheduled, I have a full schedule of appointments and discuss these many vital questions with people from all walks of life on a person-to-person basis. All of this, Mr. Speaker, has been very helpful to me as a Representative in Congress, because it has enabled me to keep a point of view related to the opinions and thinking of all the people of our Third District of Ohio.

In view of some recent actions here in the Congress of these United States, and various recommendations that have been included in the several messages of President Eisenhower to the Congress, it has seemed wise, Mr. Speaker, for me to make a few changes in my original questionnaire. Since it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to now proceed with the least possible delay to give this questionnaire wide distribution in the Third District of Ohio, I am herewith submitting my revised questionnaire and respectfully request unanimous consent that I be permitted and authorized to take the necessary steps to implement the distribution of these questionnaires.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is the questionnaire I now propose to use. The results of the tabulation of these questionnaires will be of great value to me in my constant and sincere effort to represent all of the people in our very important Third District of Ohio to the best of my ability.

NEW HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., March 1954.

DEAR FRIEND: During the current session of Congress, every man, woman, and child will be affected by the legislation adopted. It is extremely helpful to me to know your thinking on the many important matters which will be considered. Therefore, I will greatly appreciate having your opinion on the following questions. Perhaps you may also want to make additional suggestions. It is my hope that you will mark and return this questionnaire to me in Washington at your earliest convenience.

This need not be signed, although we will be glad to have you do so if you feel it would be helpful. It will greatly assist us, however, in tabulating and interpreting your answers if you will state your occupation.

Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Representative to Congress, Third District, Ohio.

Occupation: _____

1. Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later? Yes ☐ No ☐

2. Do you feel that the Taft-Hartley law—

A. Should be repealed? Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Should be changed giving greater rights to employers? Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Should be changed giving greater rights to workers? Yes ☐ No ☐

3. Do you favor farm-price supports? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Should social security be broadened to include groups not now covered (farmers, professional, etc)? Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Should contributions be high enough to make the social-security program self-supporting? Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Those receiving social security are now limited to earning $75 per month in employment covered by social security. Should this $75 limitation be increased? Yes ☐ No ☐

A. If so, to what amount? $_____

7. Do you favor Senator MCCARTHY's investigation of subversive influences both in and out of Government? Yes ☐ No ☐

8. Do you favor the Un-American Activities Committee investigation? Yes ☐ No ☐

9. Do you favor investigations by congressional committees? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Do you favor the St. Lawrence seaway if financed by revenue bonds to be retired from toll charges paid by users? Yes ☐ No ☐

11. Do you believe the United States should remain in the United Nations? Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Do you favor continued foreign economic aid? Yes ☐ No ☐

13. Do you favor continued foreign military aid? Yes ☐ No ☐

14. Do you feel that the reciprocal trade laws should be continued to assist in our foreign trade and commerce? Yes ☐ No ☐

15. Do you favor increased postal rates on:

A. First-class mail? Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Second- and third-class mail? Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Airmail? Yes ☐ No ☐

16. Do you feel it is necessary that the Post Office Department operate without a deficit? Yes ☐ No ☐

17. Do you favor increased pay rates for postal employees? Yes ☐ No ☐

18. Are you in favor of universal military training? Yes ☐ No ☐

19. Do you favor the requirement that drafted and enlisted military personnel serve in the Reserves for a specified period after discharge from active service? Yes ☐ No ☐

20. Would you favor UMT after the expiration of our present draft law? Yes ☐ No ☐

21. Do you believe that a civil-defense program is necessary? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Do you believe that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act should be amended to provide for more liberal admission of immigrants into the United States? Yes ☐ No ☐

23. Do you favor a constitutional amendment voiding treaties which deny or abridge any constitutional rights of American citizens? Yes ☐ No ☐

24. Do you feel that personal income taxes should be lowered by:

A. Lowering the income-tax rate? Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Increasing exemption for dependents? Yes ☐ No ☐

C. Raising exemptions for married couples? Yes ☐ No ☐

25. Would you favor exemption of the first $1,500 of retirement income from income taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐

26. Do you feel that the Eisenhower adistration is doing a good job? Yes ☐ No ☐

Name _____

Address _____

Remarks _____

Need for Increased Fire Protection on the Watersheds of Los Angeles County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, late last December the newspapers across the country blazoned the story of a forest fire in the San Gabriel Mountains, of Los Angeles County, Calif. They told how it threatened the costly observatory on Mt. Wilson.

Drought conditions had prevailed for months throughout the entire region, the foresters of Los Angeles County had joined with those of the Federal Forest Service to warn everybody against carelessness with fire. Someone failed to heed the warnings, however, and on Sunday afternoon, December 27, a fire started at about the 4,500-foot level on the slope of Monrovia Peak. A wind of cyclonic violence drove it over the crest and down into the scattered timber below.

Before Forest Service fire fighters could arrive on the scene, the burning was so fierce that the fire department of the city of Monrovia, 5 miles to the south, was called. This force was soon joined by the Arcadia department and 150 men detailed by the Forest Service. In a little more than 6 hours it had traveled 3½ miles and was described as out of control. A week passed, with 1,100 men working with big water tanks and pumpers, bulldozers, and even a helicopter, before it was under control.

During those hectic days damage estimated at more than $7 million was done to the watershed. Thirty-three residences were destroyed, 2,000 people were forced to leave their homes and belongings, and forest and vegetative growth on 15,000 acres was blotted out.

This fire caught the public interest because it threatened the world-famous observatory on Mount Wilson, and the massive 200-inch telescope. But in area burned and in dollar losses it was ex-

ceeded by another of the 10 fires that scarred the mountains and watersheds of Los Angeles County during the same year. This clearly demonstrates the fact that fire is a constant hazard in southern California, against which we must all be alert.

To top it off, the embers of the most recent fire were scarcely cold when rain came. At first it was a welcome relief from the long dry months. Then the worst fears were fulfilled. It grew from a gentle rain to a torrent. With no trees or brush, no grass, no vegetation of any kind on thousands of acres of mountainside, the water moved with increasing velocity to fill the dry beds of the canyons. In short, it turned into a gully washer.

Mud, boulders, and debris were swept down to fill the streets and cover the lawns of such towns as Sierra Madre, Duarte, and Monrovia, to depths of 4 feet or more. Houses were undermined or actually crashed in, trees and powerlines were down, cars and furniture were washed along on the crest of the flood, to be left strewn along the stream margins.

The foothill communities of Los Angeles County started in immediately to dig themselves out, and were still doing so when on January 25 and 26 a second rain on the unprotected mountainsides launched another torrent of mud and boulders. That which happened during the first storm was repeated and made worse.

The people of Los Angeles County have done much to avert such calamities. It seems, however, that all this is short of what is necessary, when some person, careless or worse, starts a fire in the drought-dried brush and tree growth which clothes those mountainsides. Then, the stage is set for a catastrophe. Lives are menaced, properties are damaged, forests which protect the storage areas of life-giving waters are ruined.

The watershed values of the brush and tree growth on those hillsides has been placed at $700 to $1,000 an acre. But when water is at a premium dollars can scarcely measure its value.

Los Angeles County, the several communities in the county, the State of California, and the Federal Government have combined their forces to fight fire wherever it occurs. The county maintains facilities for fighting fires and restoring forests which excel those of many States. The primary object of managing the 650,000 acres of chaparral and tree growth in the Angeles National Forest is to protect vegetative growth that covers the watershed.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, forest-fire protection on the Angeles National Forest cost more than 52 cents an acre. This is more than 5 times the 9 cents an acre spent for protecting all national forests. In addition, a little more than 98 cents an acre, available under the Flood Control Act of 1944, was spent for fire control on the Los Angeles River watershed portion of Angeles National Forest. Thus, over most of this national forest, fire fighting cost an average of $1.50 an acre. Yet the fires persist.

Without criticizing the expenditures for forest-fire fighting, those who have lived with the problem and studied it from day to day, have concluded that something is lacking. They believe that too little attention and too little money are being directed to the prevention of forest fires. It is as if an expensive and well-equipped ambulance were maintained at the base of a dangerous cliff, while the top of the cliff, from which victims are repeatedly falling, is without a guard or guardrail.

Supervisor William V. Mendenhall thinks that fire prevention has been neglected. He lives with the fire problem day after day, and year after year, so he sees it as few others can. Moreover, he has observed the remarkable service provided by the County of Los Angeles. Their program of prevention, which supplements the one of protection, has proved successful on similarly forested watershed lands outside the national forest. Accordingly, he proposed a long-range plan of education and improvements to keep forest fires from being started.

The plan appeals so strongly to the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County that they have backed up their conviction with a resolution. A copy has been sent to me, and I, too, am so convinced of its worth that I respectfully call it to your attention. The resolution follows:

Whereas the recent disastrous fires in the San Gabriel Mountains caused untold damage to southern California watersheds; and

Whereas destruction of watersheds will have damaging effect on properties in southern California for many years to come; and

Whereas these fires were controlled by unstinting and cooperative effort of Federal, State, county, and local agencies, including the fire departments of many counties adjacent to Los Angeles County, but, at tremendous cost; and

Whereas actual expenditures for fire fighting in the watershed areas are many times those for fire prevention; and

Whereas additional expenditures for fire prevention might well eliminate the major portion of required expenditures for the suppression of fires, as well as prevent irreparable damage to watersheds of Los Angeles County; and

Whereas present appropriations for fire prevention in the national forests of southern California are not sufficient to provide a level of service comparable to that furnished by the county of Los Angeles, either in quality, quantity, or period of coverage; and

Whereas the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest has submitted a report outlining the fiscal requirements to provide the proper level of service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors endorses the program submitted by the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest, and urges the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Forester, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress, and all other responsible officials to support the program submitted, and make available the necessary appropriations to maintain an adequate level of Federal fire protection in the national forests of southern California; and be it further

Resolved, That the county of Los Angeles pledges its utmost cooperation in maintaining the highest level of fire protection so that the natural resources of this county and other southern California counties will not be jeopardized by such disastrous fires; and be it further

Resolved, That Supervisor Herbert C. Legg be authorized to take the report of the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest and copies of this resolution to Washington and discuss with the United States Forester, Members of Congress, and representatives of the State department of agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget the problems of adequate fire protection in southern California; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the United States Senators and United States Congressmen from the southern California counties, the United States Department of Agriculture, the United States Forester, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor of the State of California, and the State board of forestry.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, March 1, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

O God, whose mercy is as great as our unworthiness, forgive our feverish ways and the impatience of our attitudes as, like restless pools, so often our spirits mirror the agitation of our disturbed day. In the midst of demands which drain our strength, save us from forgetting the courtesy which shines with respect and understanding for the opinions of others. However much we may differ in viewpoint, may we never lose faith in each other's sincerity and high mindedness of purpose. Scorning all that is petty and mean, may these testing days find us growing in true greatness, the nobility of goodness.

Under the shadow of the white dome, symbol of America's destiny, we come today shocked at the murderous violence of disordered minds who imagine a false and a vain thing. We lift our prayers for those smitten at their posts of duty, especially for the legislator whose wounds are so grievous. Upon his dear ones in these hours of deep anxiety we ask Thy sustaining grace. May the dedicated skill of surgeons and the tender ministries of nurses bring him, if it be Thy will, safely through the valley of the shadow to useful years yet to be. In life and in death, unto Thee we commit our spirits: In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 1, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting