UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Claims, vice Evan Howell, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343-889, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922-780 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

*Col. Frederick Griswold Atkinson, AO910-458, Air Force Reserve.

*George Abbott Brownell, AO142136 (formerly brigadier general, Air Force Reserve).

Brig. Gen. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. John Henderson Foster, AO284572, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. William Judson Fry, AO266683, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John Spence Gulledge, AO265793, Air Force Reserve.

*Charles Augustus Lindbergh, AO215724 (formerly colonel, Air Corps Reserve).

*Col. Joseph Stacey Marriott, AO104544, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Frank Thomas McCoy, Jr., AO310412, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Clayton Stiles, AO269341, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Felix Louis Vidal, AO943500, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Will Walter White, AO272508, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple

Daniel W. Urish (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cecil C. Davis
Lee H. Sherman

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles K. Deeks

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marvin H. Scott

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

*Subject to physical examination.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Louis J. Mendelis, D. D., LL. D., pastor of St. Alphonsus Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Let us pray. Almighty and eternal God, divine governor of heaven and earth, look with favor and mercy upon this body of men to whom Thou, the source of all true authority, hast entrusted the framing of laws by which a free people consents to abide; do Thou grant them the tenderness of conscience to be ever mindful of the account they must render to Thee for the discharge of their sacred duties; give them a wholesome fear of tyranny and the alertness to sense every encroachment upon human rights and freedom; and impart to them the courage and the determination to preserve for us the liberty and the dignity with which Thou hast been pleased to invest Thy rightful children. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Spirit livest and reignest, one God forever and ever. Amen.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

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 Evdoxia 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.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. D'EWART, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. REGAN, and Mr. ASPINALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

REDUCTION OF AGE REQUIREMENTS OF RECIPIENTS OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

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, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to a reduction of the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

HOUSING PROJECTS IN BOSTON AREA—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

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, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to housing projects in the Boston area.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, relating to the prevention of the United States Government from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

DELIVERY OF MAIL TO RESIDENCES—RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, relating to two daily deliveries of mail to residences.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

CONTINUANCE OF OPERATION OF LUCY MALLARY VILLAGE, SPRINGFIELD, MASS., RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Massachusetts, relating to the continuance of the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield, Mass.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on February 15, 1954, p. 1705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on February 9, 1954, by the New York State Assembly, by a vote of 133 to 2, calling on the Congress to revise the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

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

Whereas the people of the United States have always recognized the contribution which so many Americans of foreign birth and descent have made in the growth, progress, and development of the United States of America; and

Whereas these peoples have earned the respect and confidence of all Americans in their effort to recover from the devastating effects of World War II without relying upon self pity; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the world have courageously and with determination applied themselves to the rebuilding of their beautiful, friendly, and industrious nations; and

Whereas it is increasingly evident that the McCarran-Walters immigration law, which Congress approved over President Truman's veto, is in several of its provisions discriminatory against the freedom-loving people on account of their foreign birth of national origin; and

Whereas the American principle of equality before the law is violated by some provisions of the act referring to naturalized citizens; and

Whereas the restrictions enacted in this law against former members of totalitarian organizations, who have been converted to democracy, are detrimental to the interests of the people of a free world; and

Whereas the Democratic Party in its 1952 campaign platform pledged: "Continuing revision of our immigration and naturalization laws to do away with any unjust and unfair practices against national groups which have contributed some of our best citizens. We will eliminate distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens.

We want no second-class citizens in free America"; and

Whereas our recently elected President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, gave pledges to the people during the election campaign of 1952 that he would favor and support a revision of the discriminatory clauses of the McCarran-Walters Immigration Act, and revise the present unrational and unjust quota system so as to reestablish before the law equality for all citizens, both native and naturalized, and to allow admission of former members of totalitarian organizations who have proven convincingly, over a reasonable period of years, that they have become valiant fighters for freedom and against all kinds of dictatorship; and

Whereas our immigration laws and regulations are necessarily an integral part of the requirements of the foreign policy of the United States, these laws should be administered to provide a haven for the downtrodden victims of political, racial, and religious persecution so that our Nation will stand out as a beacon light of liberty and freedom at the court of world public opinion: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as to make available to the people of such nations as are friendly to the United States, the unused wartime immigration quota of such nations; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

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. BRICKER:

S. 2951. A bill for the relief of Janis Vitins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2952. A bill for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Costanza Savina Germinerio Evangelista;

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Christine Thum;

S. 2955. A bill for the relief of Maria Eheim and her child;

S. 2956. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cesare; and

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Eldur Eha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 2958. A bill for the relief of Ida Reissmuller and Johnny Damon Eugene Reissmuller;

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Irene Essley; and

S. 2960. A bill for the relief of Barbara Herta Geschwandtner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2961. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to George C. Stratton and Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the period August 14–17, 1954, as American Law Student Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for the establishment of the Small Business Committee as a permanent standing committee of the Senate. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to contact other of my colleagues, but I shall be happy to welcome them as cosponsors at any time.

Four years ago this month, the Senate voted into existence a select, nonlegislative Small Business Committee. Although he faced many obstacles in guiding that resolution through the Senate, our late esteemed colleague, Senator Kenneth Wherry, early recognized the important role which could and should be filled by a permanent committee given the responsibility to watch over the health and prosperity of the 4 million small-business concerns in the United States.

During the past 4 years, the Select Committee on Small Business has been on trial. I feel that it has served its apprenticeship and should now be reconstituted as a standing committee. I shall not long detain the Members of the Senate with a recital of the achievements and the fine record of our committee during those years, but a review of the annual reports of the committee reviewing the previous year's activities gives a vivid picture of the accomplishments of the committee and its staff during a most critical period in our Nation's history. The dislocations of the Korean war with its resultant economic upheaval were upon us before the committee was fully operative. Nonetheless, it immediately undertook studies and issued reports which contributed immeasurably to the mobilization effort by bringing additional productive facilities to the attention of the military and by preserving many thousands of additional firms which were threatened with extinction through overly onerous and poorly drafted controls on scarce raw materials.

Mr. President, we have prepared this resolution and urge its approval by our colleagues, since it will better define the activities of the Small Business Committee. Furthermore, by our action in making it a permanent standing committee with all the powers and prerogatives, except 1, of the other 15 committees, we are giving recognition to the vital role of the small-business men of the United States. I take this opportunity to ask most respectfully that the Rules Committee give prompt consideration to this resolution, since I feel that it will enable the Senate Small Business Committee to serve more effectively the business community when so many problems beset it from all sides.

The resolution (S. Res. 213), submitted by Mr. THYE (for himself and other Senators), was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, that rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"(5) (a) A standing committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress.

"(b) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction."

SEC. 2. The Select Committee on Small Business established by S. Res. 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, is hereby abolished. The employees, records, and property of the Select Committee on Small Business on the effective date of this resolution shall thereupon become the employees, records, and property, respectively, of the standing committee established by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. This resolution shall be effective on and after the date of beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO REQUESTS OF COMMON CARRIERS FOR INCREASED TRANSPORTATION RATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendbent, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

GATTAS E. MALOOF—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 5950) for the relief of Gattas E. Maloof was referred to the Committee

on the Judiciary following its passage by the House of Representatives.

The committee at its meeting considered the bill and authorized and directed the chairman to request that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill as it does not involve a claim against the United States, but would authorize and direct the Secretary of State to present a claim through diplomatic channels to the Government of Cuba, a foreign government.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of this bill (H. R. 5950), and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. The circumstances surrounding the tragic plight of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors are well known. The Government of the United States will never recognize the forcible annexation of these countries by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message I have prepared in commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

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

MESSAGE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR IRVING M. IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is once again a great privilege and honor to pay my deepest respects to Americans of Lithuanian descent as they commemorate the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. With this expression of greeting go my fervent hopes that the gallant people of Lithuania may soon be emancipated from the merciless oppression of the Soviet invaders.

The tragic and forcible annexation of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors weighs heavily on the conscience of the free world. The recent investigation by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress has portrayed to peoples everywhere the brutality of Communist tyranny and has underlined President Eisenhower's words: "Freedom is pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark."

The faith which binds us in this struggle is the faith which sustains the brave land of Lithuania in this dark hour. It is the faith of freemen from which is drawn the strength to resist and overcome Communist aggression.

The American people stand together on this 36th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day in their prayers that the birthright of freedom may soon again be Lithuania's possession.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, today in celebrating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we must keep in mind how far back the roots of this independence and national consciousness go, for it is the depth of those roots which has made the Lithuanian democratic tradition so lasting and so indestructible. The first independent Lithuanian state was organized more than 600 years ago. It grew into a flourishing kingdom—one of the most prominent in eastern Europe. The Lithuanians were a peace-loving people, devoted to the pacific development and enrichment of their country.

But because of the geographic position which Lithuania occupied, at the crossroads of two cultures, those of the East and the West, Lithuania was the victim of frequent incursions and devastations at the hands of her greedy neighbors. Eventually she became the prey of power politics; and in the 18th century Lithuania was forcibly annexed by Russia, and disappeared from the map of Europe as an independent nation.

Despite this disaster, however, the spirit of Lithuanian independence and freedom remained in evidence as much as in the glorious days of the early kingdom. The most brutal attempts of the czars to stamp out every last vestige of Lithuanian life met with little success. The people of Lithuania were biding their time, ready to seize the opportune moment once again to declare their liberty. That moment came 36 years ago, following the collapse of Czarist Russia during the First World War.

The years following World War I were years of great hope for the independent Lithuanian nation. The little Baltic republic made astounding progress in every field. She became a model republic. But before her efforts could achieve full fruition, the holocaust that swept all of Europe, beginning in 1939, brought an end to the Lithuanian Republic. Once again the pawn of international politics, Lithuania, with other Baltic states, was ruthlessly and without any legal grounds seized by the Soviet Union. In the immensity of the global conflict, the case of Lithuania and her neighbors was not given the due attention it merited. But today, more than ever, we are aware of the importance of this gallant nation.

In the 13th and in the 16th centuries, Lithuania was a bastion of Western European civilization, on the dividing line between East and West.

Today, the Baltic States still form a bastion of western civilization. The ideas of the West continue to live in Lithuania. Lithuanians' memory of their past and their common heritage with the West are ineradicable. So long as these endure, there can be no tyranny which can wipe out the spirit of self-determination along the paths of liberty. People and the independence of countries can be destroyed, but not a heritage or the ideas that are a part of it. It is for this reason that today we celebrate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For this reason, too, we know that the people of Lithuania will once again find freedom and justice, and that democracy will be restored to the great Lithuanian nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and pay tribute to the gallant struggle waged by that country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Thirty-six years ago the courageous people of Lithuania established a republic based on the principles of democracy and respect for the individual. To a people who had spent centuries in servitude and oppression it was a just reward that they should be enabled to take their place in the society of free nations.

But today Lithuania is once more a "nation of sorrows." The harsh Communist despotism has tried, like past oppressors, to destroy the land and the very soul of the people. However, the constant challenge of subjugation which the Lithuanian people have so indomitably met has given them an unquenchable spirit. Out of their affliction has come the strength to persevere in their fight for liberty and independence. The Lithuanian dream of self-determination has so long been a part of that country's heritage that it has become a national characteristic of its people. It is a trait that cannot be wiped out.

The proud people of Lithuania have not given in to Soviet domination, no more than they ever betrayed their national ideals to a foreign despot. Through sullen resistance, and through a still effective underground the Lithuanian people are continuing their fight.

In celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to this gallant struggle. But more than that, we affirm the fact that Lithuanian independence has never been crushed, and that we still recognize the existence, now in spirit, but let us hope very soon in reality of a democratic Lithuanian Republic.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania is being observed today wherever free men rejoice in the ideals of liberty.

Established in 1918 as an independent, sovereign Nation, Lithuania gained the highest respect and admiration of the world as an outstanding example of self-government by a people to whom the cause of freedom was sacred and precious.

Today we find Lithuania in the 14th year of her enslavement under the yoke of tyranny and oppression. Her proud people have been robbed of their independence by the armed might of Communist aggression. Lithuania's plight grows more desperate with each passing year and the inhuman burden placed upon its people becomes more and more oppressive.

We take the greatest pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia. We honor them as independent Nations.

We join wholeheartedly with the Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, in assuring the people of those captive countries that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and that we will never bargain with their Communist masters to confirm their captivity.

We rejoice that the spirit of national independence lives in the hopes and as-

pirations of Lithuania's courageous men and women.

We join them in prayer that God, in His infinite wisdom, may speed the day of their deliverance from Communist tyranny and that their beloved country may be restored to its rightful place of honor in the family of free nations.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, February 16, the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, under normal circumstances ought to be a day of great rejoicing for all Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent, many of whom reside in my State and are counted among our best citizens. But how can there be rejoicing when the Lithuanians are suffering under the oppression of Communist despots? How can there be gladness when Lithuania is burdened with the miseries of the regime imposed by the Kremlin? How can there be gayety when the dread somberness of totalitarianism darkens every Lithuanian street and byway? Because of the subjection of the people of Lithuania to Red tyranny, February 16 cannot be a day of rejoicing and gayety. Yet, because of the indomitable courage of the Lithuanians, February 16 can be a day of tremendous hope.

Lithuanians have had times of trial frequently in their history. In days gone by, foreign tyrants have held sway over the freedom-loving Lithuanians. Although these tyrants may have been able to destroy the liberties of the Lithuanian people, they were never able to suppress the dreams of independence in the minds of Lithuanian patriots, nor to quell the aspirations for freedom in their hearts. Those dreams and aspirations were in time fulfilled. After the First World War the Lithuanian people realized the hopes which they had long cherished, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence.

In the two decades that followed, Lithuania flourished. While Lithuanians happily enjoyed their freedom, they made good use of it, too. They improved their economy, and with the passing years grew ever stronger and wiser in the ways of self-government and democratic living. Their future appeared bright, when suddenly came the war of the giants.

First invaded by Soviet forces in 1939 and later crushed between the massive military machines of powerful Nazi Germany and gigantic Soviet Russia, Lithuania suffered successive occupations by these two totalitarians. In the end it was the Red armies of Stalin which won, and planted the emblem of the hammer and sickle where the yellow, green, and red tricolor once had flown. By force and fraud Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The painful years that have ensued are recorded in infamy. The deportations, the enslavements, the destruction of political freedom and economic initiative are facts which have trickled through to the free world despite the curtain of silence behind which the Communists try to hide the countries they have overrun.

But we Americans know that the people of Lithuania are of stout heart. We know that faith and hope cannot be muffled in Lithuanian breasts. Inevitably the time will come when the tyrant's grip will weaken, when freedom will win over enslavement, and sorrow will be turned to joy.

The American people and Government have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. In many ways America is informing the world of Soviet misdeeds in Lithuania, and is mobilizing the moral force of world opinion against the oppressors, in the hope that Lithuania's day of freedom will be hastened and that the Kremlin's rule of misery and hatred will be forever overturned. With the utmost sincerity I express to all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans my hope and prayer that that happy day will be soon.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues on this historic occasion in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

It is an appropriate time for Congress to turn its attention to the desperate plight of the people of that ancient country. Their dramatic story is illuminated by the testimony of thousands of Lithuanians who have escaped to freedom from the iron grasp which the Soviets now maintain on their native land.

For many years prior to World War I Lithuania was dominated by czarist Russia; during that war the country was occupied by Germany. Taking advantage of the confusion which existed in Eastern Europe in the wake of the war, and fulfilling fervent hopes and decades of struggle, Lithuania declared herself and independent republic in February 1918. Under free self-government the country prospered.

At the beginning of World War II Lithuania was again occupied by Russia. Except for an interval of 3 years, when Nazi Germany was dominant, Lithuania has been under the control of the Soviets.

Terrible crimes have been perpetrated against the Lithuanians. Yet, adhering to the ideals and principles of the freedom they once possessed, Lithuanians at home and abroad have refused to give in to despair.

From the homeland we have had reports of an active undergound. In our own country Lithuanians have sacrificed themselves to promote the cause of their native country.

Let us encourage that spirit, for it not only brings closer the day when Lithuania will be once more an independent republic, but also contributes immeasurably to the security of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as we commemorate once more the anniversary of the founding of the democratic state of Lithuania, our hearts go out to the enslaved people of that country who in their long history have suffered so much to preserve their independence and their cultural identity.

Lithuania has known tyranny and oppression before. For 120 years, from 1795 to 1915, the Russian czars ruled over the country. They made every effort to stamp out the spirit of independence of the Lithuanian people. Yet they failed. In the end an independent Lithuania was recreated, an outpost of democratic civilization on the Baltic Sea.

I am confident that just as the Romanov czars failed to obliterate Lithuania, the Red czars of the present era will fail in their endeavors to achieve the same result. I am confident that the spirit of independence of the Lithuanian people will survive to see the dawn of freedom for Lithuania and for all other countries which have become the victims of Communist imperialism.

Mr. President, it was the same hope which I understand the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is about to express when he calls upon our Government to take firm and stern measures in telling the Red czars of the modern day, in unmistakable terms, that we will not tolerate nor will we condone, by either word or deed, their usurpation of power and their domination of freedom-loving peoples.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I believe it is entirely fitting that we in America should observe this anniversary, since it cannot be observed in Lithuania.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

February 16 is a date as important to freedom-loving Lithuanians as the Fourth of July is to Americans, for it is the date of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania. It is a pleasure for me to join our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry and all Americans in celebration of this anniversary.

We shall continue to recognize and observe this day in tribute to the courage and spirit of Lithuanian independence. The ruthless tyrants in Moscow, whose armies have oppressed the people of Lithuania, have forbidden the observance of this day in the Lithuanian homeland, so it remains for us here in the United States and for others in the free world to celebrate this most important event.

We must use this occasion to say to the people of Lithuania who must live under the godless tyranny of communism that they are not forgotten. Their cherished freedom is not forgotten by the American people or by the United States Government. Our Government properly refuses to recognize the Soviet aggression which overran the nation. We have also, through measures like the Displaced Persons Act, of which I am proud to be an author, provided a haven in freedom for some 26,000 displaced Lithuanians.

History has taught us that the love of freedom which exists in the hearts of the people of Lithuania cannot be conquered or subdued by tyranny or aggression. I am certain that it will not be subdued. I join thousands of fine Americans of Lithuanian descent in working and praying for the liberation and freedom of the Lithuanian homeland.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the history of Lithuania reveals a persistent and valiant struggle to maintain her independence despite predatory neighbors.

For more than 120 years before the eventual achievement of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania suffered under the czars' intense policy of "Russification."

During the next 21 years, the Lithuanian nation demonstrated to all the world that it more than deserved its place among the independent states of the world, as evidenced by its stability and progress economically, politically, and culturally.

This happy period in Lithuanian history came to an end in 1939 when the totalitarian giants bordering Lithuania made their infamous pact whereby Hitler gave Stalin a free hand to obliterate the freedom of Lithuania and the other small Baltic Republics in return for Stalin's acquiescence in Hitler's invasion of Poland.

Shortly thereafter Soviet troops forcibly occupied Lithuanian territory and in June of 1940 Lithuanian independence came to an end when the little republic was annexed to the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the Lithuanian people have since been subjected to the Soviet tyranny, save for the several years of equally brutal domination by Nazi Germany following Hitler's 1941 attack on his erstwhile Russian partner in crime.

The most encouraging factor in Lithuania's ceaseless struggle for independence is her consistent refusal to yield to the oppressor.

On this the 36th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania the American people, ever mindful of the blessings of their own Declaration of Independence, join with all Lithuanians in hoping for the day when Lithuania shall once more be free.

Mr. President, their courageous stand against tyranny will not be in vain.

No conqueror no matter how despotic can ever enslave a people with such a heritage of patriotic efforts to achieve independence, for they will never cease their efforts until they are free.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement which I have prepared with reference to the 36th anniversary of the independence of the great Baltic Republic of Lithuania printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

It is well that we in the Congress of the United States should note and observe this 36th anniversary of the independence of the great Baltic Republic of Lithuania. The history of the Lithuanian people and of the Lithuanian nation contains many heroic periods. I predict that the present period, when all the facts about it are known and the history of it is written, will be revealed as one of the most heroic of all.

I am sure that the iron heel of oppression under which Soviet Russia now grinds the people of Lithuania is still not heavy enough to stamp out the love of freedom among the Lithuanian people. Indeed, we know that freedom's light burns more fiercely today in the hearts of the Lithuanian people than ever before. They desire freedom. They are working to achieve that desire—silently but irresistably. In the end—I cannot predict exactly when it will be—they will achieve that freedom. No people who love freedom as the Lithuanian people do can be long denied.

In the history of the Lithuanian people there have been many long nights of darkness during which foreign oppressors attempted as best they could to eradicate love of country and love of liberty from the hearts of this gallant people. They have tried to stamp out both the language and the nationality. They failed.

They will fail again.

In their struggle to strike off the chains of slavery imposed by the Kremlin, the Lithuanian people have the wholehearted support of the American people. Shortly after the Lithuanian Republic was snuffed out by Soviet Russia, the United States Government proclaimed that we would never recognize the cruel act of aggression and suppression. The United States Government has maintained that position to this day.

There has been practiced in Lithuania, as in many other areas behind the Iron Curtain, the bestial crime of genocide, an attempt to destroy an entire people by terrorism, intimidation, dispersion, and enslavement. The slave labor camps in Siberia, we know, have more than their quota of Lithuanian patriots.

We are determined that the crimes that have been committed in Lithuania shall be recognized as crimes. We are determined that genocide shall be recognized for what it is by international agreement. We must continue to fight for the ratification of the genocide convention here in the United States.

On this occasion I am happy to extend my warmest greetings to all Americans of Lithuanian birth and descent and to all those Lithuanians who are not American citizens but who have found refuge and asylum in America.

I say to them, and I hope that they will help to transmit abroad this message of hope, that all who are devoted to freedom, liberty, and justice are resolved to hasten the day of the deliverance of Lithuania and its restoration as a full and equal member of the family of free nations.

CONDEMNATION OF ACTS OF AGGRESSION BY SOVIET RUSSIA AND INVESTIGATION OF SEIZURE OF LITHUANIA AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent to submit a special concurrent resolution, and to salute the unconquerable spirit of freedom of those peoples who have been enslaved by Russian communism.

I have chosen this day because it is the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, achieved after 125 years of czarist Russian thraldom, on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania, like Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, has suffered every torture that a sadistic conqueror could impose. At least 500,000 and possibly a million Lithuanians have been seized and sent to the torture camps in Siberia, to be starved or worked to death. Until we can get at the complete truth, it will be impossible to know the suffering imposed on these nations, but its enormity is horrifying.

When her independence was achieved, Lithuania set up a model government. It had a President and Cabinet, a freely elected Parliament, civil rights, and an independent judiciary. It protected civil rights, and men and women walked without fear of being arrested and shot without trial. It established land reforms and it distributed the land in a broad fashion and it protected individual property. It established farm and market cooperatives, schools, hospitals, and cultural academies. In 21 years, the standard of living of the people was doubled, and the progress was noteworthy in contrast with the lack of progress in Russia.

The Baltic countries made infinitely greater progress on their own resources than 150 million people could achieve under the Communist dictatorship.

On July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, and in article I pledged that Russia "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory."

On September 28, 1926, Russia signed a nonaggression pact with Lithuania, and this pact was renewed in 1931 with a 6-month cancellation clause. That clause was never invoked. On October 31, 1939, Prime Minister Molotov stated that "These pacts are inspired by mutual respect for the governmental, social, and economic systems of each of the contracting parties."

The real purpose of Communist Russia, the cynicism and crookedness of its pledges, soon became apparent.

On August 23, 1939, the two totalitarian dictatorships, communism and nazism, had signed their nonaggression agreement, and Poland was quickly divided. The Baltic Republics, under threat of force, were compelled to grant Communist Russia military bases, and in June 1940 when France was falling, communism struck at the Baltic Republics despite all its previous vows.

Cynically disregarding its solemn pledges, Russia moved in and took over these three Baltic countries. It held rigged Communist elections. But in Lithuania and other countries, people showed disapproval the only way they could. They refused to vote. In Lithuania, the Communists succeeded in herding only 16 percent of the people to the polls. On August 3, 1940, Russia proclaimed the incorporation of the Baltic republics into its own system and in so doing violated its repeated pledges.

Immediately, our great Secretary of State Cordell Hull denounced the Russian perfidy and announced that the United States would not recognize these aggressions. And on October 15, 1940, President Roosevelt in a great statement to the Lithuanian American Council said:

It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence: Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect.

The American position on this issue has always been the same. I am proud that President Roosevelt, President Truman, and recently President Eisenhower have followed the doctrine of nonrecognition and refused to condone these aggressions. On last Sunday, in Chicago, I was privileged to attend a great gathering of Lithuanian-Americans, who have done a magnificent work of keeping alive the spirit of freedom among their enslaved countrymen. There have been six separate mass purges in Lithuania, and an unknown number in the other nations. We should honor the

brave members of the resistance movements in these countries.

But we should do more than that. Not only the executive branch of Government, but the legislative should go on record as refusing to condone or recognize these aggressions. Lithuania's day of independence is a fittting occasion to move forward with a policy that will help strengthen resistance until freedom is attained—as it surely will be. It is time that the legislative branch and the people of the United States took an attitude on this thing.

In the case of those nations other than the Baltics, where we have granted recognition, the aggression was more subtle and even more devious. Recognition was obtained in those cases by means of solemn pledges to establish democratic governments, guarantee civil rights, permit free elections, protect religious freedom, and maintain the rights of individual property. Once our recognition was extended, the Communists then moved in, seized control by subversion and extinguished all rights in a midnight of tyranny.

These nations will rise again.

Freedoms will certainly be reestablished, religion protected and encouraged, property respected.

I propose in my resolution that the doctrine of nonrecognition be reaffirmed legislatively; that Communist aggressions and subversion be condemned in respect to all these countries; that the United States urge the United Nations to adopt this doctrine of nonrecognition, and to apply it universally; that we withdraw recognition of the governments of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, all obtained by chicanery and deviousness.

Finally, I proposed that a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee investigate from all possible sources, and publish to the world, the destruction and subversion of human liberty and free institutions in all these and other nations brought under the hell of communism, that the enormity of human physical and mental suffering caused by the Communists may forever impeach them in history and in the minds of men.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

Whereas the United States doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest of free peoples offers hope to the enslaved and starving; and

Whereas such doctrine is consonant with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas President Roosevelt and President Truman and their Secretaries of State through peace and war, strongly reaffirmed and supported such doctrine; and

Whereas through their leadership, this doctrine of nonrecognition was established as a fundamental principle of American statesmanship, and was made the basis for settlement with the Axis Powers; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has forcibly and aggressively seized Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and through violations of solemn pledges seized Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, subjugating their governments and ruthlessly deporting millions of their citizens to camps of slavery in European Russia and Siberia; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has replaced free governments with Russian or puppet officials, backed with Russian arms and the secret police: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress (1) reaffirms the doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest of free peoples as a principle of international law, and reaffirms the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to recognize conquests; (2) condemns the violations of solemn international agreements and the acts of aggression perpetrated by Soviet Russia upon the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; and (3) requests the President to direct the United States representative to the United Nations to lay these violations of solemn pledges and acts of aggression before the United Nations, and to urge universal application by the United Nations of the doctrine of nonrecognition of the conquest by Russia of such peoples, and to withdraw recognition obtained by means of pledges later dishonored, until such agreements are kept to the satisfaction of the President; and (4) that the Committee on Foreign Relations, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, conduct an investigation of the illegal seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the destruction of human liberties and free institutions in all such areas controlled directly or indirectly by world communism, including the treatment of citizens within those areas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for his very fine statement and for the recommendation he has made with reference to the severance of diplomatic relations with Communist-dominated countries, as a testimonial of our permanent antagonism and resistance to Communist tyranny.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN TODAY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the text of a radio broadcast by Mr. Eric Sevareid on his CBS news broadcast for February 12, 1954. It reads as follows:

Many things about Abraham Lincoln can be argued; but no one can argue with the proposition that Lincoln never confused means with ends, technique with substance; he would never have understood a triumph of matter over mind.

With a slightly guilty bow in the direction of Mr. Goodman Ace, who employs the cold print of the Saturday Review to police the hot world of radio and television, I have been enjoying a gloomy private image of President Lincoln transposed upon the scene of contemporary Washington. On the occasion of the Gettysburg address.

There's a planning conference going on in the office of the President's news secretary. The ghostwriters are going over a mass of papers—suggestions from Cabinet officers as to what the President ought to say about the farmers, working people, taxes, and the next recruiting quotas. The chief ghostwriter is beating his brains out figuring how to cover the women's angle in the speech.

A secretary comes in and says, "The boss says he's just going to make a few general remarks, 2 or 3 minutes." There's consternation in the room. The draft suggestions are thrown in the wastebasket. The news secretary puts in a pool call to the networks and says, "Sorry boys, the 13½-minutes package is out." Consternation among the networks. Their teletypes chatter out emergency instructions to the radio crews to patch out with interviews of any Senators who will be present; TV camera crews are told to fade in shots of cemetery crosses and bereaved families of veterans.

At the railroad station the news secretary is half apologetic, half angry with the press party. "The boss hasn't written it yet. That's why there's no advances. Look, I know the early p. m.'s will miss it, but he's stubborn, and he's President." The Tribune man puts in a hot phone call to his home office suggesting they run a page 1 editorial on the lousy White House public relations.

In the club car, the Hollywood actor-director imported as TV counsel is talking to the national committee PR man. "I keep telling him to give them the grin, flash the old teeth. That sad look of his—the viewers will get the idea he's losing the war. He keeps saying people will just have to take him the way he is. But he makes with the jokes pretty good. If he'll get in a buffola to close with, maybe he can still send 'em home happy."

The chief ghost writer enters, collapses into a chair and says, "I've just seen his opening paragraph. Know how he starts? 'Fourscore and seven years ago.' Brother! After all I've told him about simplifying; he means 87 years ago why doesn't he say so? After all, his vote strength is with the common people, not the eggheads."

At the platform on Cemetery Hill, the TV pool director steps up to Mr. Lincoln, and, as conjured by Mr. Goodman Ace, the conversation goes like this?

"Mr. President, you'll open up on camera 2, that's this one * * * when the red light comes on, you start your speech. Then we'll cut to a profile. You'll stand about here. Oh, I'll take that shawl, Mr. President."

"Well, there's a chill in the air and I * * *"

"But you're not going to do the show in that shawl, are you?"

"Yes, I am."

"Well, I wish we'd have known—we could have had costume send one over. I'm afraid the lights are going to pick up all that fuzz around it. By the way, I'll get the make-up girl. We ought to trim that beard a little. It's kinda straggly and it might—"

"Oh, this is quite all right."

"But, Mr. President, this is television. At least we can touch up that right cheek. That mole is going to look like—"

"No, no, young man. It will be all right."

"But, Mr. President, you know you're following Mr. Everett. He's going to look quite distinguished with that white hair—oh, before I forget, your speech."

"My speech?"

"I'll have the boys run it off for the teleprompter * * *"

"No, I'll manage with this."

"With that? You're not going to read it off that envelope, are you?"

"Well, I had planned—"

"Okay, Mr. President, but Mr. Everett will steal the show. They'll come away talking about him. They'll little note nor long remember anybody else."

STORAGE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED GRAIN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on numerous occasions early in 1952 I criticized certain storage agreements between the CCC and certain warehousemen in particular on March 13, 1952, I outlined and criticized a storage agreement which had been made between the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., of Louisiana. An account of my

remarks appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

For release that same day the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, speaking in Dallas, Tex., issued a statement in rebuttal. I quote a paragraph from the Secretary's statement:

Senator WILLIAMS is the No. 1 enemy of United States farmers, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan charged in a press conference here.

The quotation I have read is from an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 13, 1952. Continuing his statement the Secretary defended his storage transactions with emphasis upon the Camp Crowder deal which had been exposed a few days before.

On March 7, 1951, I referred further to the same case, and this time made the specific charge that Mr. Jack Cowart, a top Department of Agriculture official involved in the transaction, had accepted a bribe of $22,300.

On May 9, 1952, Mr. Jack Cowart testified before the Committee on Agriculture, where he emphatically denied that he had accepted any payments from the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co.

In yesterday's newspapers there appeared articles which set forth that this same Jack Cowart, the former high-ranking official of the Department of Agriculture, was found guilty of having lied before the Department's investigators in earlier testimonies and again before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1952.

As I read the article stating how Mr. Cowart had been convicted as a liar, I could not help wondering what that makes Mr. Brannan.

I ask unanimous consent that the item appearing on the United Press news ticker of May 9, 1952, be printed in the RECORD, followed by the article appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Cowart Convicted of Lying to Government About Stock."

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

[From the United Press news ticker]

GRAIN STORAGE

Senate investigators were told today that Alex Campbell, former Assistant Attorney General, handled $2,800 in payment to Jack Cowart, former Agriculture Department official who collected a total of $22,300 from a warehouse he helped.

Accountant Carmine S. Bellino of the Senate Agriculture Committee staff said Campbell endorsed the checks totaling $2,800 and deposited them to Cowart's bank account at Dallas, Tex. He said Cowart, convicted recently of taking a bribe in another case, collected the other $17,500 from a Baton Rouge, La., warehouse through a check made to his mother-in-law, but also deposited to his account.

Campbell, who formerly headed the Justice Department criminal division, is now practicing law in Fort Wayne, Ind. He ran unsuccessfuly against Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, in 1950 as the Democratic nominee. The transactions were in 1951.

The disclosures came as the committee dug into Cowart's role in helping the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., get profitable Government storage contracts.

Chairman ELLENDER denounced Cowart, who was not present, as "just a common, ordinary crook."

Cowart, who had been in the Agriculture Department since 1942, was removed last year. He was assistant to the production and marketing administrator at the time he showed an "unusual interest" in helping the Baton Rouge warehouse get storage contracts.

Bellino said Campbell and Cowart were "good friends."

Chief Counsel Paul Cotter said Campbell had been given a chance to make a statement and that Campbell felt that he "had been used."

"The question is whether he was used knowingly and willingly," Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said.

ELLENDER said the entire record, including Bellino's research on Cowart's bank accounts, would be turned over to the Justice Department.

Bellino said Cowart's bank records also showed transactions with Vaughan E. Livingston, Campbell's law partner, and checks from J. Kenneth Edlin of Chicago. Bellino identified Edlin as an "ex-convict" who was mixed up in the Frank Nathan-Abraham Teitelbaum tax case investigated last year by a House committee.

The accountant said the $22,300 Cowart got from the warehouse was purportedly for sale of stock held in the name of Cowart's mother-in-law, Mrs. Z. Van Winkle. But neither Cowart nor Mrs. Van Winkle had ever paid anything for the stock, Bellino said.

Bellino said Cowart decided to handle the $2,800 through Campbell because he "needed legal protection."

Of the $22,300 total Cowart received, only $20,300 showed up in his bank account at the Lakewood State Bank in Dallas, the accountant said.

He produced photostated copies of the checks, which showed that Campbell endorsed some of them as "agent" and some as "retainer fees."

There was no evidence produced that Campbell kept any of the money.

Bellino said the checks were made out by the Baton Rouge warehouse to Campbell, who endorsed them for deposit to Cowart's account.

There were a total of six between February 28, 1951, and July 30, 1951. One was for $800, marked as 2 months "retainer fee." The other five were for $400 each.

Campbell left the Justice Department in 1950 to run for the Senate.

Bellino said Cowart's main bank account showed deposits of more than $54,000 for the period of 1949 through 1951. Of this, $15,861 was Government checks, he said. There was a total of $34,345 in various other checks.

He said the account records showed that there appeared to be some financial transaction between Cowart and Von E. Livingston, Campbell's law partner, who represented Kennett Murray Co., a livestock firm.

Bellino said checks also indicated financial transactions between Cowart and Robert J. Colina, an official of the livestock firm.

The accountant said Edlin, the Chicago ex-convict, vigorously denied any financial transactions with Cowart.

Bellino said Cowart normally carried large amounts of cash on his person and often cashed personal checks for friends. He said that might explain some of the many checks in the Dallas bank account.

The accountant said Cowart also maintained two other smaller bank accounts, one in another Dallas bank and one in a Sanger, Tex., bank. But both were small, he said. Cowart's wife also maintained an account here, he said.

The checks for Cowart were drawn by officials of the Baton Rouge warehouse firm on a Center, Tex., bank. All four of the partners were from Center.

Of the $22,300 paid Cowart indirectly, all but $2,000 showed up in his bank account.

The committee was told that Cowart showed such an active interest in the Baton Rouge warehouse that he demanded to see its financial statements once a month from the United States Warehousing Administration.

H. Stanford Yohe, the Administrator, said Cowart told him that Ralph Trigg, then Production and Marketing Administrator, was interested in the case and that he did not question Cowart, because the latter worked directly out of Mr. Trigg's office.

But later, Yohe said, he learned that Trigg had denied any interest in the case at all.

Cotter read from a transcribed long-distance telephone conversation in which Martin J. Hudtloff, then Director of the Warehouse Branch, told a subordinate: "You remember this (Baton Rouge) is hot politically. We must bend to meet the situation."

Asked what he meant, the red-faced Hudtloff told the committee that "A lot of people had their fingers in this."

Cotter asked if Cowart had a lot of political pressure behind him.

"I think that's so," the warehouse official said.

Hudtloff told how he once was ordered by Elmer F. Kruse, a superior in the Production and Marketing Administration, to personally attend a meeting at New Orleans about getting storage contracts for the Baton Rouge warehouse. That was October 4, 1949. The warehouse was approved the following month.

Hudtloff said he was surprised to find Cowart also at the meeting with the four men who were forming the Baton Rouge company.

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1954]

COWART CONVICTED OF LYING TO GOVERNMENT ABOUT STOCK

(By Morrey Dunie)

Jack Cowart, former high-ranking Agriculture Department official, was found guilty in District court yesterday of making a false statement to the Government.

A jury of four men and eight women deliberated an hour and 40 minutes before returning the verdict.

Cowart, 48, of Dallas, Tex., was accused of lying to an Agriculture Department investigator in October 1950 when he denied owning any interest in the Baton Rouge (La.) Warehouse Co., Inc.

He was permitted to remain free under $1,000 bond pending a probation report. He faces a maximum sentence of 5 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine.

At the time of the offense, Cowart was Assistant Production and Marketing Administrator. When he testified during the trial before the jury and Judge James W. Morris, Cowart denied he "knowingly" made a false statement to the investigator.

The Government charged Cowart received 163 shares in the warehouse firm, although the stock was placed in the name of his mother-in-law, Mrs. Zoa Van Winkle, because Cowart was still with the Government.

Joseph A. Lowther, of the Justice Department, prosecuted Cowart, who was defended by Attorneys Emory W. Reisinger II, Lester May, and Howard Dailey.

Last October Cowart was acquitted of a charge in Alexandria (Va.) district court of receiving compensation from the same warehouse company while he was a Federal employee. Prior to the trial, Cowart had served 18 months in prison for receiving compensation from a prefabricated housing firm doing business with the Government.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the un-

finished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to insert a new section in the committee amendment on page 3, after line 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will first state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the pending amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 1 is not by itself of sufficient importance to warrant amending the Constitution of the United States. However, it does safeguard the exercise of the treatymaking power. It should be a part of any constitutional amendment designed to prevent abuse of the treatymaking power.

I would, of course, be opposed to requiring that all executive agreements likewise be approved by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate. If such a provision were ever written into the Constitution, the Senate of the United States would be forced to disband. It would not have the time to carry out that responsibility and it would certainly have no time to discharge its other responsibilities.

The pending amendment will produce two highly beneficial results not heretofore mentioned in this debate. First, foreign governments and their citizens cannot reasonably be expected to appreciate fully the details of Senate procedure. As a result, when the Senate approves a noncontroversial treaty by the voice vote of only two or three Senators, other parties to the treaty and their citizens may well conclude that the United States Senate has no interest in the treaty. The pending amendment will prevent that unfortunate impression.

In the second place, the requirement for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties reenforces the doctrine that the treaty method should be used for the conclusion of the most important types of international agreements. In the past, the State Department has taken the position that treaties and executive agreements are wholly interchangeable instruments of national policy. As a result, the Senate has been asked to approve, as treaties, relatively unimportant agreements whereas international agreements of far greater importance have been submitted to both Houses of Congress or have been concluded by the President alone. When the pending amendment becomes a part of the Constitution, it will be much more difficult to contend that treaties and executive agreements properly can be employed interchangeably. The very fact that a record vote is required on treaties, but not on executive agreements, will lend much weight to the view that the treaty method is the only proper method for assuming on behalf of the United States important and long-term commitments.

The pending amendment will tend to make a President and his Secretary of State respect the traditional distinction between treaties and executive agreements. This traditional distinction was best defined in a Law Review article written in 1939 by former Assistant Secretary of State Francis B. Sayre, in which he said:

International agreements involving political issues or changes of national policy and those involving international arrangements of a permanent character usually take the form of treaties. But international agreements embodying adjustments of detail carrying out well-established national policies and traditions and those involving arrangements of a more or less temporary nature usually take the form of executive agreements (see Sayre, The Constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act, 39 Col. L. Rev. 751, 755).

Mr. President, I think the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] would add much to the proposed constitutional amendment which is now pending and should be incorporated as a part of that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on an amendment which the Senate may reach today. I refer to the one numbered "2-3-54-C," which reads as follows:

On page 3, strike out all in lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution.'"

This amendment disturbs me very much, Mr. President, because it is a part of the record made on the proposed constitutional amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] which I respectfully state is in a very confused condition.

I should like to refer to this so-called perfecting amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It would amend article VI of the Constitution whereby all treaties made subsequent to 1789 must not only be under the authority of the United States, but also "in pursuance of" the Constitution. It is the retroactive feature which, in part, bothers me.

COMMITTEE DID NOT CONSIDER SUCH A PROPOSAL

During the long history of the Bricker amendment no proposal has been before any committee of the Senate which would change article VI of the Constitution.

Indeed, this particular proposed amendment never saw the light of day until a very short time ago. It was not until recently that any of its sponsors tried to explain to the Senate what its rather involved language was supposed to accomplish. Its sponsors have hinted that the White House finds no objection to this amendment, although it should be noted that the White House certainly has never endorsed it. At least, I know of no such endorsement by the White House. I am very pleased to stand on the floor of the Senate today and completely support the attitude of the White House toward the Bricker amendment as a whole.

FERGUSON-KNOWLAND PROPOSED AMENDMENT IS AMBIGUOUS

The amendment to which I am referring has all the clarity of the fine print in a footnote to a lease, and it makes me just as apprehensive as most of the fine print made me apprehensive when I represented the best interests of a client and always suggested that he study the fine print at the bottom of the lease offered by the counsel for the landlord.

It is my personal belief that no amendment is necessary and that the "compromise" amendments, which have been drafted on the backs of envelopes, should be voted down on the floor of the Senate.

After listening to the explanations of the Ferguson-Knowland amendment given by one of its sponsors yesterday, I have very grave misgivings concerning it.

As a preliminary matter the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was unable to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] concerning the plausibility of using the words "in pursuance of." I believe that his unanswered question is worth repeating here, in the hope of a satisfactory explanation:

The phrase, "in pursuance of this Constitution," as applied to treaties, in the language of the substitute amendment, could very well be interpreted as meaning treaties which are made to carry out or put into effect the Constitution of the United States.

Since no treaties have been or will be made for that purpose—the Congress of the United States by the enactment of statutes and the courts of the land by their decisions being the agencies which implement provisions of the Constitution—this amendment, as now worded, becomes utterly meaningless when the language is strictly interpreted in the light of its proper meaning. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1954, p. 1334.)

Second, I am completely unable to comprehend why it would be at all necessary to amend article VI of the Constitution if the other amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr.

KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] should be adopted. That amendment would provide:

A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

With that amendment included, I do not know why there should be any discussion about amending article VI of the Constitution.

Even if the language of the proposed change to article VI is meaningful, the change seems to me to be entirely unnecessary. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] gave a rather metaphysical statement or explanation of a conflict which would exist between an unamended article VI and his other amendment about "treaties conflicting with the Constitution." But I fail to see where the conflict is. I am unable to see how a provision of a treaty which is of no "force or effect" could possibly be "supreme law of the land."

So that there will be no misunderstanding, let me state my position in this way:

Under the new section 2 as proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], a provision of a treaty which conflicts with the Constitution would be of no force or effect. Yet the Senator from California seems to be saying that it would still be the supreme law of the land under article VI of the Constitution unless we change that article.

I believe a further explanation by the authors of the amendment needs to be made, at least for the purpose of the legislative record and history of the amendment, because I respectfully submit that to date the debate on it has left the matter in a very confused state. I further submit that because of the confused debate on the amendment up to this hour, it is one of the problems that ought to go back to the Committee on the Judiciary, under a motion to recommit which I shall later make.

FERGUSON-KNOWLAND AMENDMENT POSSIBLE NEW FORM OF "WHICH" CLAUSE

I believe the reasons for wanting an amendment to article VI were revealed during the rather lengthy explanations of the proposed change made by the Senator from Michigan. In explaining its purposes, he made the following statement:

The amendment will thus prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that this amendment will prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization, for under the Constitution these powers are vested exclusively in the President, the Congress, and the Federal courts.

* * * * *

Mr. President, I think we should state clearly that that is the purpose of the amendment, and that it would prevent these things, which many persons feel can now be done. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1954, p. 1310.)

When I heard this statement by the Senator from Michigan, it stirred up some memories. It turns out to be, as I have studied the record, almost the exact language of section 2 of the original Bricker proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 130 of the 82d Congress, which reads as follows:

No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

I think the record of this historic debate since the 82d Congress—and the debate has been going on since the 82d Congress—shows that this provision in the old Senate Joint Resolution 130 was violently opposed both by the administration and by a great number of witnesses who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in 1950. When the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] reintroduced his proposal as Senate Joint Resolution 1 in the 83d Congress, he changed the language somewhat, making it not quite so restrictive. Even in this milder form, it was resisted by Secretary Dulles and many other witnesses in the hearings in 1953, as the record before us shows. Even the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary, who supported the "which" clause, dropped section 2 of the original proposal of the Senator from Ohio.

I believe it has become clear during the various hearings that old section 2, which apparently has been resurrected, would inhibit United States participation in all sorts of very useful international endeavors. International organizations, such as, for example, the International Court of Justice, certainly exercise judicial functions.

I am speaking on this point today as the author of the Morse resolution of 1945 on the World Court. I have not changed my views at all since 1945, when I introduced the Morse resolution, which passed the United States Senate, establishing the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in any matter involving a conflict between our Government and a foreign government, in respect to the settlement of which matter the foreign government is willing to submit it to the World Court for adjudication, save and except for the reservation which was attached to the resolution, namely, that it shall not apply to domestic issues.

Yet I am worried about the language in the amendment which will be before the Senate subsequently and to which I am addressing my remarks today, because the World Court exercises judicial functions. Does our participation in the International Court constitute a delegation of judicial power to an international organization? If it does then I do not see how we can escape the interpretation of the Senator from Michigan as to the meaning and intent of this amendment. At least, I think it lays the foundation for much confusion, conflict, uncertainty, and ambiguity, when and if the matter subsequently should come before the courts.

Under the Ferguson interpretation, would it be possible to extend the jurisdiction of the Court at some future date to cover the adjudication of claims of, or demands against, our citizens? On this question the State Department made the following statement in the hearings in 1953, page 834:

Having in mind the doctrine of sovereign immunity, it may well prove to be highly advantageous that we be able to afford our citizens access to an international tribunal for the adjudication of their claims against foreign governments. This in turn would require that they submit such claims, which might be in the nature of debts locally contracted, to the Court's jurisdiction and the reciprocal liability that might result from an adverse decision.

If for no other reason—and there are many other reasons—than the possible effect of this amendment on future World Court procedures and adjudications once the amendment becomes if it does, the law of the land, I argue today that the amendment ought to be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration and clarification.

FURTHER COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION REQUIRED

I do not think such consideration and clarification should be attempted on the floor of the Senate by myself or any other Senator offering some penciled notes by way of a clarifying amendment which might clearly take the World Court out of the purview of the amendment, if it is not intended to have it within the purview of the amendment. I respectfully submit that the language used by the Senator from Michigan makes it quite probable that the World Court would come within the purview of the amendment.

If that is its purpose, I think it would be a great mistake. The situation I have outlined illustrates, as clearly as I can illustrate, the point I have been making on the floor of the Senate for several days past, that so many constitutional problems are, in my judgment, going to arise in respect to the amendments as they have been drafted in the course of the debate in the Senate that, in order to play safe, we ought, regardless of the number of weeks or months it may take, recommit the whole matter to the Committee on the Judiciary for further hearings and consideration by the top constitutional experts of the United States. Then let the committee submit a report, based upon its findings after it shall have analyzed the record made in such hearings.

I think we ought to play safe when it comes to a matter of amending the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe the time which will be required for further hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary can justify anyone taking the position today that the Senate ought to take action now.

Let me make one other point. I take it for granted that if the joint resolution shall be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee will do its job. Under a motion to recommit, the job of the Committee on the Judiciary becomes a clear one to proceed to conduct early hearings on the amendments drafted on the floor of the Senate, such as the amendment to which I am directing my attention today. The committee then should submit to the Senate at the earliest date possible, commen-

surate with full and fair hearings, a report on the amendments.

Someone has asked "Would you be willing publicly to guess how long that would take?"

Yes, I am willing to guess. I think it should take not more than 6 weeks. If the Committee on the Judiciary does its job, it should take not more than 6 weeks to hold the hearings and to submit the report.

Mr. President, in the interest of playing safe, we had better be willing to take what I think would be a maximum period of 6 weeks for further hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is not a case of my not wanting to vote on the matter. I serve notice now, as I have so many times heretofore, that when called upon to vote, I shall vote against the Bricker amendment and all amendments to it, because I do not think any of them is necessary. Nevertheless, the amendments have been offered, and I think a scholarly job ought to be done by the Committee on the Judiciary, after calling before it the experts best qualified to testify on the subject, in the calmness of the reasoned discourse which can prevail in carefully conducted hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, we all know that with the heat of debate and the confusion which so frequently prevails here, the floor of the Senate does not happen to be a good place in which to be drafting and considering amendments, without the benefit and the advice of a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

There are other possible effects of the proposed amendment upon international operations which disturb me. For example, what about the Baruch plan for the control of atomic energy? Under the Ferguson interpretation, I wonder if the Baruch plan may find itself in conflict with the amendment if it shall be adopted? I merely ask these questions, Mr. President; I do not purport to know the answers. I raise the questions to illustrate what I think the Committee on the Judiciary ought to consider.

Would it not be necessary for us to delegate certain executive powers to an effective international law organization? Does not the present international control of radio frequencies involve certain quasi-legislative functions on the part of an international organization? Would such functions be affected by this amendment? Would such functions be outlawed under the interpretation of the Senator from Michigan in his proposed amendment to article VI of the Constitution?

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know; and I respectfully say I doubt if any of my colleagues know, either. I do not see how one can know, on the basis of the record which has been made to date on the question. Again I say this illustrates the importance of having the entire matter recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for hearings, so that experts more qualified than we are can testify as to whether or not the adoption of the amendment would have any effect on the operation of, for example, such an international radio commission.

The Senator from Michigan has said that the old section 2 of the Bricker amendment should now be read back into his new amendment to article VI. I believe this shows the true purpose of the proposed amendment.

My beliefs have been strengthened by certain statements made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I speak of the Senator from Ohio with the greatest respect. However, the Senator from Ohio and I disagree on the desirability of the legislative program which he is sponsoring in connection with his proposed constitutional amendment.

Within the past 2 weeks, I listened to the Senator from Ohio on the Meet the Press program. He was asked whether or not he originally opposed the "which" clause. I understood him to answer in the affirmative, but I understood him also to say that many of the problems covered by the "which" clause had been handled in his original draft by section 2, which prohibited vesting any legislative, executive, or judicial powers in any international organization.

In accepting the Knowland-Ferguson amendments, the Senator from Ohio made the following statement on the floor of the Senate, as it appears on page 1333 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1954:

> I listened with great interest today to the speech made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on the amendments endorsed by the administration. Specifically, I agree with him that those amendments, if adopted, will produce the following results:
>
> First. Prevent any delegation of the executive, legislative, or judicial power of the United States to the United Nations or to any other international organization.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that that is in line with the purpose and the intent of the provision of the first resolution the Senator from Ohio introduced in the 82d Congress; and, in my opinion, it has a good many—not all, but a good many—of the facets of meaning of the "which" clause, which, in my judgment, is revived by the language, in part, of the amendment under discussion.

I am fearful—and I speak now on this point as a lawyer—that the statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will constitute practically the entire legislative history, if the amendment is adopted, unless further hearings are held. It is quite important to write the legislative history plainly, and I think further hearings would help do that. Further hearings would also settle very clearly whether or not any of the attributes of the "which" clause are to be restored to the resolution by the adoption of the amendment designated as 2–3–54—C.

THE FERGUSON-KNOWLAND AMENDMENT WOULD BE RETROACTIVE

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was asked by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] whether the Senator from Michigan interpreted his amendment to article VI to be retroactive to 1789. The debate will be found at page 1334 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Michigan in reply said, yes, it would be retroactive.

The amendment would apply to such questions as the German debt settlement treaty, which was overwhelmingly approved at the last session of Congress. I think it unfortunate that it was approved; nevertheless, it was done. The treaty provided for the international arbitration of claims of American holders of German bonds. Is the arbitration court an international organization to which judicial powers of the United States have been delegated? Would the treaty become invalid under the retroactive interpretation given by the sponsor of the amendment to Article VI? If the sponsor means it would be retroactive, I respectfully submit that what I have just stated would be its effect.

As the record shows, I have no love for the German debt treaty; but I submit that casting doubt upon the treaties of 165 years is a high price to pay for the possible invalidation of the German debt treaty.

In a retroactive examination of all treaties concluded by the United States since 1790, such treaties as the United Nations Charter would have to be reviewed. Can we not see shades of the great San Francisco Charter debate of 1945 once again on the floor of the Senate, but with striking changes in emphasis because of some very interesting internal changes in the political complexion of the United States?

Who is to say that we shall not have to review the United Nations Charter? The Senator from Michigan is correct when, in answer to the question of the Senator from Minnesota, he stated that the effect of the amendment would be to make all treaties retroactive. The United Nations Charter is one of them. There are persons in this country who not only think we ought to review it, but that we ought to withdraw from it. The suggestion the Senate is considering may be the back door through which to accomplish their objective.

Woe be unto my country if, because of a period of political excitement—which is a very polite term for me to use in describing the present political climate in the United States—we find ourselves adopting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which may result at least in a big "hassle" over whether or not we should withdraw from the United Nations, and provide a back-door means through which those desiring to do so may seek to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. President, I do not like to think of what might happen to my country in the decades immediately ahead if that should happen. If we have not learned by now that we cannot live by ourselves alone, if we have not learned by now that history, and the Great Mover of history, in my judgment, have placed a great responsibility on our country to lead the world, in the centuries immediately ahead, toward the goal of perpetual peace and real freedom for men and women everywhere, and if we do not grasp that responsibility and obligation now, I think our descendants will live to rue the day of our failings and shortcomings.

So, Mr. President, if the amendment is to be retroactive in effect—and one of the authors of the amendment has so stated on the floor of the Senate—then in my judgment the amendment may

raise the entire question of the constitutionality of our entering into the United Nations Treaty or Charter. Would not arguments be made that our acceptance of the United Nations Charter was unconstitutional because certain executive or judicial powers, or quasi-executive or quasi-judicial powers, including the World Court Charter, which is a part of the United Nations Charter, had been delegated to the United Nations?

All of this seems to me to be both needless and positively harmful. It illustrates the dangers involved in the acceptance of amendments which have been composed in corridors and floor huddles, and never have been scrutinized by the appropriate committees of the Congress, or subjected to full public debate following adequate committee reports.

The sponsor of the amendment, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], has been unable to give a successful explanation of the meaning of the words "in pursuance of" in connection with treaties, as opposed to laws. If we adopt this amendment, no one will know how much of the "which" clause has been revived until the Supreme Court passes on the question at an indefinite time in the future.

Furthermore, Mr. President, on the basis of what record would the Supreme Court pass on that question? It would do so on the basis of the very confused record which has been made in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate, without the advantage of having a report by the Judiciary Committee, following a hearing held by it, on the meaning of the Ferguson-Knowland amendment.

Under the circumstances not only is it not safe for us to pass on to the American people a recommendation for a constitutional amendment—and that is what we really are doing—but it simply is not good statesmanship for us to do so. We in the Senate have some responsibilities of statesmanship; and I respectfully submit that one of them is that we use the procedures of the Senate for the presentation of a record to the full Senate which we, in turn, can use as the basis on which to reach our judgments. Yet we do not have a judiciary Committee record on this matter.

I say we are not acting in a statesmanlike manner if we vote for the Ferguson-Knowland amendment containing the "in pursuance of" clause, when not even the authors of the amendment have yet made a clear statement in the course of the debate—and I speak of them most respectfully—as to what effect the "in pursuance of" clause would have.

Mr. President, I should like to urge in the strongest possible manner that we call a halt to the whole project of amending the Constitution on the floor of the Senate. It should be clear by now to most Senators that no emergency exists, and that the proposed "compromise amendments," hastily drafted and improperly considered, probably will create real dangers and fears to replace the hypothetical dangers and fears which exist in the minds of a few persons today.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the pending proposal is to amend the Constitution of the United States. Our basic charter contains the majestic phrases of freedom. The Ferguson-Knowland amendment would graft upon that charter a mumble of ambiguity.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS IN MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on December 10 last, I had an opportunity to personally visit the plant of Hormel & Co. in Austin, Minn. During that time I had an opportunity to visit with some of the members and officers of the American Federation of Government Employees, local 368. These people are employees of the Meat Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry in the United States Department of Agriculture. They are loyal, effective, and hard-working employees of the United States Government.

During my visit I had an opportunity to observe the work of these Government employees. Theirs is a difficult task which performs a vital public service in protecting the high standards of public health which the American people have come to expect. I regret to say, however, Mr. President, that the United States Government as the employer is not meeting its responsibility fully to these employees.

At my request the membership of local No. 368 of the American Federation of Government Employees held a series of meetings to formulate their evaluation of our Government policy on wages and working conditions as it affects the employees of the Meat Inspection Division. Within the last few days I received a letter, dated February 6, from Mr. L. B. Dunfee, president of the Austin local of the AFGE, setting forth the results of their study. The letter is an impressive one and presents an impressive case demonstrating the need for increased salaries, more equitable overtime pay, the adjustment of status for nonveterinary inspectors, and an improved retirement system.

The importance and effectiveness of the letter leads me to bring it to the attention of the Congress. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the letter, with the accompanying exhibit, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I am also asking the Department of Agriculture for a report on this letter.

There being no objection, the letter and exhibit were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
MID LODGE NO. 368,
Austin, Minn., February 6, 1954.

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

DEAR SIR: I regret that my work assignment prevented me from being present during your visit at our Government office the afternoon of December 10, 1953, in response to an invitation extended to you by Mr. P. L. Lattin, past president, Mr. W. P. La Porte, secretary, and Mr. J. V. Rollins, member of Local No. 368 American Federation of Government Employees. I am certain, however, that they presented to you a lucid, if brief résumé of a few of the more important problems confronting Meat Inspection Division employees.

As per your request for more detailed information at the time of your visit, and your letter of January 15 to Dr. H. J. Schick, I herewith submit for your edification pertinent data in support of our contentions.

We maintain that meat inspection employees pay is not compatible with that paid by private industry for work requiring even less responsibility, training, and skill. Common labor in the meat packing industry receives pay of $62.25 per week, based on $1.50 per hour for a 40-hour week plus fringe benefits of $2.25 per week. Here at this packing plant, the incentive system which increases the hourly work output, also increases the weekly common labor pay check to as much as $125 per week. The meat inspector must increase his speed to keep up with this high output operating schedule, but receives no such incentive pay. In fact this packing company runs some chain-driven operations at speeds in excess of those acknowledged by the Government Personnel Division to be maximum per man hour for safe, competent inspection.

A meat inspector, grade GS–4, receives base pay of $61.06 per week. If he is required to work 10 hours of overtime, his weekly pay will be increased about $20, however, most meat packers do not work overtime hours therefore, most meat inspectors receive only the basic rate. For more detailed explanation, see exhibit A enclosed.

Laws of the Congress of the United States demand that the meat packing industry, along with other industries, pay their employees at least one and one-half times their hourly rate for overtime work. Another injustice being perpetrated upon the meat inspector is failure by this same Congress to insist upon payment of true time and one-half to the meat inspector for overtime work performed. The intent of overtime pay at one and one-half times base pay is to penalize the employer; however, in the case of the meat inspector, he is the one being penalized. It is grossly unjust to pay the inspector for overtime work at rates which are actually less than his regular base rate. The meat packer requests the overtime inspection and pays the Secretary of Agriculture for it at premium rates, so why can't the meat inspector receive true time and one-half pay for this required overtime work?

To illustrate: A graduate veterinarian inspector, grade GS–9, earns base pay of $2.43 per hour for the first 8 hours per day. True time and one-half is $3.64. The overtime rate he receives is $1.77. Loss to the inspector is $1.87 per hour. Unfair isn't it?

Perhaps I should emphasize here that overtime work performed by Meat Inspection Division employees is paid for by the meat packer requesting such overtime and not by Government funds, therefore correction of

this injustice will not result in any added cost to the Government.

The simple solution to this injustice would be congressional action to raise the $2,980 ceiling used in computing overtime rates. (As continued in Classification Act of 1949.) This ceiling should be raised to $5,810, with overtime rates not less than the overtime rate computed on $5,810, for salaries over $5,810 per annum. This is the purpose of a Senate bill introduced by Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

The reason why the meat inspector is not receiving true time and one-half pay is explained in detail in exhibit B, enclosed. Exhibit B contains an excerpt taken from the field manual of United States Department of Agriculture Administrative Regulations.

Now a consideration of the grading of nonveterinary meat inspectors in comparison with veterinary inspectors. Meat inspection regulations provide for both veterinary and nonveterinary inspectors and specify type of work to be performed by each. All inspection performed in connection with the slaughter of animals is to be performed by veterinary inspectors assisted by nonveterinary inspectors. Processing department inspection is performed by duly qualified nonveterinary inspectors of several years experience who have advanced or been promoted from slaughtering assignments.

All ante mortem inspection (according to the regulations) is performed by veterinary inspectors; in fact many foreign governments have import laws requiring that all imports of meat from the United States be accompanied by a certificate, signed by the inspector-in-charge where the animal was slaughtered, attesting that such animal received ante mortem inspection by a veterinary inspector. The facts are that, at this official establishment there has never been a veterinarian assigned to ante mortem inspection during the past 8 years. The Bureau of Animal Industry simply does not have sufficient veterinarians to assign them to this work, so it is ably performed by the nonveterinary inspector.

All post mortem inspection is conducted by veterinary inspectors, assisted by nonveterinary inspectors. All viscera inspection is to be conducted by veterinarians; however, due to the shortage of veterinarians, the Chief of Meat Inspection has directed that meat inspectors may assist veterinary inspectors on viscera inspection, always under immediate supervision of a veterinary inspector. At this official establishment, we have 4 veterinary inspectors, whereas in 1940, a normal employment year, we had 11. It is difficult to recruit well-qualified veterinarians at the present entrance salary for Bureau of Animal Industry veterinary inspector, which is GS–7—$4,205 per annum.

I mentioned above that the meat inspectors must now assist veterinary inspectors conduct viscera inspection. Here at this establishment we have only 4 veterinarians, 2 who do only final dispositional inspection, and 2 who do viscera inspection assisted by the meat inspector. This company, as do the majority of meatpackers, has 2 killing floors which operate simultaneously; and on the hog-killing floor 2 viscera inspection tables which operate at the same time. One hog-killing viscera table requires 3 inspectors; the other requires 2 inspectors; the cattle-killing viscera table requires 2 inspectors; final inspection on the two killing floors requires 2 more, and ante mortem inspection another, 1 more for relief work totals 11. When the 2 veterinary inspectors are available, 1 works on the cattle viscera table and the other on one of the hog viscera tables, leaving the other hog viscera table to be manned exclusively by the ordinary meat inspectors. During the past summer these two veterinary inspectors were absent from this station doing relief work at other stations much of the time; therefore, the nonveterinary inspectors performed all of the viscera inspection and without immediate veterinary supervision.

This inspection is performed by meat inspectors with grade of GS–5 if available, and, if not, then by inspectors of grade GS–4, and if the shortage is acute, as it commonly is due to sickness and other absences, then by inspectors of grade GS–6, called from their inspection duties in processing departments; thereby reducing the number of meat inspectors available in these departments below a safe minimum required for protection of the public.

On the day you were here, Mr. Lattin and myself both grade GS–6 inspectors, were working on the hog kill viscera table, having been called from our processing-department assignments because of the shortage of help. We maintain that if the grade 5 or 4 or even 6 meat inspector is qualified to do, and is required to do this work which is supposed to be done only by a veterinary inspector, then he should be paid at least at the rate of a grade GS–7, which is the beginning grade of the veterinary inspectors. This is the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Now, when you contact Bureau of Animal Industry officials in Washington relative to this increased pay for nonveterinary meat inspectors performing veterinary inspectors' work, they undoubtedly will tell you that these meat inspectors always work under immediate supervision of veterinary inspectors.

That there is always at least 1 veterinarian working at the same table with 1 or more meat inspector. As I have explained to you, this is not true at this station and no doubt the same condition exists at the majority of inspected establishments around the country because of the shortage of personnel in the Bureau. You will probably be told that these men, since they are not graduates of veterinary schools, will not know the exact disposition of the retained carcass in all cases, yet it is just as true that because of training and experience they do know that a particular carcass is not fit for food and they can certainly affix a United States retained tag to the carcass holding it for further inspection and disposition by the final veterinary inspector just as well as can the graduate veterinarian. To further illustrate the aggravations of these circumstances created by the shortage of veterinary inspectors, there were recently hired at a nearby meat-inspection station two veterinary inspectors at grade GS–9, salary $5,060 per annum. These two men work beside and are learning to do the same work as experienced nonveterinary inspectors of grade GS–5, salary $3,410 per annum. Is this equal pay for equal work?

This condition can easily be alleviated by an increase in Department of Agriculture appropriations which will permit raising the grade and salary of the nonveterinary inspector to the level of the veterinary inspector whom he is replacing.

Another sore spot with the older employees is the unfair requirement in the Civil Service Retirement System Regulations that the annuitant must take a reduced annuity, in order to provide an annuity for his wife. Upon retirement from the Federal service, if the employee wishes to provide an annuity for his wife, in case he precedes her in death, his rate of annuity will be 90 percent of the full rate due him under the basic formula, with a further reduction of three-fourths of 1 percent for each full year his wife is under age 60 at the time of his retirement, but it may not be less than 75 percent of the full rate. His widow's rate of annuity will be one-half of his full rate.

We feel that as other retirement laws do not provide for such a discount to the annuitant, the Civil Service Employee should not be so penalized.

If there is any further information you may need to help you to a just decision in the matter of increased pay, true time and one-half, and adjustment of pay of nonveterinary meat inspectors performing the work of veterinary inspectors on killing floors, please do not hesitate to call on me.

We sincerely believe these complaints and request for relief are reasonable and just and also that all Federal employees must be granted an increase in salaries to meet steadily advancing cost of living expenses. Your able assistance in these matters will be greatly appreciated.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the views expressed in the above letter are the majority opinion of the membership of Local No. 368 American Federation of Government Employees as compounded and evolved in two meetings held for the express purpose of composing this letter in response to your request for information.

Respectfully yours,

L. B. DUNFEE,
President, Local 368, American Federation of Government Employees.

EXHIBIT A

A comparison of the actual earnings of a common labor worker in this meat-packing plant with that of a meat inspector working in the same conditions of blood, mud, sweat, and long hours, to wit:

Qualifications required for employment

Packing plant employee	Grade GS–4 meat inspector
None except a strong back	Physical examination to qualify for competitive civil-service examination. Then he must have completed 6 months probation as GS–3 trainee.
$3,120 per annum, at $1.50 per hour, 2,080 hours.	$3,175 per annum, base pay at $1.53 per hour.
$112.50 per annum, 50 hours overtime paid for at 1½ times base rate.	$1,055 per annum, 500 hours overtime at $2.10 per hour which is less than true time and one-half.
$1,560 per annum, production or incentive pay.	No incentive pay.
$117 per annum, fringe benefits.	No fringe pay.
$218 per annum, profit-sharing check or bonus.	No profitsharing check.
$150 per annum, cost of hospital and sickness insurance paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No free hospital and sickness insurance.
$18 per annum, cost of life-insurance policy paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No free life insurance.
Unemployment insurance policy paid for by employer and given free to employee.	No unemployment insurance in the event of reduction in force.
1 week of vacation with pay annually.	13 days' vacation with pay annually.
Up to 70 days' sick leave with pay possible under free hospitalization plan.	13 days' sick leave with pay annually.
$5,295.50 per annum, total	$4,230 per annum, total.

DAIRY SUPPORT PRICES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now address myself to the matter of the action of the Secretary of Agriculture as of yesterday in announcing a new parity price-support program for dairy products.

Many of us from farm States are greatly disturbed, I am sure, by the action of Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, in announcing the lowering of dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity.

It is now within his authority, of course, to make such a discretionary decision. However, nearly a month ago I wrote Secretary Benson urging him to continue support at the 90 percent level in order to give Congress ample time to

reach a decision on whether it wants to make such support mandatory, or prefers leaving it to the Secretary's discretion.

It would seem to me greater wisdom to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another on various proposals before it. Our agricultural committee is now studying future farm legislation. I must question the Secretary's judgment in lowering the support level until he has had the benefit of our combined decision on the future of dairy programs.

Mr. President, the Secretary's action in selecting 75 percent of parity is a revelation of things to come, if Congress should adopt the flexible price-support program which has been talked about, and which would give the Secretary a choice between 75 percent and 90 percent.

Mr. President, I notice that when the Secretary has a choice, in going below the 90-percent parity price, the highest figure he has ever set has been 80 percent on soy beans; and in the most recent case he set 75 percent on butter.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Benson on January 18, urging him to retain 90-percent support for dairy products.

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

JANUARY 18, 1954.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recent press dispatches quote you as saying you felt it would be necessary to reduce the support level for dairy products on April 1, the date the present commitment for support at 90 percent of parity expires.

May I respectfully urge you to reconsider any such decision, if it has been made, and take full cognizance of the detrimental effect any such announcement at this time has upon existing markets.

Because Congress now has under consideration enactment of new farm legislation that might well affect the support level for dairy products, it would seem most wise to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another.

By indicating in advance you intend lowering the support level on April 1, I am convinced you are complicating rather than alleviating our surplus problem. It should be apparent that dealers will seek to unload their own inventories of butter on the Government at 90 percent of parity, if it appears they can later buy butter back at a lower percentage of parity.

It should also be apparent that considerable confusion will result in the market should you lower the support level, only to have the Congress subsequently enact legislation requiring support at 90 percent of parity.

In view of the fact that Congress has such legislation under consideration and may not reach a decision upon it by April 1, I strongly urge that you immediately publicly announce your intention to continue support of dairy products at 90 percent of parity for another year in order to give Congress ample time to reach a decision on whether it wants to make such support mandatory or prefers leuving it to your discretion. I firmly believe such assurance at this time would eliminate uncertainty and add considerably to stability of the market, and prevent undue dumping of butter inventories upon the Government by the private trade.

I concur in the concern you have often expressed over getting butter out of the Government's hands into useful channels of consumption, but deplore the lack of initiative or imagination shown so far by the administration toward creating new outlets for that purpose.

Last July Senator AIKEN placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from you inviting suggestions for improving our farm programs, and promising careful study and consideration of any such suggestions advanced.

Subsequently I placed in the RECORD the results of a study entitled "Dairy Diet Dividends," which I had made by a competent authority on nutrition. At that time I declared I was making the material available for study during the recess of the Congress, with the hope that it would make a useful contribution toward making more effective use of our dairy abundance. Included in the suggestions outlined in that study was a plan for supplementing the diets of persons on public old-age assistance with a partially-subsidized monthly allotment of butter, through a stamp plan making use of established State welfare departments and normal channels of private trade. The plan was outlined in detail in the August 1, 1953, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

May I ask, in accordance with your invitation for suggestions, whether this idea was thoroughly explored by your dairy branch? If so, I would appreciate being advised as to the conclusions of the department in regard to creating such a new outlet for butter and other dairy products among groups of our citizens whose incomes at present are too low to permit them to buy the amounts of dairy products needed for an adequate diet.

I would also appreciate being advised as to what other plans, if any, the Department now has to expand outlets for our dairy abundance.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall read one or two pertinent passages from the letter because I believe they express pretty well the arguments in behalf of a continuation of the high price support level. I said:

> Because Congress now has under consideration enactment of new farm legislation that might well affect the support level for dairy products, it would seem most wise to avoid market confusion by avoiding any changes in our dairy-support program until the Congress has acted one way or another.

Then I said:

> By indicating in advance you intend lowering the support level on April 1, I am convinced you are complicating rather than alleviating our surplus problem. It should be apparent that dealers will seek to unload their own inventories of butter on the Government at 90 percent of parity, if it appears they can later buy butter back at a lower percentage of parity.

I did not have in mind at the time that the Secretary would go down to the bottom, to 75 percent of parity. However, it is apparently obvious now that every butter producer and processor in American will unload all of his butter on the Government. He will unload all of it except that which is needed for current, day by day, needs, and later will come back to the Government and buy the butter for 15 percent less than he sold it to the Government in the first instance. It is neither sound economics nor good public policy. I make the prediction on the floor today that instead of there being fewer pounds of butter owned by the Government, as a result of the announcement by the Secretary, there will be more.

I further say that the reduction which the Secretary has ordered, under the law, will do very little, if anything, to improve the consumption of butterfat products or other dairy products.

I have already asked unanimous consent to have my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD. I hope it will be very carefully studied. I point out in the letter that a number of proposals have been made to Congress and I ask that those proposals be given very careful consideration.

It is rather strange, Mr. President, that it was a year ago that the Secretary of Agriculture announced the continuation at that time of 90 percent of parity. He said he did so in order that the Government would have an opportunity to study the question, and so that the industry itself could come up with plans and proposals.

The industry has come up with plans and proposals, Mr. President, and they have been rejected. The only thing the Government has been able to do in 1 year of study of the problem of surplus dairy production has been to reduce the price of butter by 15 points. It certainly did not require a year to do that. It could have been done in the first 12 seconds, rather than in 12 months.

The Secretary has taken action, which I consider to be very damaging. I feel that we should be fully aware of what a lowering of the support level means to America's dairy industry. It will wipe out an estimated $600 million of income of dairy farmers. Based on estimates of the National Milk Producers' Federation, for each point the support level is lowered, dairy income is cut down $40 million. The price support level was lowered 15 points. Fifteen times $40 million amounts to a $600 million loss in income.

I suggest that this is no time to be having further losses in agricultural income. No area of farm operation is more expensive than that of the dairy farmer. They have expensive operations in terms of the necessary machinery and plant, in terms of equipment, and in terms of additional help which is necessary to maintain such an establishment. It is not possible for a dairy farmer to convert from dairy production to cereal grain production without a tremendous loss of his capital. It is not so difficult for a grain producer to shift from one crop to another. It is easy for a corn producer to shift from corn to wheat; but it is not easy for a dairy farmer to shift to some other kind of production without a substantial loss. It is not uncommon for a small dairy farmer to have an investment of from $35,000 to $50,000 in dairy equipment. There is a great deal of loose talk about producers going into something else, but they simply do not go into something else without having to get a new start in life.

I serve notice, Mr. President, that regardless of the Secretary's action, I shall fight on the floor of the Senate to restore better protection for the dairy industry in Minnesota and in other sections of the country. The action of the Secretary of Agriculture is literally a death blow to a large number of producers. If anyone has any doubt about it, he should see some of the telegrams I received this morning. The farmers are asking questions. When is the Government going to reduce the cost of our farm operations? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of tractors? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of fertilizers? When is the Government going to reduce the cost of milking-machine equipment? It has reduced the cost of butter, but not the cost of that which produces the butter.

I would further make note of the fact that many of our dairy farmers have blooded herds, the finest cattle they can obtain. They have spent a lifetime in building up their herds. I would also point out that public-health laws have been passed in the effort to provide better health standards. Despite all this, we see a situation brought about whereby farm income in the dairy field will be definitely injured.

Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that I did not say the Secretary had merely to buy up surpluses. I am convinced in my own mind that there are other ways of handling the situation. One way which would be very effective would be the adoption of a system of production payments. I think there is more and more interest in such a proposal.

In addition to my own price support bill,—S. 1159—there are other bills before the committee, which deserve and which will receive very serious consideration. Regardless of what kind of a bill is reported from the committee, I am determined that efforts will be made on the floor to see that the dairy industry is treated equitably along with other producers. Whatever the rest of them get, the producers of dairy commodities should at least share equitably.

The National Milk Producers' Federation has drafted an amendment providing that the support level for dairy farmers be not less than the support level for basic commodities, such as the feed which dairymen must buy.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that a communication from the National Milk Producers' Federation be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think there should not be any more than a 5 percent change in the price support level in any 1 year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr AIKEN. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not yet.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said in regard to the heavy investment in the dairy industry and the difficulty which the dairyman has in adjusting to other production without heavy loss. I also agree with the claim that the dairyman should be put on an even basis, so far as supports are concerned, with the producers of other commodities.

There is one thing which bothers me with reference to that, however, and perhaps the Senator from Minnesota could enlighten me. I am wondering whether the dairy farmers, in return for 100 percent support, would be willing to accept marketing quotas. We know that the wheat grower has had a 20 percent cut this year, and there will be another cut next year. The cotton grower has had to take a 20 percent cut in marketing quotas this year, and there is probably a 15 percent additional cut coming next year. It is almost axiomatic that when there are price supports production must be adjusted to demand.

I have full sympathy with the desire of any dairyman to get price support and be sure of an income, but what bothers me is whether they can adjust their production without incurring very heavy losses. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota could give us an idea of the thinking of the people of his great dairy State in that respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be delighted to try. I bow to the superior wisdom of the Senator from Vermont, who comes from a very fine dairy State, as well as a wonderful State in other respects.

I recall that last summer the newspapers of my State published a poll which showed that the farmers of Minnesota were going to vote 50–50 on wheat-acreage allotments. The Minneapolis Tribune carried a statement that 50 percent would vote for them and 50 percent would vote against them. The vote was 72 to 1 for acreage allotments. The editor was completely against any kind of controls for the farmer, so he read his views into the poll. When the poll came out, it was 50–50; but when the vote came out, it was 72 to 1. Every Member of the Senate will settle for a majority like that.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the dairy farmers of Minnesota be willing to do what the wheat farmers did?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know. I have no crystal ball. All I know is what has happened in the past. I was told by wheat farmers, by newspaper editorials, by experts, and even by the Department of Agriculture itself, that acreage allotments would not be accepted. But when the choice was between 50 percent of parity and 90 percent of parity, it did not take our farmers long to make up their minds what they were going to do about acreage allotments.

I hope there can be brought before the committees of Congress a program with a high price-protection formula—not merely a support formula, but a protection formula. I should like to know how the farmers feel.

My complaint about Mr. Benson's action is that now, when an agricultural bill is before Congress, at a time when the distinguished Senator from Vermont, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is about to reconvene the hearings—I understand the hearings are to start within a week—at the time we are about to consider the whole proposal of agricultural legislation, and to develop a comprehensive program, the Secretary of Agriculture lowers prices to the lowest level, to 75 percent of parity.

This is a very severe shock. Many persons expected a drop of perhaps five points. This greater slash is not in line with the views of the President of the United States. When the President was considering the modernized parity formula and its application in new legislation, he said, in effect, "Let us take it by stages. We will go 1 year, 2 years, and then 3 years, changing in stages, but not all at once." Now we find we have taken the full blow, from the highest parity price down to the lowest parity price, in one fell swoop.

All I am saying is that regardless of the problems of the Government—and the Government may have its problems—the dairy farmers are going to have their problems. If there is to be a choice between the Government being able to handle its problems and dairy farmers being able to handle theirs, I say the Government is better able to handle its problems.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I gathered from the Senator's remark that he felt the Secretary of Agriculture could have fixed the support anywhere between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But will the Senator agree that if the counsel of the Department of Agriculture told the Secretary that under the wording and the intent of the law the Secretary could not fix the support price above a minimum of 75 percent of parity, would the Senator then feel that the Secretary would have been justified in violating the law against the advice of his counsel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I think that if the Secretary had received that kind of counsel, perhaps he should have obtained a new lawyer.

Last year there was a surplus of butter. The law provides that the Secretary shall set the support price at such a level as to secure an adequate supply. It was on that basis that the counsel for the Department suggested to the Secretary that there should be low price supports, but we had a large supply of butter on hand last year, when the Secretary announced in March last that the 90 percent support price would be continued for another year.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator recall that a year ago at this time we were in a shooting war, and American boys were being taken off the farms of Minnesota and other States and were being sent to the battlefields of Korea?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And they were being fed oleo. Yet butter was bought for them by the Secretary of Defense at a price of 15 cents a pound, an insult to every dairy farmer and every dairy producer in America.

I came from a committee meeting this morning, as did the Senator from Vermont, where we heard about the bill we are picking up for another war in Indochina. We are not short of wars or short of butter. We are short of a willingness on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to do something about the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot see how it was an insult to the dairy farmers of America to insist that the armed services feed our boys butter rather than substitutes for butter, even though the price was out of line. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that the administration probably should have done what the previous administration did, namely, to require the armed services, the ECA, and other agencies, to pay at least full price for farm commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is all I am asking.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it was a mistake to sell butter at 15 cents a pound. I feel the President should have ordered the agencies of Government to pay a respectable price, even if it were not the full support price. So there is no quarrel about that. However, I do not think it was an insult to the dairy farmers to insist that the Army feed our boys butter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not what I said. I said it was an insult that the butter should have been sold at only 15 cents a pound. I say again that it was an insult to the farmers to sell it at only 15 cents a pound.

The Government has not taken much time to learn the answer to the problem. There are many ways in which the butter can be used. The administration may be greatly concerned with its desires for economy, but I want to know if the Government is going to cut the prices of tanks? We have a surplus of tanks and a surplus of ammunition. We have plenty of surpluses. We do not place an order with General Motors for a thousand tanks, and then, when we find that we really needed only 200, say to General Motors, "We will pay you 50 percent of the price on the rest of the tanks." No. We take the order at full price. If we do not, we pay the penalty.

We need the dairy industry. Regardless of whether it costs a little more to maintain it, we need it. Congress voted for fair labor standards, for a 40-hour week, for time and one-half for overtime. Congress voted for a fair trade law for retail merchants. It was a social decision to keep independent business alive. I suppose it could be proved that super markets and big chain store operators can sell tooth paste for less than a corner drug store can. But, Mr. President, America is made up of corner drug stores and hardware stores, independently operated. I am willing to pay a price to keep them in business.

If we fool around with the dairy industry, so that the dairy producers cannot make a living, we shall lose a great part of American agricultural life, which means so much to the social and economic welfare of the United States.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I had hoped that when the Senator from Minnesota got into this discussion on the price of butter, he would bear in mind dry skim milk powders, cheese, and many other products which fall under the same yardstick.

While the Senator from Minnesota understands that I do not agree with him exactly concerning the levels at which supports should be placed on commodities, I wish to point out that in 1947 the Government had bought some 200,000,000 pounds of dried skimmed milk powder, the very kind of powder we now have on hand in surplus quantities. The Army told us in 1947 that it could not use it, but it finally did at fair prices.

I had occasion to go back to a file I had preserved, and I am thankful I have preserved it, because it has reminded me of the 200,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk which in 1947 cost the Government 9 cents a pound, as against 17 cents a pound now. It was sold by the Government at cost plus the cost of delivery to the spot of export to Germany and Japan. The Army did not want to use it, but they did. A man named Colonel Sams was the one with whom we were dealing. He found out that when dried skim milk was moved into Japan and Germany, it provided useful, nutritious food. Butter and milk contain the finest food values ever devised for human beings.

Colonel Sams found that the Army could take it at reasonable prices, and the farm program lost nothing on the deal.

I think it is wrong to drop the price of butter to 15 cents a pound when the Army buys it. I think the Army ought to pay a reasonable price. Good food like butter should be placed in veterans' hospitals. Congress has provided by law that veterans shall be served butter. I know when I spent some months in a tuberculosis hospital in the neighborhood of 37 years ago the food which the hospital authorities tried to supply us included plenty of butter, eggs, and other dairy products.

I do not subscribe completely to what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, but the Senator is aware of my belief that the Congress has a responsibility to see to it that dried skim-milk powder is utilized properly. The Department has accumulated that product to the extent of 460 million pounds. There are places all over the world, such as in Korea, where such a product could be used. I think the farm programs should not be charged with the losses which will come from the accumulation of such products. Whatever the farmer has done has been in response to what the Congress and the Department of Agriculture have asked him to do.

A year ago I thought the support level was too high. I am on record with such an opinion. I believe the support level has come down more nearly to what it should be. I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Minnesota on that aspect. I am endeavoring to support the statement in the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota that we should not dump such products on the market and say they are no good. The products are good, and the American farmers are providing products which are good for us.

For the benefit of the Senator from Minnesota I desire to read a quotation from Wallace's Farmer respecting the decision on butter supports. I read from page 6:

> In spite of heavy Government buying, butterfat in December was only 82 percent of parity, while whole milk was 90 percent.

The Senator recognizes, does he not, that the announced level was 90 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. The average, during most of the program, has been 84 percent. The actual level in December was 82 percent. If the 75-percent price support is to be followed by a drop similar to that which occurred when the 90-percent price support went down to 82 percent to the farmer, then we are in for more trouble.

I do not say the problem of the Secretary of Agriculture is an easy one. I commended the decision which he finally had to reach. However, I do not think this is the final solution of such problems. We need to bear in mind that there are uses for dairy products which the price support programs have sometimes tended to dislocate. In the case of milk going into the fluid market, the 90-percent of parity has been reached without trouble.

A few days ago, when the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was off the floor, I suggested that perhaps the Aiken stamp plan was the more attractive solution to many of us. The stamp program would make dairy products and milk available to children, who would thus have a reasonable supply of the most vital food available today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased to receive the Senator's contribution. We have our differences of view. I am not suggesting there is only one view to be expressed on the floor of the Senate. I am stating that until Congress has had an opportunity to study the price support problem, the Secretary of Agriculture should not make a positive price support decision.

Fluid milk has a price support level of 90 percent of parity. The price support level does not directly affect fluid milk, but it affects it indirectly. This morning I listened to a radio commentator in New York. I heard him say that the agricultural price support law would affect the price of milk anywhere from 50 to 75 cents a hundredweight. I heard him say that it might result in a reduction of a cent a quart in the market price.

If my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], were in the Chamber, I am sure he would agree with my statement that many of the fluid milk producers in Minnesota are already pinched in the fluid milk market. They are already in trouble. In spite of that, I received a letter from my home State of Minnesota in which the writer said

that the children were not receiving enough milk in the hot-school-lunch programs.

We ought to thank God that the dairy farmer is producing what he is. The United States is the only country in the world where people go on a diet voluntarily. People in other countries go on diets involuntarily.

What is the problem involved? Let us consider the dried solid milk accumulation. Why is there such an accumulation? Because there was too much fluid milk. Why was there too much fluid milk? In America today there are millions of children who do not get a glass of milk to drink. Money is squandered in this country on projects which are much less worthwhile than providing each of our school children with a glass of milk.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am deeply interested in this matter, as is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because New York State is the second largest dairy State in the Union. Dairying is the chief agricultural activity of the farmers of the State of New York.

I was very much interested in the question addressed to the Senator from Minnesota by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as to whether a quota limitation could be or should be imposed on milk. It seems to me that the opinion completely loses sight of the vast difference between the production of milk and the production of grains, such as wheat, corn, oats, and rye.

The production of milk has great seasonal variations. May, June, and July are the months when the greatest amount of milk is produced. In other months the production of milk falls off in varying degree.

It has always been recognized that in order to maintain a steady supply of milk during the months of small production a dairy farmer would have to produce during the months of great production a supply far greater than possibly could be consumed during those months. In the case of wheat and corn, there is one growing season. The farmer does not have the regular and inevitable seasonal differences which a dairy farmer encounters in the production of milk.

I remember, and I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had the same experience, because we were governors of adjoining States at the same time, that I pleaded with the dairy farmers of my State, as I believe he did in his State, to buy more milk cattle, to raise more cattle, to feed them well, so that even though there should be an overproduction during the summer months May, June, and July, there would nonetheless be produced enough milk to feed the people of New York State, and also the people of the great cities of New England during the lean months.

It does not seem to me possible or practicable to have a quota limitation on milk in the same manner as a quota limitation is put into effect so far as grains and possibly other agricultural commodities are concerned. You cannot at will turn on or off the flow of milk.

I should also like to point out that obviously there has been no decline in the price of the feed which cows must consume if they are to produce milk. The prices of wheat and corn are no lower than they were a few months ago or a year ago; possibly they are slightly higher. The implements and supplies which the dairyman needs for the conduct of his business certainly cost no less than they did a year ago; possibly they cost more. On the one hand, there exists a stable, or possibly even an increased, cost of production; and, on the other hand, the farmer is experiencing an inevitable decrease of serious proportions in the income he receives from the sale of some of his products. That does not seem sound or just to me. It places the dairy farmer in between two crushing assaults. It places on him a burden which I think he will have great difficulty in bearing.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that I believe our farm population and the production of foodstuffs are of the utmost importance to the Nation. I believe the small farmer is the backbone of the Nation. In my State he does not usually vote for me, because he lives in upstate, Republican New York. But the problems of raising foodstuffs to feed our Nation and possibly other nations should be above politics. I feel that the farmers of New York and the hundreds of thousands of other farmers in Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Vermont, and other States of the Nation are the backbone of the Nation. We cannot afford to sacrifice them. Their prosperity is too vital to the prosperity and security of the whole country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, about a month ago I read in the New York Times, one of the leading newspapers of the Nation, an article entitled "Merchant Marine Asks Full Parity." It seems that the merchant marine presented to the Government a bill for a subsidy, saying, "We want to be paid a subsidy. Our operational costs are larger. Our income is less. Give us some money to make up the difference." Congress voted for such a program because the merchant marine is vital to the security of the Nation and is important to its commerce and well being. I refer to the merchant marine only to point out that in many areas of American life we have to make adjustments because they are important to the well being of the national economy.

I was delighted to hear what the Senator from New York said about dairy farmers as a group. I must say with equal candor to the Senator from New York that the strongest and the largest dairy-farming counties of Minnesota have not voted Democratic. However, this matter is not a political one. The men and women on the dairy farms cannot be sidewalk farmers; they cannot sit in a large law office in a big downtown building and purchase 2,000 or 5,000 acres of land and plant it. On the contrary, they must be on the job at 4:30 in the morning and until 9:30 at night; and they must produce 7 days a week, because the cows are not on a 40-hour week, and they do not stop giving milk on Sunday. They do not even listen to the admonition of the Lord; they continue giving forth of their produce even on the Sabbath. These farmers are the backbone of a balanced agriculture. Dairying is vital to soil conservation and to the nutritional well-being of the American people. Yet the country is complaining because there is too much butterfat.

At the same time, the people of many other countries of the world are almost starving to death, and are crying out because they are weak from hunger. On the other hand, Americans are crying out because there is too much food in the United States. Mr. President, if the only problem whichever faces our Government is that we have too much food, it seems to me we shall, indeed, be a very fortunate people.

On the other hand, a government which cannot figure out what to do with an abundance of food is a government which will never be able to balance the budget or to have a balanced economy, because if we cannot figure out how to give our ample supplies of food to people who were hungry and in need, how can we arrive at sound economics and sound fiscal policies?

Suggestion after suggestion is made about what to do; but the fluid-milk problem could be solved if we had the will to do so. Of course, it would cost something. The only thing that does not cost something is advice, and generally it costs something anyway, if it is bad advice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield? And, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the very able statement the Senator from Minnesota has made, does not he regard it as unfortunate that the budget the administration sent to the Congress provides for a cut, as I understand, of $15 million in the appropriation for the school-lunch program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Unfortunate? I say to the Senator from Illinois it is ridiculous. I do not know who prepare the items for the school-lunch program; but in case those who prepare that program have not heard about it, let me point out that the population of the Nation is growing by leaps and bounds. In case those who prepare the items for the school-lunch program have not heard about it, let me point out that the babies born in the period from 1946 to 1948 are beginning to enter the kindergartens, and are on their way to the first and second grades. The result is that the schools are bulging at the seams. Yet we are asked to reduce the school-lunch program.

Of course, the population of the cities is rapidly increasing. Fifteen percent of the population now live in rural areas; 85 percent live in metropolitan areas.

Obviously, it is as important for school children to have enough milk and enough food, as it is for them to have enough fresh air. Of course, if someone proposed to build schools without windows, he would be locked up in a sanitarium. Yet at this time the Government proposes that the school-lunch program be reduced. I am opposed to such a reduction. In fact, Mr. President, this Congress will be in session a long time if an effort is made to enact into law such a proposal.

There is going to be enough butter for the school children to eat; in fact, there is going to be enough butter for grandpa to eat, too. There will also be enough milk for both the children and all the other people of the United States to drink.

It is about time we called a halt to the kind of stalemate which has developed, when we cannot figure out what to do with our abundance of food. If our only answer is to reduce the price to a point where the producer cannot survive, then I say a Pandora's box of economic troubles will be opened, because every depression the Nation has had has begun on the farm. We have said again and again that depressions are farm-led and farm-fed.

Mr. President, whether we are called "prophets of gloom" or whether we are called "fear dealers," or whatever one may choose to call us, I say there is trouble in the Nation today. There are people without jobs. The farmers will be angry, too, because they are being taken for another 15-percent "tailspin." Plenty of problems confront the country today. This is not the time to aggravate the problems, for we shall never obtain the kind of economic stability we want by paying less for doing more.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The distinguished Senator has just referred to accusations being made by some persons in the other political party against some who have called attention to the recession in the business tempo and the activity and the output in our country. I wonder whether my colleague is familiar with the fact that this morning a Federal Reserve economist said the dip in the Nation's economy has been sharper than was outlined in the President's economic report.

I read from an item just taken from one of the news tickers:

Winfield W. Riefler, assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, said the Federal Reserve's index of production has now declined about 10 percent since last July.

This drop in production, he said, is equal to the full decline in the 1948–49 reaction.

While this decline does not change the diagnosis that the current reaction reflects primarily an unbalanced inventory situation, Riefler said it raises the possibility that it may in itself set forces in motion that will spread more widely over the economy.

Riefler testified before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, which is holding hearings today on credit policy and its impact on the Nation's economy. A panel of bankers and economists generally supported the administration's credit policies to meet the current recession.

It seems that, although they are informed and are sufficiently aware of what is happening, in discussing it they refer to it simply as "the current recession."

I quote further from the statement made by Mr. Riefler:

"Information now becoming available indicates that the reaction to date has been sharper than was known when the [President's] Economic Report was in preparation," Riefler said.

Riefler said, however, that the decline thus far "does not seem to have shaken the general expectation of businessmen that it will be short-lived."

The President's report was presented to Congress 3 weeks ago, but was in preparation for weeks before that. In the message the President said the "contraction since last June or July has thus far been largely in the nature of an inventory adjustment"; in other words, businessmen were cutting down on their buying because their shelves were overstocked.

Riefler said "additional evidence" since presentation of the Economic Report "tends to confirm rather than modify the diagnosis" made by the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let the Senator from Minnesota make one brief comment. I say this with certain fear and trepidation as I stand before the most distinguished economist in the Senate, and one of the most distinguished in the Nation.

I have been checking up on the so-called inventory adjustment. The recession of 1949 is used in comparison with conditions of today. I shall be very careful in my use of the word "recession."

In 1949 there was a $5 billion liquidation of inventory, but there was also a deficit of approximately $6 billion, in terms of the cash budget of the Government of the United States, which offset the inventory.

What is the situation at present? A $6 billion or $7 billion inventory adjustment is now predicted, but as of 6 months from today, February, it is estimated that the cash budget will be in balance.

That simply means that there is just that much less money in circulation. It means that much of a down-turn in the economy. The inventory adjustment in 1949 was offset by the cash deficit. The inventory adjustment in 1954, instead of being offset, is left $6 billion or $7 billion off what it would have been if there had been a deficit. So the deficit was of some good, in terms of a balanced economy in 1949.

The Senator from Illinois knows these facts much more definitely than I do. I do not think I have misstated the facts. I have spent some time with leading economists during the past 3 weeks. I am not worried about being called a prophet of doom or whatever other names our friends may use, the fact is that there are danger signs in the American economy.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make this point: I do not desire to associate the immediate problem of the price support program for dairying with the overall general development of our economy, though I do not suppose they can be dissociated. Nor do I desire to make this a partisan question, because I am speaking today in reference to our agricultural program for people who are setting aside their partisanship. I make this statement without fear of successful contradiction: Democrat or Republican, when you are broke, you are broke. When the note comes due at the bank, the banker is not interested in your political credentials. He wants the money. It is about time for some people to leave their hide-bound politics and start to think about some downright economics—how to pay the bills, how to feed the family, how to keep business, maintain the farm, or keep the job. If we think in those terms, we shall get on with our task of building a stronger economy.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. Later I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I heard the distinguished Senator's statement a little while ago with respect to criticism being made because there is an abundance of food. I believe the Senator will agree with me that evidently the present Secretary of Agriculture is dedicated to the creation of a scarcity of food. Does the Senator agree with that conclusion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say that the Secretary of Agriculture surely feels that the abundance which we have is unhealthy and undesirable. I must confess that as I look at his proposals it seems to me that he is relying upon what he calls the automatic workings of the marketplace, to give us just a little less than abundance, which would put us on the fringe of scarcity. That is the way to keep prices up.

Mr. KERR. I should like to have the Senator think for a moment about the situation which exists in this country today because of a little scarcity of coffee. Is the Senator aware of what a little scarcity of coffee is costing the American consumers this year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has put thoughts in my mind which are making my brain cells literally whirl. How right the Senator from Oklahoma is. The cost which the consumer has paid because of the coffee scarcity goes far beyond any program which might have been devised to help the coffee producers.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that the little scarcity in coffee will cost the American consumers not less than $1 billion this year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota was not aware of that figure.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator give us the benefit of what he thinks a little scarcity in the wheat crop, in the production of dairy products, in the corn crop, or in the production of other foods might cost the American consumers in 1 year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if the dairy farmers were to do what is sometimes done in other areas of American industry, and withhold their product or their labor from the market, as they did in the 1930's, the situation could become serious. As a boy I saw the ditches along our highways run white with milk as farmers turned over milk trucks, because the price of milk was too low. They could not take it to market and make any money. If the dairy farmers were to turn off the milk spigot, so to speak, everyone from the Secretary of Agriculture on down would be crying "Uncle, we have had enough." Prices would go up through the roof, and everybody would be crying for the product at any price. But our farmers are not that kind of people. Our farmers produce, and they expect to receive reasonable treatment from their Government. They expect to be allowed to produce at a fair price.

I have looked at the facts. The American consumer pays a smaller percentage of his earned income for food than any other consumer in the world, and he has a greater variety of food and more nutritious food. If we consider what the farmer receives for his product as compared with what industry gets for its products and what workers get for their wages, we see that the American farmer has not done too well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. As a basis for the question, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that in this discussion, in my judgment, he is making a great contribution toward providing vital, wholesome, and necessary information to all the people of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Senator that, according to the information available from the statistical departments of the Government, in June of 1951 the food index, or cost of food paid by the American consumer, was at a figure of 112.3. According to my information, the last report of the Department of Agriculture indicated that the cost of food to the American consumer in January 1954 was practically unchanged, or within less than one-half of one point of being the same as it was in June 1951. However, information from the same Department discloses that in January 1954 the American farmer received about 20 percent less for the food he sold than he received in June of 1951. On the basis of that information, is it not perfectly clear that the claim of the Secretary of Agriculture that rigid price supports, or fair prices to the farmer, penalize the consumer, is wholly without foundation, and in reality the perpetration of a fraud on the American people by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a sort of political-economic hogwash, if the Senator wishes my candid opinion.

I have before me some figures, contained in a letter written to Mr. Don S. Anderson, Acting Director of the Livestock and Dairy Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service in Washington, signed by the general manager of one of the largest dairy cooperatives in the State of Minnesota, the Cass-Clay Cooperative Creamery Association, representing thousands of small farmers, the salt of the earth. The name of the general manager is Charles Ommodt—a good Norse name. He has a few things to say to the acting director of the Livestock and Dairy Division. I think the Senator from Oklahoma would be interested in some of the statements made in this letter:

> For instance, permit me to point out to you that it takes a good hide to bring $2.50 today and still shoes are selling at $20 a pair. Farmers are selling their wool at 59 cents, yet they get about $2.75 out of a suit of clothes retailing up to $100.

Mr. KERR. That is a cowhide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A cowhide; yes. The price of it is $2.50.

Mr. President, nobody is fooling the farmers of America. The support price of wheat could be reduced 50 percent and Wheaties would not go down 50 percent. I used that example before and I repeat it. In the same way, Mr. President, the price support on oats could go down 50 percent, and oatmeal would still be sold at the same price at which it is being sold today. Why? Because more advertisements would be put in the newspaper in an attempt to sell more oatmeal. The farmer would not get more of the money. It would be paid to advertising agencies.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to follow up the discussion between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oklahoma. It seems to me that Mr. Benson has a pretty good hide, too, when he goes around the country and tells people that the consumers, who number 140 million, according to his figures, are the ones who have to pay for the subsidy, so-called, which is being paid to the farmers by the Government. He does not think that farmers are consumers, apparently. He does not seem to realize the fact that it is a pretty petty practice on his part to try to set up one part of the population against another.

Is it not correct to say that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, stated before the Committee on Agriculture that in the past 20 years $16 billion has been paid in subsidies to farmers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that statement has been made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, that is not correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He said that was the amount the Government had expended upon its price-support program and its agricultural program since 1933.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did he not include in that figure the loan programs connected with REA, rural telephones, FHA, and other activities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Including the work carried on by the Forest Service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the actual amount which has been paid to farmers in the past 20 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. About $1,027 million, or an average of 35 cents a person a year. God bless America, if we cannot afford to pay that much. It has cost 35 cents a person a year to put the agricultural economy of America, with fewer men on the farms, in a position to fight a war and to meet the conditions of a postwar period. Thirty-five cents a person a year is what it has cost for this so-called great outlay.

I say that the Secretary's Office—and I want to get this off my chest—if not the Secretary himself, has been laying down a barrage of propaganda to divide the farmers from city people. The effects of that propaganda are felt in every congressional office on the Hill. We are getting the information that a huge subsidy is being paid out from Washington at a terrible cost to the American people.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. President. I saw the report of the Secretary of the Treasury with reference to the stockpiles of goods, to which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] referred. In the report the Secretary of the Treasury evaluated the butter in storage at 38 cents a pound. The junior Senator from Minnesota is interested in a business. I say to my colleagues that if any businessman were to write off his inventory for tax purposes in the same manner in which the Secretary of the Treasury wrote off the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation he would be in jail.

There is not a businessman whose tax reports have not been examined as to how much he writes off for tax purposes on what he calls spoiled merchandise.

Mr. President, I started taking inventories when I was 11 years old, and I have been doing it for 32 years. I know what must be done in keeping figures for tax purposes and how much can be charged off for losses from depreciated merchandise. The Bureau of Internal Revenue will not permit any private merchant in America to write off his inventory as the Secretary of the Treasury has written off the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in violation of the law.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to repeat that statement. He did it in violation of the law. The law requires him to evaluate the stores on the basis of their true value, not on the basis of their adjusted value. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would remind the Senator from Minnesota that the law to which he has referred was enacted in 1938.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The practice to which he refers has been in vogue each year since that time, so far as I know.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. In some countries murder was practiced, but that did not make it legal.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably the law can stand reexamination and possibly revision. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has called attention to the high costs which the farmer must pay at the present time. I do not take it to

mean that the Senator is defending price controls. I am sure he is not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Vermont need not put such thoughts in my mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish the Senator would also include the extremely high prices on gasoline and oils which the farmer must pay, and which are contributory causes to the difficulties with which he is faced today.

I should like to make one other suggestion. I was interested in the discussion on economics between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for whom I have great admiration, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Minnesota. As background material I would refer the Senator from Minnesota to the speech made by the senior Senator from Illinois on Washington's birthday in 1951. It is one of the best explanations of how the United States got into the difficulties of inflationary prices I have ever heard given in the Senate. I give the Senator from Illinois full credit for it, and I hope each Member of the Senate will read that speech, because it is one of the best I have ever heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly concur in that statement. I recall the speech.

Mr. AIKEN. It explains to a very large extent the troubles, real or otherwise, which Members of Congress and the people of the country as a whole are experiencing today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may make a comment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the very kind words which the Senator from Vermont has to say about my speech of 3 years ago. It was not that good a speech. However, it did criticize the excessive buying by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department in unlimited quantities of Government bonds and thus laying the basis for credit and price expansion. I think it was a great mistake on the part of the Federal Reserve Board and on the part of the Treasury Department at that time.

It should be remembered, however, that within a month after the delivery of that speech—and I do not say that the speech was a major factor in any sense—the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury reversed their policy and adopted a policy of buying moderate quantities of Government bonds, not unlimited purchases.

It should be noted that from March 1951 to December 1952 the general price level remained approximately constant. During that period wholesale prices were falling and retail prices were rising. However the average of the two was almost precisely constant. Therefore we had virtually 20 months of price stability. That was a very real period of advance.

I believe that the attitude of the administration in saying that they checked inflation is not correct. Inflation had been checked for 20 months prior to the election. What the "New Look" did came in 2 or 3 stages.

In December, by what may well have been a process of osmosis, the Federal Reserve Board discontinued the purchase of Government bonds. The total quantity of active bank credits shrank by approximately $4 billion in the next 5 months, despite the fact that the index of production was rising. This helped to initiate a price decrease.

Furthermore, the Treasury raised the interest rate too fast and too far, jumping from 2¾ percent to 3¼ percent, with consequent restriction upon loans.

These policies helped to bear unfortunate fruit later on in the year. We do not maintain that the policies of the Democratic Party have always been perfect economically, but we do say that by March of 1951 relative stability had been obtained, and bank credit was not being inflated—it was rising at approximately the same rate at which production was increasing—the two keeping pace with each other.

What happened after the election was the adoption of a hard metal policy of undue restriction. In these matters it is important to avoid restriction, contraction, and deflation as it is to avoid inflation. The happy medium is the course to follow. But that has not been followed. If I may use a somewhat vulgar illustration, sometimes when we are suffering from an internal disorder we take an excessive dose of castor oil. Then, when we recover from that, we take an excessive dose of bismuth. We oscillate from one condition of internal difficulty to the other. Our Republican friends gave us a large dose of the wrong economics.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his very fine presentation and analysis of his address of 3 years ago and of his thoughts since that time. I believe some of us concurred with the Senator from Illinois. I recall that I listened with keen attention, and, I hope, with an open mind and sincere purpose, to the argument of the Senator, and I felt as he did, that there had to be an accord reached between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System. I noted that some of the political pundits and partisans who criticize those of us on this side of the aisle with reference to our views on fiscal policy tried to make it appear that we thought there should be no restrictions and that interest rates should be only at a nominal figure.

There is no evidence to support that description of our attitude or policy. We have felt that a good fiscal policy was of importance to the economy. We have felt that there should be restraints upon the price structure and the wage structure, and that in a period of declining production, declining employment, and declining consumer purchasing power, we might make adjustments more to liberalize credits and taxation. That would do more to keep this country on an even keel than would anything else. The public-works program should be just an addition to the fiscal policy.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and other Senators for their attention to our fiscal policy. I was delighted to hear the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] point out the fact that the President's economic report was prepared and had to be prepared, not by malicious intent, ahead of the date of its presentation. The facts upon which its conclusions are based are facts which had been gathered weeks and months prior to presentation.

The Council of Economic Advisers, to my mind, are very good, sound, able men. I think Mr. Burns and his two copartners are very eminent and learned men, and they were very careful in the economic report not to become too wedded to any one conclusion, recognizing that we live in a volatile period. I do not think we are doing a disservice when we suggest at times that there are symptoms which could lead to serious difficulty. If we have a friend who is not feeling well, whose eyes look rather glassy, whose complexion appears to be rather sandy, and who has a bit of palpitation of the heart, I do not think we are unkind to him to say, "Why do you not go to see a doctor?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does the Senator address his remarks to me? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not address them to the Senator from Illinois, but I wanted to talk to the most healthy-looking specimen in the Senate, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], if he, with his good health, is concerned about present conditions—of what economists must be thinking about the general economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of who gave rise to the terrible word "recession"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not. It is one of the many things I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was first referred to by Dr. Mitchell, the greatest expert on business cycles in the world. For many years he was the head of the Bureau of Economic Research, and he classified business cycles into four classes: Revival, prosperity, recession, depression. Thus the word "recession" became part of our standard terminology.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that the right-hand man to Dr. Mitchell and the one who later succeeded him as head of the Bureau of Economic Research is Dr. Burns, who is head of the Council of Economic Advisers? He is a very estimable gentleman. Therefore, when the Senator from Illinois used the word "recession," which later caused him to be accused of being a prophet of gloom and doom, he was merely using terminology started by the foremost authority on business cycles in the world and who is the present chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that anyone who starts to argue economics with the senior Senator from Illinois may feel that he had a bad night and did not realize what could happen to him, because the Senator from Illinois is one man with whom people might have a hard time in trying to dispute about economics.

I want to say, in all seriousness, that the Senator from Illinois, from his background of economics as both a practitioner and as a student and a scholar in that field, cited what he considered to be danger signs in our economic situation. The Senator did not say we were going to have a depression. He merely said there were signs of the times which indicated the necessity for corrective action, and he used the word "recession." I think he is to be commended. I believe there is a great deal of merit in that particular point of view. Go to any farm implement dealer in the State of Minnesota or in the State of Illinois, who has taken years and years of work to build up his business. He has extended his credit, and his inventory was heavy. He found his implements which were ready for delivery to consumers were not selling. Notes came due, and the implement dealer could not pay the notes, and he went out of business. Our automobile manufacturers can try to fool the people with their television programs, but the truth is that the automobile dealers all over the country have extra space filled with automobiles, not only 1954 models, but with some 1953 models.

We know that farmers buy more steel than do all the automobile manufacturers put together. They buy more petroleum products than does any other industry. They use more rubber than do all the automobile manufacturers put together, and they use more electricity than is used by Chicago, Houston, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. This is no time to be saying to them, "We will trim you for another 10 percent," when we see the farmer's share of the dollar coming down every year since 1951. In fact, it has gone down to 42 cents out of the consumer dollar.

We see real estate go down. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that farm assets were reduced at the rate of three-quarters of a billion dollars a month every month last year. There has been a $9 billion liquidation in farm assets. If there were a $2 billion liquidation in any other industry in America, we would be much concerned. How many times do we have to be hit on the head; how many times does disaster have to fall upon us before we begin trimming——

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] reminds me that I should correct my statement and say "pruning" instead of "trimming." I accept this expert husbandry advice.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator is as able an expert as there is in the Senate on the question of dairy production, prices, supply, and demand. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that the value of whole milk to the producer has declined drastically since June 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly am. I made a brief comment about that an hour or so ago.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota equally aware of the fact that the consumer today pays more for whole milk than he did in June 1951?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much aware of that fact. I have before me a letter from my good friend, Mr. Charles Ommodt, operator of a big creamery. He is a practical man. He has not had time to come to Washington to learn what is going on. He is talking to the folks back home. He operates a big cooperative creamery. He wrote a letter to Mr. Don S. Anderson, acting director of the Livestock and Dairy Division, Commodity Stabilization Service.

Those names are changed so often that I cannot remember which service we are speaking about. Mr. Ommodt said to Mr. Anderson:

> Or take a quart of milk. After a farmer pays transportation to the plant, he gets about 7½ cents for the milk which sells for 20 cents.

That is in Minnesota, where milk sells at retail for 20 cents. In some other parts of the country the consumer pays 25, 26, or 27 cents for milk.

The dairy farmers of the United States will be hurt by the reduction from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. While the reduction does not directly affect whole milk, it does so indirectly, through the effect the reduction will have on cheese, dried milk, butter, and similar products. I felt it was necessary that a voice of protest be raised in the Senate against this kind of action.

I wish to conclude by saying that, in my mind, the job of Congress is to make a most careful examination of all perishable commodities. We have a good, workable program for our storable commodities. We have never lost a dime on cotton; we have never lost money on corn, wheat, or any other storable commodities. We have a program which works. Yet the Secretary wants to tamper with it, although it works. We never had a better program. It has proved itself, both in peace and in war, to be a desirable program. But now it is found necessary to level it, or at least a big part of it, by 15 percent. We are taking that much off the safety valve.

I shall make another prediction on the floor of the Senate, without being an expert in these matters. With the very large surplus of corn in storage, the price of corn will be down next spring. By next spring there will be little pigs coming out of our ears, and the surplus of corn will disappear in a short time. The great surplus of corn which is being talked about will have become a thing of the past.

After that, there will be another problem to worry about. But first let us determine what is to be done with the perishable commodities.

The Soviet Union is firing one premier after another, liquidating its political commissars in succession. Why? Because the Soviet Union cannot produce food. The Soviet Union has produced a hydrogen bomb and has produced atomic bombs. The Soviet Union has 4 million men under arms. It plans to spend billions of dollars for defense. But there is one thing the Soviet Union has not learned how to do and that is to milk cows or to have enough cows to milk. The Soviet Union has not learned how to produce cereal grains and food fibers for a growing nation. The Soviet Union today stands literally on the brim of starvation in many of its areas because of the failure of its agricultural economy. Perhaps one of the reasons why the Soviet Union has not been more aggressive is that it remembers what Napoleon once said: that an army travels on its stomach. The Soviet Union is having serious problems—the problem of its scarcity of food, the problem of the failure of its farm people, the problem of the failure of its farm economy.

But, Mr. President, the United States is a Nation that has fewer men and women on the farms every year. This is a Nation which is growing at the rate of 2,700,000 persons every year, a Nation that, by 1975, will need another 100 million acres of cropland, or the equivalent thereof, under 1950 production standards, in order to feed its people.

This is a growing country. We have a great agricultural economy that has served us well. We have an agricultural commodity economy that produces great people, fine communities, country schools, consolidated schools, community churches, small villages and small cities, all of which are the backbone and hope of the social life and moral fiber of the United States.

We have an agricultural program designed to benefit this great group of people. We have provided for agricultural research, vocational education, soil conservation, farm credit, rural electrification, rural telephone programs, and farm price supports. I say that never has the Government of the United States done anything quite so well for such fine people as it has done in its agricultural program for America's farmers.

Therefore, I say that now the job is not to retard, but to go forward. The job is to see to it that we use the abundance that is ours for those who are in need. Our task should be to contemplate a little bit the tomorrows. Too often have we legislated for agriculture on an emergency basis. We need to have a long-range agricultural program, one that will give farmers some assurance for the days to come. If we do not do that, we are not going to get young people to go back to the farms. Why should young men and women go back to the farm lands, or go back to the dairying business, when they find that a Secretary of Agriculture can lower their prices 15 percent by a stroke of the pen? Not on your life.

Do you think, Mr. President, that any industrial worker in a union would take that? Do you think American business would take that? American business would come before Congress and protest. Are we to think that the great American transportaiton system would take that? The railroads of the country would go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and say that they had to have an increase in rates, and they would justify it on the basis of an increased overhead as compared to a fair, equitable profit. The private utilities would go before the Federal Power Commission and say they needed an adjustment of rates. The gas companies would do the same thing on the basis of equity

capital invested and a fair and reasonable return on the investment. Any business in America when it gets into real, serious trouble will come to Congress or the State legislatures and ask for fair and equitable treatment.

But here we see the breadbasket of the world, the hope of the world, as Lincoln said. The production of food and fiber is being played with to a point that hundreds and hundreds of people are becoming far more concerned about that than that we may mismanage our political affairs. The remedy will be of benefit, not only to ourselves, but to the world, and everyone in the world.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LIMIT YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGES IN DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT LEVELS

Contrary to the objectives of the Agricultural Act of 1949, milk producers in 1953 did not realize the support levels announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary announced price supports that were intended to reflect 90 percent of parity to the producers of manufacturing milk. Actually only 84 percent of parity was received, causing a loss of over $100 million to the producers of manufacturing milk alone, and around $200 million to the producers of all milk. The total drop in price for all milk sold from farms from 1952 to 1953 was 13.5 percent. The total reduction in income was $400 million, even though the volume of sales in 1953 was 5.4 percent above that in 1952. This severe drop in income has been a severe shock to dairy farmers and has put a severe strain on their ability to meet mortgage obligations.

Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority under the 1949 act to reduce announced supports from 90 percent of parity to as little as 75 percent of parity. When it is realized that for each 1 percent that supports or prices are lowered that dairy farm income may be lowered by $40 million the prospective results become staggering. From 1952 to 1953 average prices received by farmers, for each 100 pounds of milk equivalent sold, dropped from $4.71 to $4.08. If the Secretary elects to lower supports the full limit of his authority, then the support level would be dropped the equivalent of another 62 cents per hundredweight. In that case dairy farmers might realize only $3.56 for all milk sold during the 1954–55 marketing year. Then, if 103 billion pounds are marketed, income would be lowered from $4.6 billion in 1952 for 97.7 billion pounds of milk to $3.56 billion. Thus we would have the devastating paradox of 5 percent larger supplies bringing one-fourth less money.

Such a development would hardly be in line with point 6 of the President's message on agriculture of January 11, 1954, in which he stated:

"In keeping with the policy of gradual transition, the Secretary of Agriculture will use his authority under the Agricultural Act of 1949 to insure that year-to-year variation in price-support levels will be limited."

Neither would such a development be in line with the 1949 act and recommendations for legislation by the President which insure that changes in price supports for basic commodities and certain nonbasic commodities shall be limited to definite steps and rules.

For these reasons the National Milk Producers Federation believes the 1949 act should be amended to provide for limitations on year-to-year changes in price-support levels for dairy products. For this purpose the attached amendment is proposed:

"The price-support level for milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat for any year shall not be reduced by more than 5 percent of the actual price intended to be reflected to farmers for the preceding marketing year, except that such limitation does not apply to reductions due exclusively to adjustments in the parity index.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the parity percentage level at which price supports for milk and butterfat and the products of milk and butterfat are provided shall not be less than the parity percentage level at which rigid mandatory price supports are provided for the basic commodities." (To be added at the end of subsec. 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the United States Senate is truly a great deliberative body. There are, of course, occasions when it is not so deliberative. Discussions may not be as deep as the sea on occasion, but they are, at least, as wide as the 48 States.

I have been entranced this afternoon by what started as a protestation of the order or policy announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. It was not very long before that discussion encompassed the Federal Reserve System, the Economic Report, the Soviet Union, high price supports, utilities, and everything else under the sun. So now I propose to disturb the equanimity of the Senate for a moment or two with a fact or two. Facts as we know, are stubborn things, but now and then it is necessary to advance or present them.

If memory serves me correctly, in the year 1949 the United States Senate was under Democratic jurisdiction, so to speak. In the year 1949 the very distinguished former Senator from Tennessee, one whom I always counted as a friend, the Honorable Kenneth McKellar, was the President pro tempore of this body. If I remember correctly, in the year 1949 the very distinguished Texan, who presided often as Speaker of the House of Representatives when I was a Member there, was the Presiding Officer of that body. There was a Democratic majority in this body and there was a Democratic majority in the other body. It was in the month of October 1949 when the Senate and the House were Democratic, and when the incumbent in the White House had identity with the Democratic Party, that the Agricultural Act of 1949 was placed on the books. So, Mr. President, the act of 1949 is no piece of Republican villainy; it was a Democratic measure. The act of 1949 was not a concoction of a Republican Congress; it was the fruit of a Democratic Congress.

I bring to the attention of the Senate a section of the act which was passed in a Democratic Congress, section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949. If I can understand and if I can read the English language, this is what it states:

The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

I may say to my amiable friend from Minnesota, that is the act of 1949 which was put upon the statute books of the Nation by the administration and by the party of the Senator from Minnesota, and which was signed by the President of the party of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows that the act was placed on the books after a very hard fight in the Senate. The mandatory price supports on commodities, with regard to which the Senator has read, were placed on the statute books only after there had been a long and bitter struggle on the floor of the Senate. Incidentally, there was a majority of some 62 percent of Democratic Members who succeeded in putting the law on the books.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know about the vigor of the struggle which took place on the floor of the Senate, because I was not a Member of the Senate at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, I do know the Congress was in session that year for 290 days, and there was an abundant opportunity for a Democratic Congress to agree upon an agricultural policy. The statute to which I have referred was placed on the books.

Mr. President, that section is still the law of the United States. That section is now being administered by a Republican Secretary of Agriculture. If there is anything wrong with the law, one should look for the seed in another administration besides this, because the law has been on the books for the past 5 years.

Mr. President, I bring again to the attention of the Senate the language of the act which states that the Secretary of Agriculture shall support, at from 75 percent and not to exceed 90 percent, as the Secretary shall deem necessary, in order to assure an adequate supply. That is the only criterion in the law for the support of dairy products. With respect to other commodities, 7 or 8 criteria are provided; with respect to dairy products, there is established only one criterion, and that is the question of an adequate supply.

I think it necessary, in the interest of fact rather than fancy, to consider the subject of supply. It was stated on the floor of the Senate a year ago that there existed no surplus of staggering dimensions. I would rather let the facts speak for themselves as to precisely what the inventory stocks are, because if we are going to deal with a very important policy question, we should know the facts.

First of all, I bring to the attention of the Senate what the stocks of dairy products under Government control were on February 20, 1953, 1 month after Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture. At that time there were

in the hands of the Government a little more than 60 million pounds of butter, a little more than 22 million pounds of cheese, and a little more than 66 million pounds of nonfat milk solids. Those stocks were in existence 1 month after the new Secretary of Agriculture took office.

If one were to measure those items in terms of milk equivalents, one would have a figure of 44 million pounds of milk equivalents. That was a year ago.

I now call the attention of the Senate to what the situation was as of the 10th of February 1954, which is a rather current figure. There are presently on hand 270,559,320 pounds of butter.

That is a lot of butter. If the per-capita consumption is 26 pounds a person, as it was estimated to be for 1953, that amount of butter would feed 10 million people for a year, if my arithmetic is correct.

There are presently on hand 282,040,354 pounds of cheese.

That looks like a Rocky Mountain of cheese in the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In addition, there are on hand 469,558,000 pounds of nonfat dried milk.

If ever I saw a mountain of cheese and other dairy products, and everything that goes along with it, Mr. President, that is indeed a mountain.

It was not so about a year ago; but see what we have accumulated since that time. As against the equivalent of about 1,044,000,000 pounds of milk, we have today the equivalent of 8 billion pounds of milk. And that belongs to the people of the United States of America.

The law—not a Republican law, Mr. President, but a Democratic law—says the Secretary shall support prices at not to exceed 90 percent and at a minimum of 75 percent, as the Secretary determines to be necessary, in order to assure an adequate supply.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a conscience. He is a very able and devout man, and a patriot and a citizen along with it; and I admire his courage to the end for standing up on the rock of conviction.

I have read the mandate in the law. What is an adequate supply? It is for the Secretary of Agriculture to determine. In view of the supply at the present time, when it is urged that the Secretary continue to buy at a 90-percent level, what are we to say to the consumers and to the taxpayers of the United States of America? It is their money with which these surpluses are being purchased, and such money has to be reflected in an appropriation or an expenditure bill which will constantly throw the budget out of gear. That is the supply situation. The Secretary of Agriculture, in conscience, must make a determination of what is an adequate supply. When he reaches that point, he has no other course to follow, in my judgment, than to reduce the price-support level if he is going to conform to both the spirit and the letter of the law.

I think I can speak with knowledge because, after all, the northern section of the State of Illinois is given over to huge dairy farms, and cheese plants may be found all over the State. So I have some interest in the price of dairy products, and I try to keep up with the matter. I know that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture for an opinion as to what he, the Solicitor, thinks is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture under the law. The Solicitor has indicated the following:

> Unless the Secretary can conscientiously determine that a support level of 75 percent will not assure an adequate supply, it is his obligation under the statute to fix the support level at 75 percent.

You will note, Mr. President, that in all the welter of discussion here, the facts have not been brought forth. But people are going to ask about the facts someday.

This situation reminds me a little of a fellow who saw an automobile accident, and later was put on the stand during the trial of the case in court. Counsel asked him, "Did you see the accident?"

The witness replied, "Yes, sir."

Then counsel asked, "How far were you from the point of the collision when it happened?"

The witness replied without hesitation, "Twenty-two feet nine and one-half inches."

Counsel looked at the court and at the jury, and then said to the witness, "Mr. Smart Aleck, how did you know it was that close?"

The witness replied, "Well, when it happened, I took out a tape measure and measured it because I knew some fool lawyer would ask me that question." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, we are going to be asked some questions. Mere words will not suffice as answers; the facts will be necessary.

So, first, here is the act, passed by a Democratic Congress. In the second place, here is an opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, as to what is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law. The Solicitor's opinion is that—

> Unless the Secretary can conscientiously determine that a support level of 75 percent will not assure an adequate supply, it is his obligation under the statute to fix the support level at 75 percent.

Mr. President, there is the whole story.

I suppose I can amplify the matter somewhat, from some other figures; and I think that would be wise, because the country should have the figures.

The Government's inventory, which means the taxpayers' inventory, because it is their money which must be used, and it is their credit which must be pledged and hypothecated to purchase these commodities, on April 1, 1953, was as follows: 122,500,000 pounds of butter, 74,500,000 pounds of cheese, 169,300,000 pounds of nonfat dried milk.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois state again the date of those figures?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It is April 1, 1953.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois read the figures again?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Butter, 122,500,000 pounds; cheese, 74,500,000 pounds; nonfat dried milk, 169,300,000 pounds.

Whole milk equivalent—if the preceding figures are expressed in terms of whole milk—3,195,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are rich in dairy products. These belong to them.

Some purchases have been made since that time, and I shall state them for the RECORD: 264 million pounds of butter have been purchased. O Mr. President, what a mountain of succulent, golden bread-spread that really is!

Two hundred and forty-six million pounds of cheese have been purchased.

Mr. President, I am quite a fancier of cheese. I suppose that is because I was brought up that way in a small town in Illinois. I like all kinds of cheese.

So I know we are not going to run out of cheese for a little while, because we have bought 264 million pounds of it.

Then we read that we bought 490 million pounds of non-fat dried milk.

What is the total, when expressed in terms of whole milk equivalent? The total is 7,740,000,000 pounds.

Of course some of it has been sold. I can supply those figures for the RECORD.

For utilization, as it is called, 121,000,000 pounds of butter; 43,600,000 pounds of cheese; 198,000,000 pounds of non-fat dried milk.

But the inventory, Mr. President—in other words, what we had on hand—as of February 1, 1954, is truly staggering. The inventory, which was purchased with money from the Federal Treasury—which, after all, is the same thing as issuing debentures and notes and other obligations which the Treasury must buy in order to supply the Commodity Credit Corporation with funds—is the equivalent of more than 8 billion pounds of whole milk.

In the face of that situation, what is the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under the law? By the way, Mr. President, I repeat that law was written, not by a Republican Congress, but by a Democratic Congress, in October, 1949, and in the same month it was signed by a Democratic President. What conscientious administrator, could read that mandate and reach any conclusion other than the one reached by Secretary Benson?

That is the whole story. Of course he can go on; he can continue to use the credit of the Nation, and he can continue to pile up an even greater mountain of surpluses. But in that event what kind of caustic criticism would there be from the people of the United States?

Mr. President, the time has arrived to come to grips with this matter.

I may say the Secretary of Agriculture certainly has given consideration to the question of future production. I have before me some figures to indicate what the production was in other years. There is no need to encumber the RECORD with them at the moment; but the fact of the matter is that, first of all, mild

winters and good pasturage had something to do with the increased production; and, in the second place, when the drought came to the Southwest, it was a kind of intuitive notice to the farmers in the Northern area that perhaps they had better hold on and continue to milk their dairy cows. So those were the factors which finally led up to an increase in dairy production. As I recall, in the last year it was nearly 4 billion pounds, when expressed in terms of fluid milk, over what it had been before.

Mr. President, with that kind of production staring agriculture in the face, with a mountain of cheese and butter and nonfat milk solids already in the inventory of the people of the United States, what other action could the Secretary of Agriculture take?

That is the whole story in a nutshell. If we are going to get back to a durable basis, instead of buying butter, to be stored in caves and wherever else storage space can be found, and, instead of buying cheese and storing it wherever storage space can be found, let us get this program geared to a flexible basis, which is what existing law calls for. Then we shall have made real progress in the direction of a more stable agriculture.

Mr. President, I admire the courage of the Secretary of Agriculture for standing up to his responsibility under the law, no matter what kind of caustic criticism may have been heaped upon him.

I am sure production will continue as time goes on. So this problem must be solved by some durable remedies.

Mr. President, it is a fact that the whole general farm problem was not solved in the 20 years of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Some question has been raised about unemployment. I wish to remind our friends on the other side of the aisle that from 1933 to 1940, inclusive—a period of approximately 8 years—and after 8 years of expenditures, there were still 9½ million unemployed in the United States. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle talk now as if 2½ million or 3 million unemployed represent a terrible situation.

President Eisenhower has been in office only 14 months. I think he has done a great and resolute job. If we give him a little more time, I believe he will swing the country out of its difficulties, because I think the people of the Nation have confidence in his soundness and in his determination to assure prosperity in the United States, within the framework of a free, competitive system.

My friends on the other side of the aisle had 8 years to do so, but they did not reduce the unemployment figure very far, for if my recollection of the figures for 1940 is correct—and I am drawing entirely upon my recollection—there were still 9½ million out of work.

The farm program was not solved. It was merely side-tracked by the war. Put an army in Europe and all over the world, and what happens? It must be fed. Our civilization moves out with our Army. Everything goes with it. We want our soldiers to have the best. The home folks must also be fed. When our allies cannot smite the soil and make it produce, they must be fed also.

So the task of feeding the world, feeding our allies, feeding our own people, and feeding an army, which at one time put 18 million persons in uniform, placed a tremendous burden upon the agricultural plant of the United States.

The war is over, thank God. But let no one take credit for solving the farm problem for a little while. Let no one take credit for a solution which is built upon a graveyard prosperity, and upon considerations of young blood. No matter what my political tag might be, I would never undertake to claim the credit for a prosperity built upon the broken bodies of young Americans all over the world. I think a sense of shame would prevent me from doing so.

Production for our allies, for our own country, and for our Army necessarily diminished. Thank God, our boys are coming home. Most of the countries in the world, and the majority of the population in most of the countries of the world, address themselves to agriculture. It would be strange indeed if they did not start producing, so that they can pay off their debts and have something to sell in the markets of the world, to enable them to procure raw materials and other things which they need.

Exports will be diminished. The needs of the military are diminished; and the chickens are coming home to roost. It is just that simple. In an adjustment someone is hurt.

I see my old friend, the former Governor of West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], seated on the other side of the aisle. I was in his State the other day. I said to the people of that State, "We have developed a state of mind in which we have become accustomed to high prices, high wages, inflation, broken bodies, a disregard for young blood, and the purchase and procurement of the instrumentalities of death." How careless we were. Then suddenly we got the idea that, having sent our people and the other peoples of the world through the valley of the shadow of fear and blood and disaster, somehow we could escape the consequences.

Long ago there was a philosopher on the eastern seaboard by the name of Ralph Waldo Emerson. If ever there was an unchallenged truth, it is the law of compensation. There is a great truth that has never been challenged. It is the law of action and reaction, which Newton discovered, perhaps in an orchard, a long time ago.

How can we tear the economic and social fabric of a country apart and escape payment of the bill? How can we send young people down the road to Armageddon and not pay the bill? Bless you, Governor, if I thought we could escape entirely without economic hurt or pain I would resign my seat in the Senate this afternoon. The law of action and reaction hold good not only in the physical field, but in the moral domain as well. Long ago St. John the Divine wrote a great and profound truth when he said, in the Revelation:

> How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?

That is good gospel, JOHN BRICKER. It is good politics, and good economics. Yet we indulge in frothy talk and persiflage as though we could escape paying the bill. It would be strange indeed if those who planted the seed could escape paying the bill.

I say to my Democratic friends, "Do not throw such stones at us. You put the law on the statute books. A Republican Secretary of Agriculture is only enforcing the law which you placed upon the statute books. Now you quarrel about it, because circumstances and conditions have developed because of which we have butter running out of our ears and cheese running out of our ears when butter is not. We also have a surplus of nonfat milk solids."

That is the story. I do not wish to be too unkind. I know that an election is coming in 1954. I know that some things must be said for the record. But, Mr. President, the record, based upon fact, will be made, and I intend to make it as we go along, not for reasons of narrow provincialism and partisanship, but because I believe it is a necessary service to the country to make sure, in an hour when they may be some dislocation, that all the facts are known, for, if economic crucifixion is on the way, I remind our Democratic friends that we all will go down the drain together. It will not be a case of crucifying a political party. That was not the case in 1931, when there was a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. That President interviewed more than 165 Members of Congress. He came to Congress hat in hand. If anyone wishes to get the facts, they are in the record for all to see. The Republican President pleaded with Members of Congress.

A man from my own State, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, was the majority leader in the House of Representatives. He was my congressional neighbor. Anyone who is interested can look in his biography and see what he said to Gilbert Haugen. He said, "I do not intend to ask for favorable consideration for the President's program. I do not intend to ask the committees for favorable reports. We intend to beat him."

They did beat him. He was a great statesman. While they were doing that, they did something more. They crucified the country by failing to give the President an opportunity and the necessary weapons and the instrumentalities with which to lift the country out of its distress, which was caused by the inflow of depressive forces from all over the world.

That is only a reminder. I am speaking now as a citizen, rather than a Republican. I want to be sure that this country will not go down the drain. I will not chide anyone for talking about a recession. That is his own business. I try to be as restrained in my language as I can.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. But may the Lord help me never to lose sight of the greater objective, which comes before partisanship, or before any narrow concept which may be uttered on this floor. That greater objective is the health and vital-

ity of all the people of the United States. It transcends every party consideration.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana knows nothing of the program which might have been before the Congress in 1931. He was not here at that time. However, he would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he can point to any legislation which the present administration or the Secretary of Agriculture has requested, which would actually benefit the farmers, which has been refused by the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Speaker speaking of 1931 or the present time?

Mr. LONG. I am talking about the present time, of course.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Democrats placed this law on the statute books. The Secretary of Agriculture has the duty of enforcing it. Was the Senator present when I read the language of section 201 (c)?

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator realizes that he is not answering my question. My question is this: What proposal has the administration—either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture—made which would enable the farmer to get along better, but which Congress has refused to enact into law? I know of no opportunity that we have had to vote favorably upon any measure which would benefit the farmers. I know of no such measure with respect to which the Democratic side of the aisle has turned the administration down. Can the Senator point to one?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid my friend does not correlate my statement with the statement made on the floor by the very amiable and distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. He was taking the Secretary apart for announcing that, beginning April 1 of this year, the price support on dairy products will be reduced to 75 percent. Section 201 (c) was placed upon the statute books by the Democrats. That law was signed by the President on the 31st of October 1949. If I remember my contemporary history correctly, that was a President from the State of Missouri.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to read it for the edification of my friend from Louisiana, but I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is interested in any measure which will genuinely help the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Louisiana is familiar with the legislative processes of this great deliberative body. It was sometime in January that the President delivered his state of the Union message. Within the past few days a bill has been introduced and is now in the Committee on Agriculture. Hearings are under way. My friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] makes the point that, in view of that fact, the Secretary of Agriculture should have done nothing. What about the law? What about the Secretary's conscience? What about the criterion in the law which says that he shall support not in excess of 90 percent or lower than 75 percent, depending upon what he determines is necessary in order to assure an adeqate supply?

Suppose the Senator from Louisiana were presiding over the Department of Agriculture, with 250 million pounds of butter running out of his ears, and the amount increasing day by day, what action would he take? Would he buy more butter and raise still higher this golden mountain?

The Solicitor of the Agricultural Department told the Secretary there was a mandate in the law. I believe it is a mandate; and if I were in the position of the Secretary, I would have done as he has done.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The question I had in mind was that there has been criticism even by the Secretary of Agriculture himself of the present agricultural law. Beef cattle declined as low as 50 percent of parity or less last year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after Congress adjourned, stated that the law was not adequate. Yet he waited a year without asking for any changes in the law.

I have heard of no request for a change in the law which would genuinely help those who are raising beef cattle.

If the Secretary of Agriculture is not satisfied with the law as it relates to butter or other agricultural products, he should send us a recommendation as to what would help to correct the situation.

In the main the proposals I have heard are proposals for a so-called flexible price support program, rather than a proposal which would give full parity of income to the farmers. I understand the pledge made by the Senator's party last year, was that the farmers would receive 100 percent full parity income.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from Louisiana that I do not quarrel about the section of the law I have just read. The Senator from Louisiana is quarreling about it because the Secretary has put it into effect. When the mountain of surplus gets so high, what shall the Secretary do, except to invoke the provisions which were written into the law? I believe he is doing the right thing. How else are we ever to gear supply to demand?

I do not quarrel about it. It is from the other side of the aisle, that the Secretary has been taken to task. It is from there he receives protests because he has enforced a very sensible provision of the law.

Mr. LONG. I am not quarreling about that particular provision of the law. The point I make is that if the administration is not satisfied with the law on the statute books and if it feels the law is inadequate to provide for the well being of the farmers, it should recommend provisions which will help us do better. However, no revision has been requested which would insure farmers a greater parity income. If such proposals are sent to Congress I shall support them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Secretary of Agriculture is not quarreling about that particular provision in the law. If he needs some added authority it will be along the line of somehow expanding the consumptive use of the surplus commodities which are stored up in the country.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois was referring to the time during the 30's when the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives allegedly were not cooperative with the then President of the United States, who was a Republican. The only point I wish to make is that the same situation does not obtain today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no. My friend from Louisiana probably was not in the Chamber during the very interesting colloquy that took place a short time ago. It reminded me of the little ditty:

"The time has come," the walrus said, "to talk of many things:
"Of shoes—and ships—and ceiling wax—
"Of cabbages—and kings."

From cabbages and kings we went into the Federal Reserve Board, the price of hides, the unemployment situation, and a great many other subjects. It had all started out as a protest against the order of the Secretary of Agriculture which will go into effect on April 1.

I confined myself to that order, because I do not want the RECORD to be confused. I want the facts to be fully known.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is aware of the fact that the present program with respect to dairy products which is now in the law has remained in the law during the present administration. Is it not a fact that last April the Secretary of Agriculture could have reduced the support price and made it lower than 90 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly he could have reduced it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course he could.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, wait a minute. I want to be sure that my friend has all the facts. Did the Senator from Louisiana see the inventory position we had a year ago as compared with today? Expressed in terms of fluid milk, we have 8 billion pounds in the inventory today, as compared with 1,044,000,000 pounds a year ago. That is the difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, a little while after he was nominated for the position which he now holds, I asked him why it was that he did not make the support price less than 90 percent. He said he had been pressured into not doing it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from Louisiana forgets the whole purpose of the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the purpose to have the Secretary pressured into taking action or not taking action?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The support price could have been set between 75 percent and 90 percent. The mountain of butter to which the Senator from Illinois has referred would not be so high, if only the Secretary had exercised the right he had under the law to make it less than 90 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only question is, When we get a mountain of it on our hands shall we use a flexible provision or not? The burden of the discussion this afternoon was that the law should not be used now.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the mountain of butter and cheese and dried milk now in surplus was created under a law which has been recommended by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. No one quarrels about it. What we are trying to do is this: We say the law is all right and that that section is all right. We say, let the Secretary use it. But the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] protests when the Secretary of Agriculture undertakes to use it now.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to tell my friend from Illinois that the Secretary could have used the law last April, but he did not see fit to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did not have to use it last April.

Mr. ELLENDER. He did use it in another direction. He made the support price 90 percent. He had to make a declaration prior to April 1 of last year, and he made it 90 percent, when he could have made it 75 percent or 80 percent or 85 percent. In answer to a question by me he said he was pressured into doing it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, well——

Mr. ELLENDER. We have the flexible law on the statute books now, and we can see how it works with respect to butter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not quarreling. The quarrel comes from the other side of the aisle. If I misstate the fact, let the Senator from Minnesota stand in his place and deny it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota will soon stand in his place and not only deny it but disprove it. I hope the Senator from Illinois will remain in the Chamber to hear my denial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois will be here. However, if I can hear and understand the English language, if the Senator from Minnesota did not take the Secretary of Agriculture to task this afternoon for issuing his order, then I am a Chinaman and I do not understand the English language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is not a Chinaman and he understands the English language. If the Senator from Minnesota had not taken the Secretary to task he would have felt derelict in his responsibility.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I have only started, and the Secretary of Agriculture will have more to come from me, and the Senator from Illinois may share in the blessings.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a confession, Mr. President. The Senator from Minnesota admits, of course, that that is what he was thinking. So I simply cite the record as a fact and I surrender the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, no one enjoys listening to the Senator from Illinois more than does the junior Senator from Minnesota. The Senator from Illinois is a brilliant speaker. He has a capacity of persuasion which is second to none. For the facts he has available, he makes a presentable case.

I should like to add a few comments which may be of some help to my distinguished colleagues, and also serve as some semblance of inspiration to the Secretary of Agriculture.

We have heard a great deal of debate this afternoon. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said it has covered everything from ships to sealing wax, and even the depression of the 1930's. I noticed that the Senator covered the 12 long years from 1920 to 1933 in approximately a split second. He commented upon the condition of the country from 1933 to 1940, and upon the fact that after those 7 years there were still some 8½ million unemployed persons. Then the number went to 9½ million in the next paragraph—anyway, to 9 million persons unemployed. But I would remind the Senator from Illinois that after 12 years of his party's leadership this country was prostrated, and the fact that the Democratic administration raised it up even to its knees was a feat second to none.

The Senator from Illinois has commented upon the fact that we on this side of the aisle are disturbed because there are 3 million persons unemployed. I am happy that the other side admits there are 3 million unemployed. The last figure I have seen issued by the Government was 2,800,000. In 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt took over, there were 15 million persons unemployed. The mess that was talked about was at least not an economic mess.

The Senator from Illinois makes a great point about the fact that we have gone into war and have built prosperity upon the terrible destruction of war. Other nations have collapsed because of war. Other agricultural economies have been destroyed because of war. Our country has not been destroyed. Our agricultural economy met the task of war and its responsibilities and came out strong with a modernized agriculture, with soil being rebuilt, with electricity on the farms, and with greater production and greater income. It is a tribute to the farmer that he went ahead with the program, with a great capital investment on his part, knowing that he had a friendly government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. We took several million returning servicemen and found jobs for them at a time when the war industries were closing down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. He brings out a pertinent fact.

The Senator from Illinois chastised me because I stood on the floor of the Senate and rebuked the Secretary of Agriculture for pulling out the props from under dairy farmers. The Secretary did not need to do that. The Senator says—and I use his own figures, which I took down rather carefully—that on February 20, 1953, there were 60 million pounds of butter, 22 million pounds of cheese, and 62 million pounds of nonfat milk solids. That was the surplus, above an adequate supply, which the Government had purchased under the 90-percent-of-parity program which had been in existence for quite a while.

Then the Senator from Illinois pointed out that on April 1, 1953, just 24 hours after the Secretary of Agriculture announced the continuation of 90 percent of parity for dairy products, to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] referred, there were 122,500,000 pounds of butter, 74½ million pounds of cheese, and 169 million pounds of dried milk solids.

If the Secretary of Agriculture, on March 31, 1953, with all that surplus, could find an attorney in the Department of Agriculture who would advise him to continue price support at 90 percent, he could have found one in 1954.

The Senator from Illinois has selected a very feeble rod and reed upon which to rest his argument, on the basis of an adequate supply. There was more than an adequate supply at that time. If the Secretary was basing his judgment on adequate supply, he was doing an illegal act in 1953.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of a leading newspaper in my section of the country, from which I should like to read a paragraph with reference to certain addresses given in Minnesota in 1952. It says at the top:

IKE AND ADLAI OUTLINE FARM PROGRAMS—EISENHOWER CALLS FOR 100 PERCENT OF PARITY; STEVENSON SUPPORTS DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S PLANK

Dwight D. Eisenhower made his bid for the important farm vote today with a plan which he said would guarantee present price supports for another 2 years, and then would lead to higher prices for the farmers.

He called for a wider range of farm-crop supports including "greater protection" for producers of perishable products such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables.

Eisenhower said that farmers' returns must be boosted from the present 90 percent of parity to a full 100 percent—but in ways that would "minimize Government control and protect farmers' independence."

"All I know of farmers convinces me," he said, "that they would rather earn their share than to have it as a Government handout.

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income," Eisenhower said, "and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity."

Mr. President, I hope it has been noted that the Republican candidate referred to greater production of perishable commodities, such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. He called not for 90 percent of parity, but for 100 percent, and he said he would continue 90 percent for the next 2 years. The President of the United States kept his word. When it became known in this Capital that the Secretary of Agriculture was going to reduce price supports, the President of the United States saw to it that he kept his word.

Mr. President, it appears to me that with a little programing and planning we would not need to find ourselves in this situation.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois indicates that the only thing we can do is to buy butter. We have had a full year within which to figure out

something else. I suggest that last year when Mr. Benson authorized 90 percent of parity, the record will reveal that he called upon the dairy industry and upon his Department to figure out a better program, but after long study the Secretary of Agriculture came up with exactly what the Senator from Illinois is now criticizing, namely, the statutory language in the present law as amended and as added to the Aiken Act of 1948. In other words, the amendments of 1949 with relation to dairy price supports. This is what the President now suggests. Therefore, I ask this question: Are the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture saying that all we are going to have is 75 percent of parity?

The Eisenhower proposals to this Congress called for a continuation of flexible price supports of 75 to 90 percent on dairy products. In fact, the language of the President indicated there is no need of a change. I think it is about time the farmers find out immediately whether they are going to get 75, 90 or 100 percent. I did not write these stories. I did not write the headlines. The name of the junior Senator from Minnesota is not on them.

I say the farm people were told as follows:

He called for a wider range of farm-crop supports including "greater protection" for producers of perishable products such as meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables.

I have a copy of the speech, so we need not look at the press reports. I ask Senators to listen to this:

September 6. Kasson, Minn.

Fourth, we must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

The moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan? What happened to the moral program that came to Congress? We surely got the bankruptcy cleaned up, and the situation became very moral all at once.

If the wool growers could stand a little of that moral bankruptcy and get 90 percent of parity, perhaps other producers also can stand a little of it.

There are 1 or 2 other gentle observations I wish to make. Does the flexible price-support program mean it will be the minimum figure? I noticed that the President, in sending to Congress his program with respect to other agricultural commodities, says that there will not be any sudden drops in farm income; it will be in easy stages. The program will be a modernized parity formula, which will not become effective all in 1 year; it is to be extended. The President makes it very clear that as to corn, wheat, and cotton, there will be no sudden drop in the price-support program.

Yet now a group of American farmers, representing the backbone of American agriculture, are given a 15-percent clobber right over the head, all in one fell swoop. I say that is not equity. I say it represents a loss of from $500 million to $600 million a year in cash income to American farmers.

The question has arisen as to the mountains of surpluses. I am interested in knowing why the Senator from Illinois did not comment on the reduced budget for the school lunch program. The school lunch program budget is $15 million less than it was last year. If the Senator from Illinois wants to do something about the mountains of surpluses, let him advocate a school lunch program of a couple of hundred million dollars a year, which this country can well afford. There are children in our schools who need the food. The health of our people is as important as is any other aspect of our social life.

The Senator from Illinois points out that we have enough dairy products to feed 10 million people. That is exactly what I have recommended we should start doing. We have 4½ million people of old age. I should like to see some United States Senator try to get along on $35 or $45 a month. We have in this country 4½ million people who are receiving less than $50 a month on which to live. They cannot buy butter; they cannot buy milk. They do not live; they subsist.

Even though Congress extended an additional $5 a month for old-age assistance, the actual welfare payments we give to our citizens during the course of a year represent a puny, paltry amount. What about the aged, dependent people, the blind, the deaf, and the disabled? There are almost 9½ million of them. With a little imagination, we could get something done to help them. It would not bankrupt the United States of America; in fact, it would enrich the Nation.

Other things could be done, too. New means of marketing and new means of distribution could be found. The dairy industry itself presented two plans that I know of to the Department of Agriculture. Neither one of them was accepted; in fact, neither one was given public discussion to any degree.

I am simply saying, let us stop trying to see who gets the best of the other person in the argument here. It is wonderful for Senators to argue about this question, but I ask my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, what about the $600 million loss of income to the dairy farmers of the United States? What is his program for restoring 100 percent of parity? The Democrats did not promise that. We were out-promised 10 percent the last time. We were out-bid on the hustings.

The photostatic copies of the statements to which I have addressed myself prove that to be so. It was said that 90 percent was not sufficient; that 100 percent was the goal. It was said that 90 percent of parity would be maintained for 2 years to come.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have followed the argument of the Senator from Minnesota with a great deal of interest. I think he is making a good case and is making an honest appraisal.

We hear a great deal said these days about the flexible price support program. Of course, because of the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, dairy products have suffered a decline in price supports. It is my understanding that the President in his message, speaking of price supports of from 75 percent to 90 percent, referred to the wool industry, in which I am very much interested, because the people of my State depend to a certain extent upon the growing of wool. The President has come up with what might be considered to be a counterpart of the old Brannan plan. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember it well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Minnesota remember how the Republicans disliked it? They did not think a two-price system was worth anything. But what has President Eisenhower suggested as a means of alleviating the critical wool situation in the United States? He said, in effect, that the sheepman should sell his wool in the marketplace for what the wool would bring. Then the Government, out of revenue derived from the imposition of a tax on the importation of foreign wool, would pay the sheep grower 90 percent of parity for his wool.

Why should there be discrimination? I believe the sheep grower should get 90 percent of parity, and, if possible, 100 percent. I think the small cattleman should, too. But I believe the dairy farmer is entitled to it just as much as those who produce the six basic crops.

If I may go a little further, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota mentioned earlier this afternoon that subsidies paid by the Government to the farmers over a 20-year period amounted to a little in excess of $1 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell the Senate and the people of the United States how much in the way of subsidies business has received during the past 20 years, or merely during the past year?

Magazine publishers, newspaper publishers, those who build ships and who build and fly planes all receive subsidies. Why not make a comparison. Mr. Benson seems to be setting off the farm element as against the rest of the population. Let us try to determine exactly what the Government is paying in the form of subsidies, and how much business is getting. Let me suggest that we see how much business has received in subsidies, not for the past 20 years, but for the last year. How does the figure compare with what the farmers have received over the past 20 years?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some time ago, in the month of September, I received from the Bureau of the Budget, the executive agency of the Government having to do with such matters, official reports setting forth certain figures with respect to what are known as special services to economic groups.

From these reports I find that agriculture received $463 million in 1952; $547 million estimated in 1953; and $2,857,000,000 for a 5-year total, from 1949 through 1953.

Business received $1,041,000,000 in 1952; $1,018,000,000 estimated in 1953; and $4,430,000,000 for the 5-year total.

Labor received $200 million in 1952; $206 million estimated in 1953; and $1,006,000,000 for the 5-year total.

These are not my figures; they are figures supplied by the Bureau of the Budget. They have been made a matter of public notice and of public discussion.

I think the situation has been stated quite clearly by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], in a presentation to the Senate. The distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] made a breakdown of the actual cost of the price support program over a 20-year period.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the six basic crops, the loss, over a period of 20 years, was less than $21 million; on the nonbasics, over a similar period of years, it was $1,080,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So in the case of agriculture there is a loss, in a 20-year program, of approximately $1,080,000,000. During that period of time agriculture's income went up $84 billion. During that period of time agriculture has received 3 percent of the Government's peacetime expenditures; yet it represents 15 percent of the population.

I have studied the foregoing facts, but I am citing the figures from memory.

We ought not to be picking at any one group. I am not opposed to county newspapers having free circulation in their counties; I am for it. I am not opposed to magazines and newspapers having low postage rates, even less than the cost of distribution. I believe in the free press and the widest dissemination of magazines and periodicals. I am not opposed to American business being given help. I wish it to be given help. I am not opposed to American hospitals, both private and public, receiving Government assistance. I desire to have the best medical attention for Americans. I am not opposed to a sensible and reasonable expenditure of public funds to maintain solvency in America's agricultural economy. We can argue endlessly about what the price support level should be. The only question to be answered is, At what level is the breaking point between solvency and insolvency reached? What is the level of solvency and the level of insolvency in a price-support program?

When the Government, which is in the price support business, reduces price supports to 75 percent of parity, I think a burden rests upon the Government to show that Americans engaged in agriculture can live on such price supports. Let those responsible prove that such price supports will not mean the liquidation of the dairy industry. There will be hundreds and hundreds of little people, small farmers, who will never be heard. Their voices will never get to the floor of the Senate. Their articles will never appear in the great newspapers of America. They will be liquidated. They will have to sell their herds, lose their farm equipment, go out of business; and we will charge that to an "adjustment." The trouble with trying to define what is meant by "adjustment" is that it depends on who is getting adjusted. Every time a Republican administration adjusts America, it adjusts it downward; it never adjusts America upward. Why in the name of common sense we have to go through this process is beyond me.

I desire to reply to the argument of the Senator from Illinois about the adequate supply formula. The 75 to 90 percent formula is workable in theory and not in fact, because in April 1953 the Secretary of Agriculture supported dairy products at 90 percent, and the butter was still running out of our ears, to use the language of the Senator from Illinois.

In 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture decided to support butter at 75 percent, not 80 percent, not 82½ percent, not 87 percent, not even 77 percent, but the lowest figure in the book.

I say to the farmers of America this may be the shadow of things to come. If the Secretary of Agriculture can look upon a surplus and say it is so great that we have to go to the bottom of the scale of price supports, we do not have in effect a flexible price-support program, but a price-support program of the minimum 75 percent of parity.

I think the President realized that situation when he stated that a reduction in the price-support program should not go into effect hastily.

Corn, wheat, rice, and other grain products are to be adjusted in easy stages, but the administration is saying that the dairy farmer has been a good fellow and needs no similar aid. The administration knows that a dairy farmer cannot get out of the dairy business without literally liquidating his assets, without wrecking his family's savings; so he will have to take it.

I rise on the floor of the Senate, on behalf of some of the finest farmers in America, to protest what I consider to be an unconscionable act on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. I know I am voicing the sentiments of many Members of this body and many Members of the House of Representatives.

Last year when farm prices declined, Congress was not asked to pass legislation to relieve the situation which existed in the areas where large quantities of beef were being produced.

After the Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture traveled across the country, making speeches explaining the reason why the cattle farmer was in the situation he found himself, that it was due to a law passed by the previous Democratic Congress.

It seems to me that we should make the issue clear on the floor of the Senate that many of us desire to vote for a program which would make it possible for the Republican administration to keep the promise made during the last campaign; but we do not care to support a program which might mean the cotton farmer would be faced with the situation in which the dairy farmer now finds himself. We had hoped the administration would support a program which would guarantee 100 percent of parity to the farmers. I would be delighted to support such a program.

The recommendations of this administration with regard to cotton are 75 to 90 percent of parity. I hope that the Members from the cotton-growing States observe what has happened to dairy farmers who had 75- to 90-percent support prices for their products. The dairy farmers did not receive the benefit of even 80 or 85 percent; they were dropped to the bottom of the cistern. They were put at the bottom of the well, as low as they could be put.

I hope no one is being fooled. There will be a great deal of propaganda stating that the friends of the administration from the cotton States know that they will not be let down to 75 percent. I suggest that they try it for size and see.

Madam President, I previously read only one clipping which I had. I have before me a photostatic copy of the Saturday, September 6, 1952, issue of the Minneapolis Star. The Star had two editions on the same day. One of the headlines states, "Eisenhower's Farm Program. Asks 100 Percent Parity With Less Government Control."

Poor Adlai Stevenson. He had to defend just 90 percent.

Another headline states, "General Lashes at 'Agricrats.' Says Democrats Treat Farmer as 'Political Captive.'"

Who is the political captive today?

The second headline reads, "Eisenhower Calls for 100 Percent of Parity."

Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I know that the President, as a candidate and now, desires to see American agriculture have equity and fair play. I ascribe no ill motive to the President. I suggest only that he call the Secretary of Agriculture to the White House and have a conversation with him. The President had better talk to the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to the Solicitor. We do not want a situation resulting from the Secretary of Agriculture's asking the Solicitor what farm price supports shall be put into effect. I do not desire to rely upon lawyers in the Department of Agriculture to determine the future of American agriculture. Why did not the Secretary of Agriculture interview some dairy farmers and ask them what they should get? The Secretary of Agriculture did have dairy producers in his office. They did not approve 75 percent of parity. The dairy processors did not recommend such a figure; but the Solicitor, a lawyer, did, because the Secre-

tary of Agriculture desired to be sure he did not violate the law.

The Senator from Illinois said the Secretary of Agriculture is a man of conscience. I wish the Secretary of Defense had more of a conscience when he decided to pay 15 cents a pound for butter for the Army. Does the Secretary of Defense think farmers can receive 15 cents a pound for butter and be able to buy Oldsmobiles or Chevrolets?

I know the Secretary of the Treasury estimated that butter was worth 38 cents a pound in reserves. Yet the law states, and no Senator on the floor disputes it, that when there shall be an evaluation or an inventory of surpluses, those inventory figures shall be on the basis of the price supports which the Government has put into effect.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in an attempt to get the Congress to cancel the indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which amounted to 700 or 800 million dollars, cited a large accumulation and stated that butter was worth only 38 cents a pound in storage. Yet the same government has sold it to another department for 15 cents a pound. The Secretary stated that oleo can be obtained for the same amount. I might tell the Secretary that one can obtain transportation from a $1,200 car just as one can from a Cadillac; but there is no comparison.

The Secretary of the Treasury states that butter is worth 38 cents a pound. Secretary of Agriculture Benson states it is worth 75 percent of parity. However, those who produce it and pay rent and taxes, who maintain homes, who clothe children and send them to school, who contribute to their churches, who join the PTA, who till the soil, who spend their lives in agriculture, say it is worth 90 percent of parity, which is 10 percent below fair play.

Since the administration is going to lower the prices the farmers receive for the products of their farms, I call upon the administration to lower a few other things. How about lowering a few taxes? The only taxes that are going off the books are the ones we prescribed in the 81st Congress.

Mr. LONG. How about lowering the price of coffee 50 cents a pound?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the suggestion. Yes, Madam President, why is not the price of coffee lowered? Of course it is a foreign commodity, but it affects the folks at home.

There are many other things that can be done.

Madam President, I am sure the battle will continue to be waged in the days to come. I shall be prepared to continue it at any hour that is convenient to the opposition.

In the meantime, I call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to review the situation. There is still time to do so between now and April 1. I ask him to give consideration to the Congress. Let him let the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture give him some advice.

The Secretary of Agriculture should do for the dairy producers of my State of Minnesota what he has done for the tobacco growers. The tobacco growers have the benefit of 90 percent of the parity price for tobacco. Let the Secretary of Agriculture do for the dairy producers of my State what he has done for the sugar producers, who receive from 90 percent to 100 percent of parity for the sugar they produce. That program costs a great deal of money, but I am in favor of it; I voted for it. I wish to see the sugar producers make a living, too.

Similarly, Madam President, let the Secretary of Agriculture do for the dairy producers of my State what he has done for the wool producers, who also have the benefit of 90 percent of parity for their product—even if we did have to give it a little injection of Brannanism. [Laughter.]

But when it comes to helping the dairy producers, it is said that "things are getting tough," and that the parity price for dairy products should be lowered to 75 percent. I think such a move spells disaster, and I believe my statement will be borne out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I would not see the RECORD for this afternoon closed without referring once more to the facts.

To my colleagues who were not in the Chamber earlier this afternoon, because they were detained in committee meetings, I should like to say that earlier today the Senator from Minnesota lashed out against the Secretary of Agriculture for preparing to undertake on April 1, the beginning of the marketing year, to reduce the price supports of dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent.

Madam President, of all those who have presented curious arguments and have indulged in the begging of a question, the Senator from Minnesota is indeed in a class by himself. He speaks about comparing price supports on dairy products with price supports on tobacco. Of course, a tobacco farmer can put tobacco seed in the ground or not put it in the ground, as he prefers. If he does not put the seed in the ground, no tobacco will be grown by him. A farmer who plants seed is thus able to reduce his crop. So quotas can be applied to tobacco. Similarly, quotas can be applied to cotton, corn, and wheat. They are susceptible to some measure of control.

On the other hand, it is not possible to say to a cow, "Do not give so much milk" [laughter], because so long as the dairy cattle are on the farm, the milk will flow.

So, what does my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, say? I want to be sure the people of his State will know, from the RECORD. He says, "Keep the present program going at 90 percent of parity, at least until we can get a better look—no matter what the law is, no matter what the conscience of the Secretary of Agriculture is. Keep it going. Buy the dairy products at 90 percent of parity; put them into storage. We will worry about the cost later; but keep up these price supports."

Where is the end to such a program, inasmuch as it is not possible to apply quotas to dairy cattle or to the production of milk?

My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, has a way of forgetting all the facts, at times. So I must refresh his recollection, by pointing out that in the last quarter of last year—and taking it as a basis—milk production in the United States was 10 billion pounds higher than it was in 1952. It is a little like the small boy who asked for a machine with which to make salt for everyone. When he got the machine, he kept on making salt. Finally he made so much salt that he threw all of it into the ocean, and that is how we got salt water. [Laughter.]

So we are urged to "keep the machine going."

We are spending $460,000 a day—just think of it—$460,000 a day—for rental on Liberty ships, for rental of caves and warehouses and refrigerator space in which to store surplus commodities. Yet the Senator from Minnesota says, "Keep the program going."

The fact that such a program adds to the public debt and to the budget seems to make no difference to him. In the next breath he says, "Let us have a little lower taxes."

Well, Madam President, how are we to have lower taxes unless we first stop such a program and curtail it, so that at least there is a chance to save a little money and bring the budget into balance?

The argument the Senator from Minnesota presents is a most curious one. Let us be sure the whole story is told, so it will not be lost in a nebulous maze of English language that goes all over the lot.

I am willing to let the facts speak for themselves.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois will recognize my question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed I shall. I simply did not wish to prolong the discussion.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Illinois comes from a great agricultural State, which has important dairy interests. Although they do not compare in size with those of my own State of New York, yet I realize they are very substantial.

I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will agree that I am correct in saying there has been no reduction—and I realize that a reduction cannot be initiated by the Secretary of Agriculture—in the price of the grains the dairymen must buy to feed to their cows, if there is to be a steady and substantial supply of milk; whereas, is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture on his own initiative, and within the powers given to him by law, is going to reduce by 15 percent the price supports for milk and milk products?

In other words, the dairy farmer is to receive 15 percent less than he has been

receiving in the last month or the last year, although he will have to pay substantially the same price for all the feed he gives his cattle, in order to have them produce the milk the Nation requires. Is not that a fact?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether it is a fact. Let me ask my friend the Senator from New York: Does he wish to keep this kind of program going, and does he wish to continue to have surpluses accumulate, regardless of the factor of the relationship between cost and production and the return the farmer receives, and regardless of the necessity of reaching a point where there is at least a reasonable balance between supply and demand?

That is the whole purpose of flexible parity, and it is the purpose of the President's program.

But when the time comes to put it into effect, there is loud protest.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, now the Senator from Illinois has asked me a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to give my version of the present dairy product surplus situation in the United States.

In the past 3 or 4 years we have had 90 percent of parity incentive prices for dairy products. It was very proper to offer 90 percent of parity price supports, because a shooting war began, and we were faced with an emergency, and we did not know how long it would last.

The farmers have responded. They have very greatly increased the number of cows. I must say that a good deal of the dairy surplus comes from the territory of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and myself. We are producing about 18 percent more milk than we were 2 years ago, and the consumption has gone up only possibly 4 percent. That is the reason for our dairy surpluses. We have had unseasonably favorable weather. Up until this year we have had an adequate supply of grain in the country. We have had an adequate supply of roughage. We have had better cows than we used to have. So we have produced very large surpluses.

I find that this winter many of our farms are overstocked with cattle. Farmers have been buying Canadian cows this winter and paying as much as $350 a head. They have not had hay enough to carry the additional cows. They have been buying Canadian hay at high prices. They have had to buy more grain than usual, at a price which I think is comparable to that of last year. It was down in the fall, but I believe it is now up again. Of course, the farmers were caught in the squeeze, but the principal squeeze was caused by the increased production, which is about 18 percent so far as New England and New York is concerned.

With the lowering of the support price for butter, cheese, and powdered milk, New England, and I believe also New York, will receive that lowered support only on class II, or surplus milk. The price of class I milk will be fixed, as usual. In some parts of the country where there are marketing agreements, the price of class I milk is tied to the price of butter, just as it used to be in New England and New York. But in our area the price of class I milk is tied to the purchasing power of the people, as indicated by department-store sales. It is tied to the general price level, as shown, I believe, by the Federal Reserve bank, and it is tied to cost of production. In New England we are not tied to the prices of butter, cheese, and powdered milk. We are not tied to the price of butter in any respect.

What this will mean to us temporarily in New England is that, instead of a 90-percent guaranty for class II milk, we shall receive 75 percent for that percentage of our milk, which is so-called surplus.

As the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] stated a few minutes, or a few hours ago, we must have a normal surplus of 20 percent in order to take care of unusual demands for milk at certain times and upon certain occasions. But we are producing far beyond that point. I understand that in the Boston area we are likely to have a milk surplus of 60 percent sometime this year.

That does not make a favorable appeal to our friends in the Dakotas, Kansas, and western Minnesota, which are primarily manufacturing areas, because we contribute to the surplus which pushes their market down, and they do not like it very well.

Now that I am on my feet, I should like to clear up one other matter. The proposal to make payments on wool has been likened to the Brannan plan. I know that anything which suggests payments rather than loans and purchases is likely to be likened to the Brannan plan. However, I wish to point out certain differences. The main points of the Brannan plan were:

First, 100-percent supports for crops and commodities which comprise about 70 percent of the agricultural output of the country. That 100-percent support would certainly mean a surplus at all times, and low prices at all times.

The second point was the feature of payments to the producer to make up the difference between what he received in the market and 100 percent guaranteed support.

Third—and this was the really bad thing about the Brannan plan—it would have restricted production, as of that time, to approximately $24,000 per farm. It would tend to put most of the big producers, and particularly the dairy producers, out of business. It might not put them out of business entirely, but it would require them to bring their production down to $24,000 a year per farm.

The upshot of such a plan would be—and I suspect that was the result intended—to break up the very large farms and plantations and divide the land among people who did not have much land. In countries like Italy and other countries which are heavily overpopulated, I think it is probably essential that the large farms and estates be broken up and the land redistributed. But those are countries where there is not land enough to go around. Here in America we still have plenty of land. So I think the main bad feature of the Brannan plan was that it would bring to America plans which had been used in the countries of Eastern Europe, and which would not be acceptable to the people of the United States.

So it is true that the Brannan plan had provision for payments, but the Brannan plan, in guaranteeing 100 percent supports, also had provision for perpetual overproduction. It also contained the very unacceptable proposal for breaking up the large plantations and farms and redistributing the land among the people.

I certainly wish more people could live on the land. There is something about living on the land that makes one feel that he has a stake in his country. But when we break up an economical unit into several uneconomical units, we must consider that we are increasing the cost of production, and probably greatly increasing the cost of living for all the people of the country.

So let us not compare the payments proposed for wool or payments proposed for butter—and I think perhaps payments would work on butter, for a while, at least—with the plan which contained such revolutionary features as the virtual expropriation of land and redistribution of it among the people of a country which is already embarrassed by having too much land for present purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the majority leader yield to me for a brief statement? I wish to say something to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Vermont and I have worked together for 20 years, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. We have worked together in the interest of the farmers.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have worked together to increase the prosperity of the dairy farmer and the dairy industry. I think we have never had any vital differences in all those years.

Mr. AIKEN. And we shall not have now, either.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator will agree with me that at all times it was our aim to maintain some relationship between what the dairy farmer receives for his product and the price which he must pay for feedstuffs and other supplies essential in the conduct of his farm. That relationship has been greatly disturbed by this sudden action on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. The high price of feed is maintained, and there is a very great reduction in the price which the dairy farmer receives for his product.

Mr. AIKEN. I am convinced that the Secretary had no other recourse, barring new legislation. He could not have done differently. With the support levels fixed at the minimum, I am convinced that there will not be an overall lowering of price for the New England-New York area of more than possibly 25 cents a hundred; and if we can expand the markets as we hope to do in the next few months, any lowering of price will be of very temporary duration.

I point out something else at this time. As the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York know, I have been very much interested in trying to devise a system of getting surplus foods to the low-income families of the United States. I have been interested in it over a 10-year period. If we could do it there would not be any such thing as a surplus of dairy products, or a surplus of butter, or a surplus of meat products, or a surplus of leafy vegetables. As I say, I have tried to interest the Government in such a program for the last 10 years.

Yesterday for the first time I received an encouraging letter from the Department of Agriculture, stating that they were working on the proposal. They were inclined to be skeptical about applying it to the whole country without first having some experience with it. The Department's suggestion is that we might possibly want to work out a plan for setting up pilot programs, selecting an urban area at one point and a rural area at another point, and getting experience, which could be used in working out a proper plan later on. I was very much encouraged to get that official encouragement for the first time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont for correcting the RECORD. I know it needed to be done with reference to the payment plan under the Brannan proposal. The Senator from Vermont is absolutely right.

Mr. AIKEN. There is a great deal more to it than the payments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand; there was much more to it than the payments. As a matter of fact, the compensatory payment idea was originally sponsored as one possibility by the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. That was written into the Agricultural Act of 1948. I refer to the provision for payments. When Secretary Brannan came up with his plan in the spring of 1949, Congress became incensed. I do not believe that is too strong a statement. Congress not only threw out all the provisions for the remainder of the Brannan plan but it threw out also the provision for the payment plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Congress threw out not only the bath water, but the baby along with the water.

I feel that the Senator from Vermont has been very constructive once more in citing to the Senate his persevering efforts on behalf of his food stamp plan. I am encouraged to hear that there is real interest in getting a pilot plant operation started. I believe we should have such beginnings.

I realize that the dairy surpluses represent a serious situation; but I also feel that if we spent a little time in trying to find outlets for the dairy products we would not have surpluses. We could find a better way to price the products than by merely buying and storing them. With respect to certain items, compensatory payments could be made. I am not prepared to think of it as being of universal application. It could be considered with respect to certain items, such as cheese and perhaps butter. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question but that the production of 120 billion pounds of milk a year is far less than the people of the United States should be consuming for their own good.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], to insert a new section in the committee amendment at page 3, after line 15.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I inquire whether the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER The yeas and nays have been ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, may we have the pending amendment stated for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I wish to speak on the pending amendment before the yeas and nays are taken. I shall be very brief.

I merely wish to repeat the gist of my remarks of last evening, when I said I would not vote for the proposed amendment to the Constitution now under consideration, or for any other constitutional amendment which may be brought before the Senate which would limit the powers of the President in the making of treaties or executive agreements.

The amendment presented by the distinguished majority leader undoubtedly would carry out the purpose covered by the resolution I presented to the Senate last year. I strongly urged, in a number of speeches on this floor, that the rule of the Senate respecting the taking of the yeas and nays on treaties be changed by requiring a quorum call and a roll call on each treaty. Both the majority leader and the minority leader carried out the intent of my resolution in spirit, even though the Senate did not adopt a new rule or pass a statute on the subject.

Madam President, the purpose of the pending amendment can be achieved without including such a provision in any proposed constitutional amendment which would limit the powers of the President in the making of treaties or executive agreements. It can be achieved by adopting a rule of the Senate or by enacting a statute. The provision can be made as tight as if it were contained in a constitutional amendment. There could be included in the statute or rule a provision that unanimous consent could not be given to waive the requirement of a quorum call, and a rollcall. The rule or statute would of course, become binding on the Members of the Senate in all cases.

Madam President, I feel that no such provision has any place in a constitutional amendment. I have said repeatedly and said it very strongly and with deep conviction, that I believe the adoption of any constitutional amendment curtailing the powers of the President to make treaties and executive agreements would be against the interest of this country; it would be highly dangerous and would inevitably lead to great difficulties in our relationships with other countries. Because of my strong conviction I cannot in good conscience vote for any constitutional amendment to achieve what is claimed to be the purpose of the Bricker amendment, the George amendment, and the several others now before the Senate.

In view of the fact that I am heart and soul opposed to any kind of an amendment to the Constitution which would curtail the treatymaking powers of the President, I shall vote in the negative on the substitute proposed by

the distinguished majority leader. It is unnecessary and in my opinion should not be written into the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is absent on official business. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

I announce also that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business, and if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Ferguson	Mansfield
Anderson	Flanders	Martin
Barrett	Frear	Maybank
Beall	George	McClellan
Bennett	Gillette	Mundt
Bricker	Griswold	Neely
Bridges	Hendrickson	Payne
Burke	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bush	Hoey	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Holland	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd	Hunt	Saltonstall
Carlson	Ives	Smathers
Case	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Symington
Dirksen	Kerr	Thye
Douglas	Knowland	Upton
Duff	Kuchel	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Welker
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams
Ellender	Malone	Young

NAYS—16

Cooper	Hill	Monroney
Fulbright	Kennedy	Morse
Gore	Kilgore	Murray
Green	Lehman	Pastore
Hayden	Lennon	
Hennings	Long	

NOT VOTING—8

Capehart	McCarran	Schoeppel
Goldwater	McCarthy	Wiley
Kefauver	Millikin	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, I call up the amendment offered by myself and on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], designated "2-3'54-C," and ask that it be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me, so that I may make a statement for the information of the Senate, since a number of questions have been raised?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not expect to have the Senate continue in session this evening beyond 6 o'clock, perhaps 5:30, and would not expect to have any further voting this evening.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Michigan will be prepared to make an opening statement on the amendment and to reply to such questions as may be raised, so that the information may be in the RECORD tomorrow. I understand a number of important dinners have been arranged for this evening. I have not given advance notice to the Senate of an evening session. We have kept busy during the day. I am very hopeful that tomorrow we may not only reach a vote on this amendment, but also on the perfecting amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] at that point desires to make his motion to recommit, perhaps we might even have a vote on the motion to recommit, if the motion shall have been made. That would then clear the decks for discussion of the proposed substitutes which have been offered by a number of Senators.

Again, I express the hope that perhaps by Thursday the Senate may be able to reach a final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1. Of course, that will depend on developments.

While I shall not make an announcement as to evening sessions for the remainder of the week, I hope Senators will keep in mind that either tomorrow or the following evening we might wish to run, not late into the night, but to a reasonable hour in the evening.

I desired to make this statement so that Senators may be advised in making their plans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because of the legislative situation last night I was foreclosed from offering an amendment which would also have included executive agreements, an amendment similar in nature to the amendment just agreed to with reference to treaties. I offer such an amendment as a new section and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I serve notice on the Senate that I shall call it up at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

THE NEW LOOK IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. A few days ago a number of Senators raised a serious question with reference to the so-called New Look announced by the administration regarding the Nation's military policy. I note in an evening newspaper that a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Carney, apparently has raised serious question about the new policy. I wish to read the following news article from Newport, R. I., published in the Washington Daily News of today:

BOTH SIDES MIGHT HOLD OFF IN FEAR—ADMIRAL CARNEY SEES WAR WITHOUT ATOMS

NEWPORT, R. I., February 16.—Adm. Robert B. Carney said today a future war may see a "nuclear stalemate" with both sides fearing to use atomic weapons because of the threat of retaliation.

Or, the Naval Operations Chief said, war could start with devastating atomic blows and wind up with "guerrilla bands armed with bamboo spears" stalking each other "across the remaining ashes."

Since the United States is not the aggressor and cannot tell what kind of war it may have to fight, Admiral Carney said, "we dare not entrust our safety to any single rigid and unalterable course of action." He forecast a role for sea power of "greater significance than ever before."

WARS VARY

His remarks to the Naval War College attracted attention in light of the administration's decision to rely chiefly on air-atomic power in its New Look military strategy. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently disclosed the "basic decision * * * to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate instantly by means and at places of our choosing."

"If we are honest with ourselves," Admiral Carney said in his prepared text, "we will acknowledge that there are big wars, little wars, general wars, localized wars, Marquis of Queensbury wars, and savage, ruthless wars, atomic wars, and perhaps nonatomic wars." He said there was no way to know which kind of conflict would come next.

GAS, GERMS COMPARED

Admiral Carney compared his nuclear statement with what "has so far been the case with chemical and bacteriological warfare."

He said the Nation must "hedge our strategic bets," keeping both new and old weapons and methods in the military locker.

In light of the statement of Admiral Carney which I have just read, I think there is a real question whether this new policy, the so-called new look, was based on our overall military requirements or on political requirements. I believe it has become quite apparent that cutting the budget was uppermost in mind when the new policy was formulated. I think the position of Mr. John Foster Dulles, which is essentially a prepare-for-one-type-of-war policy rather than a prepare-for-varied-types-of-war policy, may be a doubtful policy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment.

I think the fallacy of the present policy that we can defend ourselves by preparing for a singular type of war is evident from the fact that we have no assurance that the Soviet Union will engage in a singular type of aggression.

On the contrary, to date the Soviet Union has engaged in varied forms of aggression. Atomic retaliation, for which we had a monopoly in 1947, did not stop guerilla warfare in Greece. It did not stop the Korean war. Nor is it stopping the war in Indochina today.

In the light of the statement made by Admiral Carney, a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I think the time has come when the Congress of the United States should hear directly from the military experts on the question whether we are preparing adequately to meet the kind of aggression with which we may be confronted tomorrow.

As was brought out on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, the record will disclose that Admiral Radford, in an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee in 1949, dissociated himself with the policy of atomic retaliation. I should like to read what Admiral Radford had to say before the House Armed Services Committee in connection with the inquiry on the B–36:

I do not believe that the threat of atomic blitz will be an effective deterrent to war, or that it will win a war. I do not believe that the atomic blitz theory is generally accepted by military men.

Our citizens must realize that its military leaders cannot make this promise—that there is no short cut, no cheap, no easy way to win a war.

I might interpolate at that point to say that there is no short cut, no easy way, to prepare this country adequately—certainly not, from a military standpoint, by cutting the budget.

I continue to read from the statement of Admiral Radford:

We must realize that the threat of instant atomic retaliation will not prevent it, and may even invite it. We must realize that we cannot gamble that the atomic blitz of annihilation will even win a war.

Mr. President, Admiral Radford, who is chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made that statement at a time when America had a monopoly on atomic weapons. Under those circumstances the policy of atomic retaliation made sense.

It seems to me that a policy relying exclusively on atomic retaliation makes no sense when we no longer have a monopoly on atomic or hydrogen weapons.

I think Congress has a right to know the reason for the change in policy.

Let me refer to the statement of another member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a very able soldier, Matthew Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the Army. In a speech made on November 10, 1953, General Ridgway stated as follows:

The ultimate determinant of military victory still is the trained fighting man with his feet on the ground.

Our Nation may at some future date substantially alter the ratios of land, sea, and air strength in our present Military Establishment. But no evidence yet adduced today would validate such a course. Perhaps it never will. New weapons, history shows, have a way of canceling out.

Each of the changes in technical capabilities has brought changes in tactics. Each has required changes in organization. None has resulted in reduced overall military manpower requirements.

Mr. President, General Ridgway made that statement on November 10, 1953, before the American Ordnance Association in Cleveland, Ohio. The statement would appear to be a sensible one. Since that time, apparently the Bureau of the Budget has reversed the military policy stated by General Ridgway. In view of the statements by Admiral Carney and General Ridgway, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe the time has come to raise a serious question regarding the present military policy announced by the administration. I think the Senate and the House of Representatives, should be fully and adequately informed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished junior Senator from Washington has indicated his belief that budget reduction and tax reduction have been placed ahead of national security, and that the reduction in the ground forces of the United States Army and Marine Corps and the mothballing of naval vessels are the result of budgetary goals.

Perhaps it will shed some light on the question if the statement of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Roger M. Kyes, is read at this point:

We can no longer afford to prepare for every conceivable kind of war. We can no longer afford the luxury of a status quo in strategic planning.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further, let me say I believe this is the first time I have ever known of a high administrative official of the United States Government in referring to the adequate defense of the Nation, to suggest that defense against Communist aggression is a "luxury" which, so he says, we cannot "afford."

A few days ago, in speaking on the floor of the Senate, I expressed grave apprehension about the present policy. At that time I expressed the opinion that the balance of terror which a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff today has said may prevent the use of atomic weapons in another war, might be sufficient to prevent a global war; but that this may not be the kind of war we shall have to face. Indeed, experience has shown that the Communist world seeks to spread the Iron Curtain by degrees, instead of by global war. Not only may global war not be the kind of war we may face; it may not be the greatest danger presented by Communist aggression.

The so-called new look has already failed its first test, namely, the Indochina conflict.

The imminent breakup of the Four Power Conference in Berlin in failure, the continued belligerency of the Soviet Union, and the continued pressure of Communist aggression, require the administration to take a new look at the New Look.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the statement he has made. I also wish to commend him for spearheading the questions he has raised about the New Look. His reference to Mr. Kyes, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, is a most important one.

Every Member of the Senate should stop to refresh his or her recollection of the situation which existed 1 year ago. At that time many of us were ridiculed because we raised a series of questions about the cut in the size of the Air Force. We were told we had at the head of the Nation this time a man who was the world's outstanding military expert. We were told he was a man who could tell us what was the right military policy and what was the wrong military policy.

I agree that he is one of the greatest military strategists in the world. I think he is an outstanding military officer—one of the best. But what has happened since that time certainly adds force to the contention we made then, namely, that by questioning the policy of a year ago we might be able to add to the sum total of our defense forces.

What happened, Mr. President? At that time we were fighting for 143 wings for the Air Force. We were ridiculed. Yet today, after having cut the Air Force to 120 wings, the administration has finally come around to 137 wings, but in the meantime a year's valuable time has been lost.

I believe it is high time that once again we ask questions about the new policy. It is quite evident the administration is following the same line of reasoning that it followed a year ago. A year ago we discovered that the cut in the Air Force was made through the Bureau of the Budget, as the result of a letter sent by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary of Defense. As I recall the testimony given before the Armed Services Committee or before the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. MAYBANK. It was given before the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. As I recall that testimony, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Kyes admitted, Mr. President, that they did not realize how much they had cut the Air Force.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield on this point?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. They further admitted they had not consulted the Chiefs of Staff.

Following what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said about Admiral Carney—and no one has greater respect than do I for Admiral Carney; I have known him; his ability is great; his integrity is unimpeachable—let me say that General Vandenberg said the same thing day after day, hour after hour, in testifying before the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

What happened? Every amendment which was submitted—I myself submitted several, as did the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and other Senators, who were agreed in favoring 143 wings for the Air Force—was rejected.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] submitted an amendment calling for the training of more flyers; but that amendment, too, was rejected. All such amendments were rejected.

In making this statement, I am not attempting to say, "I told you so," in referring to the statement I made a year ago. Furthermore, no one has greater respect than do I for the integrity, ability, and knowledge of war of the President of the United States. Nevertheless, the situation has been changing from day to day, ever since last year, when no one paid any attention to Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg.

I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding to me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from the State of Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President perhaps I think more of the desirability of the new military budget—commonly termed the new look—than do some of my distinguished colleagues. I am studying that budget, and will make up my mind about it. In the meantime, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington several questions.

First, he was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was he not, when he served in the House of Representatives?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, he knows a great deal about this subject.

Secondly the statement made by a great United States naval officer, Admiral Carney, would seem to be at variance with an address made in the month of January by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think there can be any doubt about it; they are absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last year we had before the Senate the subject of trade with foreign countries; and at that time there was a complete difference of opinion as between the Department of State and the Department of Defense, according to the best knowledge of the Members of the Senate.

Once again it seems there is a complete difference of opinion between the Department of State and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who presumably would not be speaking if he were not speaking for the Department of Defense. Yet his speech would also seem to be at variance with the statement which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee just read, made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the Deputy Secretary of Defense would seem to be supporting the speech made by the Secretary of State; and in his recent statements about "bomb rattling," the Secretary of Defense would seem to be supporting Admiral Carney's speech. Would that seem to be correct?

Mr. JACKSON. It would appear to be correct.

Let me also add that the question of the New Look is getting to be about as confused as the amendments which are being submitted to the Bricker amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Another question, if I may. In other words, would not it appear that not only is there a difference of opinion between the Department of State and the Department of Defense, as to how the Nation should be armed for its future security; but there would also seem to be a difference of opinion between top officials in the Department of Defense itself. Is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest once more that those who are responsible for the future security of the United States should take one coordinated position so that we in the Congress may understand just what it is this administration plans, in order to provide us with maximum security at minimum cost.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not wish to yield at this point.

I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed by the junior Senator from Missouri. With his long experience as the first Secretary of the Air Force, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and in that capacity a member of the National Security Council, he knows whereof he speaks.

The record seems to disclose at this point that two of the three members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are opposed to this policy. Admiral Carney is a voting member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It seems, from the speech made by General Ridgway in November prior to the approval of the budget, that he too is opposed to the new look.

It would appear that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who is not a voting member of the Joint Chiefs, by his remarks before the House Armed Services Committee in 1949, indicated that he was opposed to the new policy.

In view of all that, I think certainly those of us who are to be called upon in the future to vote for appropriations have the right to know whether we are providing an adequate military defense for America.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the very important statement just made by the junior Senator from Washington. I believe that the United States Senate and the House of Representatives should be concerned with whether these policies are being made by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of full advice from all over the country, on the basis of information and intelligence which the Joint Chiefs of Staff receive, or whether they are being made by the Secretary of the Department of Defense and his assistants. Certainly if we are to change our policy so radically as to use atomic diplomacy, our policy is important enough not to be used as a subject for after-dinner speeches before a different assemblage each night. Certainly our posture of defense is too important to be turned over to a mimeograph machine operation conducted by the press corps in the Pentagon.

Under the Constitution it is the duty of Congress to raise and provide armies. When we neglect that duty and allow foreign policy to be shifted overnight, when we allow $5 billion to be cut out of our defense appropriations, as was done last year, without allowing the proper committees, the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses of Congress, the policymaking committees, an opportunity to hold adequate and thorough hearings, we are neglecting one of our most important duties. The subject was considered only in the Appropriations Committee, which is primarily concerned with budgetary matters, although many of the minority members are concerned with things other than budgetary matters. When we neglect our duty in that fashion, I think it is high time to have full-dress hearings before the distinguished committees to which the rules of the Senate delegate the execution of this important duty. I refer to the Armed Services Committees of both Houses. They should call before them the men whose statements have been quoted here today. The committee should take the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1947, the Chief of the Army, and the Chief of the Navy branch. That testimony should be placed in the RECORD. Let us not turn over our vitally important foreign policy and our policy with respect to our posture of defense to after-dinner speakers or those who are engaged in grinding out new clichés, new looks, and other things which emanate from highly skilled press agents in the Pentagon.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into a long debate at this time. However, let me say, for the benefit of the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Oklahoma, who has just spoken, as well as other Senators, that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate had before it the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Armed Services Committee has heard the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, as well as the corresponding officers of the Navy and the Army.

The committee has also heard from the Secretary of Defense this year. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has heard the recent discussion by the Secretary of State. To the best of my knowledge and belief there is general unanimity of opinion regarding the amount in the budget, based on the authorization and based upon the planning.

I would not be frank if I did not say say that the Army, whose appropriations have been cut by $1½ or $2 billion, does not like the cut. But never in all the hearings, to the best of my recollection, has it been said that we are relying solely on atomic power or the ability to carry the atomic bomb. We are relying upon our ability to retaliate. We are relying upon building up a warning system in this country, so that we may be in a position to retaliate if we are attacked.

I will say to my colleague from Washington that so far as I know, the new Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the new Chief of Staff of the Navy, together with the Secretaries of those two branches, are in complete accord with the budget allowances for this year. I cannot truthfully say that the Secretary of the Army or the Chief of Staff of the Army is in full accord, but they realize that they have only a certain amount to work with, and they will work with it.

That is the basis upon which we are operating. I should be delighted, with facts and figures before me, to debate with the Senator the subject of the number of airplanes, and so forth. We could enter into an interminable argument on that subject. The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who is on his feet, is an able and capable debater; but I believe I am capable of answering him.

That is all I have to say tonight. I wish to clear the deck by referring particularly to what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just said. The committee has made it a point to hear all the witnesses to whom I have referred. The hearings have not been public. They could not well have been. They have been in executive session. So far as I know, if any Senator wishes to attend those executive sessions, he will be welcome.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for whom I have great affection and respect, whether or not the Chief of Naval Operations said that he was in favor of the new look policy, which relies for its primary defense on atomic retaliation? I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, that the statement which I have just quoted, attributed to Admiral Carney in a speech at Newport, R. I., is absolutely inconsistent with the policy laid down by the Defense and State Departments. Can the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee assure the Senate that Admiral Carney, who is Chief of Naval Operations, is in full sympathy with and supports this singular defense policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two members of my committee on the Senator's side of the aisle. At least one of them was present when, to the best of my recollection, Admiral Carney said, with respect to the policy which was finally submitted as a part of the budget of the Defense Department for this year, that the part which applied to the Navy was satisfactory to him.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is referring to the budget proposal; but let me ask the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee once again whether he asked Admiral Carney if he was in accord, not with the budget proposal, but with the new policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I cannot remember that anyone asked Admiral Carney the question in the words stated by the Senator. Certainly the impression I received—and I sat all through the hearings—was that the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy, and Admiral Carney, who did all the talking for the Navy—the Secretary of the Navy did not do the talking—were in complete sympathy with the overall policies of the Defense Department as they are now being planned.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not a fact that the Chief of Staff for the Army is opposed to the new policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not say that he is opposed to the new policy. What I would say—and he was utterly frank about it—is that because the number of Army divisions has been reduced, the Army has been forced to make new plans and new assignments and to work out new methods of doing things. He was not in complete accord, of course, with the policy of cutting appropriations for the Army by a substantial amount.

However, he did state emphatically that he was willing to go forward and that they were making new plans, and that the Army would cooperate to the fullest extent. I believe my colleagues who were present at the hearing will bear me out in that regard.

I wish to make it clear, particularly to the Senator from Oklahoma, that our committee has been attempting to get this information.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to say that I am satisfied that the statements made by the Chief of Staff of the Army and by the Chief of Naval Operations are totally inconsistent with administration policy. I believe we are right back to where we were a year ago.

We were told then that there was agreement on the policy with reference to the Air Force. When we got into it we found that General Twining, who became Chief of Staff for the Air Force, said that 143 wings were absolutely essential.

Every head of a Government agency, and every head of a Military Establishment must of necessity support the President's budget. That is his duty. It does not follow from the fact that he supports the budget that he is necessarily in favor of a policy carried out in the budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is trying to make a statement, but I should like to make just one more observation, and I thank the Senator from Missouri for letting me do so.

So far as General Twining is concerned, he was before our committee. Without disclosing any confidences stated in executive session, I can assure the Senator from Washington that the general purport of what he just stated was about like this. He was asked:

> General Twining, are you in favor of it or are you just saying it because you must go along with the bosses?

He answered that he believed that it was a good policy, that he was strongly in favor of it, and believed it was a sound policy for us to carry through.

I make that statement with two Senators in the Chamber who were present at the committee hearing. They can deny the statement if I am wrong.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not doubt for a moment that the statement is correct. The policy that has been announced is primarily an Air Force policy. As one Member of the Senate and as a former Member of the House who has fought for a long time to build up our atomic strength and our Air Force, I have never been of the opinion that we should defend this country and carry out our foreign commitments with the firepower of just one branch of the Military Establishment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My reference is to what he said this year, within a month. Let me make one further statement, and then I shall not further interrupt the Senator. I agree with the Senator from Washington that we should not exclusively rely on the atomic bomb or atomic energy. So far as the words "massive retaliation" or "immediate retaliation" or "strong retaliation" are concerned, I have never heard it said that we would rely entirely on atomic bombs.

We are relying on improved firepower. We are relying on the improved mobility of our Navy. We are relying on the greater strength and the greater carrying power and greater range of our airplanes. We are relying on the improved techniques of our Air Force. We are relying on the ability of our artillery to fire farther. We are relying on the improved ability of our Air Force to transport our Armed Forces. We are relying on all of those things. It is an overall greater strength and an overall ability to retaliate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I must say that my interpretation of the new policy is different from the impression he has of that policy. To quote further from the article:

> Secretary Dulles recently disclosed the basic decision to depend primarily upon greater capacity to retaliate instantly by means and at the places of our choosing.

I believe it is very clear that primary reliance is being placed on our atomic striking power.

I am all in favor, and have been for years, of building up our atomic striking power. What disturbs me is that the Soviet Union, as history has shown us to date, is engaged in various forms of aggression. The fact that we have had a monopoly on atomic bombs did not stop Soviet aggression, and I do not believe it will stop Soviet aggression at

this time when we do not have a monopoly on atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Missouri in permitting me to interrupt. I shall be delighted to go into this subject more fully with him at another time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for what he has said about me. I know he will be able to answer any questions I might bring up. The recollection of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts with respect to what went on in the executive session of the Armed Services Committee is correct, according to my recollection.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma has put his finger on a great part of this problem. He referred to the many speeches, comments, criticisms, suggestions, and the advice that emanates from the top officials of the various services. I believe the senior Senator from Massachusetts would be fair enough to agree with me that at times these statements are at complete variance with what we have previously heard in executive session in the Committee on Armed Services.

I do not understand how it is possible for the Congress to obtain, or for the people of this country to obtain a clear idea of how we plan to defend the United States, if after we reach an understanding of what is being told us in executive session in Armed Services, addresses, speeches, and comments are made which are at variance with what we have been told in committee.

Again I would respectfully bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who occupies such a position of respect and confidence in this administration, that provided the article to which the distinguished Senator from Washington has referred this evening is correct, then a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and a voting member, as the junior Senator from Washington has pointed out—has taken exception to a speech made by the Secretary of State.

Without getting into the merits or demerits of the address made by the Secretary of State, which later, in effect, was backed up by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, but, in my opinion later negated by the Secretary of Defense, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services:

Where do the members of our committee, where does the Senate, where does the House of Representatives, where do the American people now stand when it comes to any real knowledge about the planned military policy of this administration?

AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, before the Senate at this time is a proposed amendment offered by myself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The amendment has two parts. On page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 7 to 9, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. President, as Senate Joint Resolution 1 came from the Judiciary Committee it contained what is commonly known as the "which" clause, which provided that a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by the enactment of legislation which would be valid in the absence of the treaty.

That was not a part of the original proposed amendment when it went to the Judiciary Committee. That language was added by the Judiciary Committee to the joint resolution.

This amendment, Mr. President, is to strike out that language and to insert:

SEC. 2. Clause 2 of article VI of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this clause, no treaty made after the establishment of this Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land unless made in pursuance of this Constitution."

Mr. President, I made some remarks with reference to this amendment, as well as with reference to the previous amendment to amend section 1 of the resolution as it came from the Judiciary Committee by adding the words "other international agreements." I desire to review it so that Senators voting tomorrow may have a record of what we have in mind by this amendment, and also for the purpose of making clear the legislative history so that it may be used by courts in interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. President, the treatymaking power of the United States is in the President and two-thirds of the Senate. By article II, section 2, of the Constitution, the President has power, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Both Houses of Congress, as a Congress, were not given control or power over the making of treaties. The President and the Senate have that power, and article VI of the Constitution provides that—

All treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because there has been some misunderstanding of the supremacy section, I think it might be well to have clarified at this point, for the benefit of those who read the RECORD and who may not be familiar with the constitutional provision, that a treaty ratified under those conditions becomes a part of the supreme law of the land, along with the Constitution itself and statutes passed by the Congress pursuant to the Constitution. So that it is a part of the supreme law, rather than being supreme in the sense that some of those discussing the subject on the outside have tried to imply, thus putting a treaty in a place where it would be above the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from California.

What was sought to be done yesterday, when section 1 was amended, was to provide that all treaties or executive agreements, or international agreements other than treaties, which were in conflict with the Constitution, would be of no force or effect, so that it would be clear to the Supreme Court, in certain words, what the people of the United States have in mind with respect to their Constitution.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which applies to Congress, is as follows: "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Mr. President, much has been said on the floor of the Senate about the case of Missouri against Holland. I wish to boil the case down to as small a space as possible, by saying that Holland was convicted under a law, passed by Congress, relating to the shooting of ducks in Missouri. He appealed his conviction to the Supreme Court, and his conviction was sustained by that Court, which held that the law under which he was convicted was valid and constitutional.

Where does Missouri against Holland fit into the problem before the Senate today? Congress had previously passed a law regulating the killing of migratory birds. A conviction was obtained under that law. A lower court, a court of appeals, held the law to be unconstitutional, stating that it was beyond the power of Congress to pass such a law. After the law had been held unconstitutional, the United States entered into a treaty with Great Britain, which, of course, included Canada. The treaty was not a self-executing treaty, but provided that Congress should implement it by law. Congress so implemented the treaty, and it was under the law implementing the treaty that Holland was convicted.

The Supreme Court of the United States held that the law, made in pursuance of the treaty—that is, to carry out the treaty—was valid. The Court could have said that the United States was authorized to enter into a treaty, and that the migratory bird question was a subject a treaty could regulate under article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

The action of Congress in implementing the treaty by a statute, was in accordance with article I, section 8, which provides as follows:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to make all the laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

The objections made by some persons to the Missouri against Holland decision is that, it was a violation of States' rights for Congress to regulate the shooting of a duck in Missouri. But the power to make treaties is prohibited to the States. Article I, section 10, of the Constitution provides:

> No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

The treaty-making power was one of the powers surrendered by the States to the President and two-thirds of the Senate consenting and concurring; and the right to implement such a treaty was given to Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Those who objected to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Missouri against Holland proposed to amend the Constitution by what is known as the "which" clause, which reads as follows:

> A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of a treaty.

What this proposed amendment would do would be to limit the treaty-making power of the United States only to those things that Congress could do without the present treaty-making power.

Why this should not be done is that the original powers of Congress to make internal law was one thing, but Congress was given further power to implement treaties, according to article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

If the power to implement treaties is taken away, the whole philosophy of the Government of the United States will be changed. The "which" clause would do exactly that. It would take away the power granted to Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution to implement treaties. The treatymaking power would be restricted only to what Congress could do in the field of domestic law, a field which is entirely apart from our international relations, except in certain instances where Congress is given express power. I cite for example, article I, section 8, clause 3, which gives to Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations" and, clause 10, which gives Congress the power "to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations."

The treatymaking power should not be restricted as proposed by the "which" clause in the proposed amendment. Sometime later I shall discuss the two amendments now at the desk, known as the Bricker amendment and the George substitute.

The reason for the remaining part of this amendment, which is an amendment to article VI, is that without the amendment we would be faced with this dilemma: We would have amended article I of the Constitution by saying that any treaty or international agreement which conflicted with the Constitution of the United States would have no force or effect. But we would allow to remain in the Constitution the language in article VI which provides in absolute terms, as has been construed by the Supreme Court, that a treaty is the supreme law of the land if it is made under the authority of the United States. This means, and has been interpreted to mean—and I shall cite some cases to that effect—something different from "in pursuance of" the Constitution, which is used in relation to laws under article VI.

But, Mr. President, the words used are "under the authority of the United States" and the words "under the authority of the United States" have been construed to mean that a treaty is made by the President of the United States and is ratified by the Senate, or is advised and consented to by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Recently I made some remarks on this subject, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] consulted Webster's dictionary with reference to the words "in pursuance." He said that the definition in Webster's dictionary meant "carrying out or into effect," and he was, therefore, worried lest the expression "in pursuance of" should be used.

But I say we cannot go to Webster's dictionary to get an interpretation of words used in the Constitution of the United States. I think a better place to go is to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall, in the first case in which the Supreme Court spoke about the unconstitutionality of laws under the Constitution, namely, the case of Marbury against Madison, a famous case decided in 1803, and reported in the first Cranch at page 137. I wish to read from the syllabus of that case:

> An act of Congress repugnant to the Constitution cannot become a law.

Let me turn to page 180 of the volume. I read two short paragraphs of the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall, merely to show what is meant by the words "in pursuance of the Constitution":

> It is also not entirely unworthy of observation, that in declaring what shall be the supreme law of the land, the Constitution itself is first mentioned; and not the laws of the United States, generally, but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution, shall have that rank.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize the words "but those only which shall be made in pursuance of the Constitution shall have that rank."

Continuing to read from the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall:

> Thus, the particular phraseology—

What Chief Marshall means when he uses the words "the particular phraseology" are the words "in pursuance of the Constitution"—

> Thus, the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supported to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the Constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.

I wish to emphasize the words "a law repugnant to the Constitution is void."

Mr. President, it makes no difference whether such language is applied to the courts or to any other department; such a law is void not only as concerns the court, but as concerns all other departments, and they are bound by the Constitution.

So it is clear in the question under discussion that when the words "in pursuance of the Constitution" are applied to treaties, we are in effect saying that such treaties must not be repugnant to the Constitution; if they are repugnant, they are void. It would be the same as saying that they are not authorized by or in conformity with the Constitution. They are in conflict with it. They are not in accordance with it.

I desire to make clear my interpretation of the language under discussion. Such language has been interpreted by Chief Justice Marshall. When we use the words "in pursuance of," we are not talking about carrying out the Constitution; we are talking about whether or not treaties are repugnant to the Constitution.

Mr. President, I have spent considerable time on the question, and I do not desire to speak at greater length; but I wish the RECORD to be clear on the point.

The same question was before the Court in the famous case of Missouri against Holland, which I mentioned previously. In that case Justice Holmes stated:

> Acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States.

The case is to be found in 222 United States 416, at page 433.

I wish to emphasize the words "while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States." As Justice Holmes stated, treaties are different from laws. Laws are to be made in pursuance of the Constitution; and treaties are to be made under the authority of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this point I believe it becomes important to indicate the historical reason for the difference in the language. At the time of the original adoption of the Constitution, the United States, under the Articles of Confederation, had entered into certain treaties with both Great Britain and France. Obviously, since such treaties had been entered into prior to adoption of the Constitution, they could not have been made in pursuance to the Constitution, but only under the authority of the United States.

In the discussion of the question, either today or tomorrow, we shall go into the reason why we go back to the adoption of the Constitution, but, of course, not before that time, in formulating the language of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has presented on his own behalf and on behalf of certain other Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct, and I wish to read the language, because it is clearly stated in article VI:

All treaties made, or which shall be made—

Indicating those made in relation to peace, prior to adoption of the Constitution, as well as those to be made after the Constitution was adopted—

under authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Article VI also provides:

And the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator's amendment, if adopted, overrule the case of Missouri against Holland? Would it make the treaty involved in that case unconstitutional?

Mr. FERGUSON. It would overrule only one part of the case of Missouri against Holland. The amendment would effectively remove one of the premises of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that whereas a statute of the United States, in order to become the supreme law of the land, must conform to the provisions of the Constitution, a treaty may become the supreme law of the land if it is made merely under the authority of the United States.

That part of the decision and reasoning of Mr. Justice Holmes which I have just read would be changed by the adoption of the proposed amendment. We have the purpose in mind of removing that part of the law laid down in Missouri against Holland, and making it conform with section 1, which the Senate approved yesterday by a vote of 62 to 20. The two provisions must be considered together in order to avoid conflict in the Constitution, and at the same time carry out the idea we have in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not mean whether it would overrule the language of the justice. Would it in effect make such an agreement itself invalid?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The amendment would not alter such an agreement; but it would alter the other premise of the decision in the case of Missouri against Holland, namely, that Congress can implement a treaty by legislation under the "necessary and proper" clause, even though it cannot enact such legislation under the grant of legislative power in the absence of a treaty.

In other words, the amendment would strike out the "which" clause, which, in my opinion, is contrary to this amendment. It is the purpose of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators who joined in the sponsorship of the amendment not only to strike out the words of the "which" clause, but to strike out the intent and the meaning of the "which" clause.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure that I quite understand the Senator. It seems to me the proposed amendment may be a little like the "which" clause, but in different language. I am a little uncertain about exactly what is intended.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The "which" clause is entirely different. I have stated, but I shall repeat, that the "which" clause states that a treaty cannot be implemented by law unless such law could be enacted under the Constitution without the treaty. That is what the "which clause" provides.

But we do not provide that at all. We merely provide that a treaty that is repugnant to or is in conflict with the Constitution cannot be made.

But, Mr. President, it will be possible to implement, under article I——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I get lost when the Senator from Michigan says "is repugnant to." Does he consider the migratory-bird treaty to be repugnant to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not at all; and I so stated at the beginning. I think the decision was one to the effect that the United States Senate had a right to ratify, and the President had a right to make, the treaty, regarding migratory birds, under the treaty law of the United States.

All I say is that Mr. Justice Holmes' opinion, in which he said there was a distinction between treaties and laws made in pursuance of treaties, will no longer be the law.

This amendment is not the "which clause"; it has nothing to do with the "which clause." In fact, the amendment is repugnant to the "which clause."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me further, to permit me to ask several questions which are not exactly on the point under discussion, but which I am very anxious to ask before the session ends tonight?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Several days ago I read in the newspapers a statement to the effect that the Attorney General had furnished the majority leader with his views on the George amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. I prefer to have the majority leader reply to that question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A few moments ago, as I prepared to ask the question, the majority leader was in his seat; but now he has taken the chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer may be permitted to answer the questions of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Let the present Presiding Officer say that he assumed the chair to relieve the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], so that he might ask several questions of the Senator from Michigan.

If the Senator from Arkansas will restate his question, the Chair, in his capacity as a United States Senator, rather than as the Presiding Officer, will endeavor to answer it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that several days ago I read in the newspapers a statement to the effect that the Attorney General had furnished the majority leader with his views on the George amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Were those the views of the Attorney General in his official capacity, or were they merely his personal reaction?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; they were his views, as had been requested by the Senator from California, in regard to the amendment in question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask these questions because, as the majority leader knows, no hearings have been held on the George amendment, and there is a great deal of disagreement among Senators as to its effect. We shall have to vote on it, and I am sure some of us would like to have the views of the administration's legal department. In fact, I am one of such Senators. Most of us, including myself, have not been parties to all the conferences and negotiations held on this matter. Yet I am sure all of us feel this is perhaps the most solemn obligation we have as Senators; namely, the obligation of passing on proposed constitutional amendments. Evidently the majority leader feels that he, himself, is in need of the opinion of the Attorney General, as evidenced by the fact that he asked for the Attorney General's views.

I wonder whether the Senator from California would agree that the rest of us also would profit by being informed of the views of the Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the George amendment is not now before the Senate; but the Senator from California expects to discuss and debate the so-called George substitute amendment at the time when it is the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that I feel the amendment is certainly one which has a considerable following. Yet I do not feel at all that I know what that amendment means. I should particularly like to have the views of the Attorney General on the amendment, if he has expressed them; and I should like to have them a little in advance of the time when we have to vote. It does not do me much good to have such views 5 minutes before the vote is taken.

If the views of the Attorney General have been given, I should like very much, as I believe other Senators would, to have the views of the Attorney General as to the effect of the George amendment, either as it now stands or as it is to be amended, if the Senator from Georgia is going to amend it in accord-

ance with certain discussions we have had here relative to the power of the President as Commander in Chief and the power of the President under his specific power to recognize foreign states.

I should like to know the views of the Attorney General on that point. In connection with a matter of such importance, I believe all of us should be given the benefit of any and all views—especially those of the Attorney General—as soon as they are available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The memorandum—it is in the form of a memorandum, rather than an official opinion—was made available, at the request of the Senator from California, while these discussions were going on.

It will be my purpose to make the memorandum available to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the other Members of the Senate in ample time before the debate on the George amendment gets under way, and before any voting regarding that amendment occurs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I confess that I have had great difficulty in understanding the purpose of the amendment the distinguished Senator from Michigan is now discussing. A few days ago, when he first spoke on the amendment, I addressed several questions to him.

The Senator from Michigan makes the point that the purpose of the amendment is to insure that no treaty shall become the supreme law of the land unless it is made pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. And "pursuant" in that respect, means not repugnant to or not in conflict with.

Mr. COOPER. I assume the Senator from Michigan would not propose an amendment to article VI, section 2, of the Constitution unless he believed some treaty had been ratified and approved, and had become the supreme law of the land, when the treaty was not pursuant to the Constitution. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that is not a correct statement of my view.

Mr. COOPER. Then if such a case has not developed, what is the necessity for amending article VI, section 2, of the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Kentucky has already indicated his position; he did so in connection with the vote which was taken yesterday on the amendment which would not allow a treaty or an executive agreement to be in conflict with the Constitution. I recall that the Senator from Kentucky voted against that amendment—thereby indicating that he did not believe it necessary to have the Constitution amended in that way.

I am convinced that the Constitution should be made crystal clear, because of the decisions of the Supreme Court and because previous administrations—not the present administration—have taken the view that anything at all—anything at all, Mr. President—could be done by means of a treaty. I do not agree.

I believe no treaty should be valid if it breaches or is in conflict with or is repugnant to the unalienable rights and constitutional rights of the people of the United States.

According to the theory advanced by the Senator from Kentucky, the Nation did not need a constitution in 1787, when the Constitution was drawn up. According to the theory of the Senator from Kentucky, we did not need a constitution at that time because none of the things prohibited by the Constitution or the Bill of Rights was being done.

On the other hand, Thomas Jefferson said that the time to make a constitution is before the wrong it prohibits is done.

In the present case we have evidence that the horse can be stolen. Therefore, we had better place a lock on the barn door before the horse is stolen, rather than to wait until after the horse has been stolen.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the Senator's comments. However, I do not think the Senator from Michigan can state my views.

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I do not intend to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Or my reason for opposing the amendment. What I am honestly trying to find out is the meaning of your proposals. I start with the basic idea that the Constitution ought not to be amended unless there is some reason for it. I am trying to find out the reasons which demand these amendments. I have a high regard for the Senator's profound concern about the entire problem of treatymaking. I have no objection to the provision which was proposed yesterday, except as it may become a section or a part of an amendment which I could not support.

Let me ask him a question. The Senator from Michigan states that he is trying to make sure that no treaty will become the supreme law of the land unless it is entered into in pursuance of the Constitution. Can the Senator tell me whether or not there has been a treaty, which became the supreme law of the land after having been negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate, but which was not in pursuance of the Constitution? Is there such an example?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but the time to build an air raid shelter, if one is intelligent at all, is before the bomb drops. Today there are many shelter areas designated in the Capitol, and there are signs telling us where to go for shelter from bombs. However, no bomb has fallen on the Capitol during our time.

So I say that there is reason to believe that there is danger. There is language in court opinions which says that treaties are purely a political matter, and not a judicial question at all. By a vote of 60 to 20 the other day the Senate said that in its opinion there should be an amendment to the Constitution providing that any treaty or any executive agreement which is in conflict with the Constitution shall be of no force or effect.

Mr. COOPER. My own conviction is that the Constitution says just that without amendment. Of course, that is a matter of opinion and judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it says it, what is wrong with stating it clearly, so that he who runs may read?

Mr. COOPER. I turn to the proposed amendment which the Senator is now discussing. Let us assume a case. Suppose that a treaty is negotiated and is sent to the Senate. The treaty deals with a matter which, except for the treaty, would be reserved to the States. That is the situation against which the "which" clause of the Bricker amendment was directed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I think the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I was against the "which" clause.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose the Senator's amendment should become a part of the Constitution, and then the kind of treaty which I have described should come to the Senate. I think the Senator has said that it would not be necessary to go to the States for implementing legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Absolutely. The States are taken out of the picture by the Constitution. The reason they were taken out was that two-thirds of the Senators present had to concur. It was considered at that time, and it is considered by some today, that historically Senators are ambassadors from the States, and that therefore they have a right under the Constitution to take away the constitutional privileges of the States, or the right to make laws in the State, if it is done by a treaty which is not repugnant to or in conflict with the supreme law, the Constitution, which is the law made by the people.

Mr. COOPER. My difficulty is this: The Constitution now fixes the manner in whch a treaty may be constitutionally approved, and then provides that when the treaty is thus approved, it shall be the supreme law of the land. I cannot, then, follow the Senator's argument that a treaty might today become the law of the land when it is repugnant to the Constitution. However, I leave that question for the moment.

Let us consider the example offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Let us suppose the Senator's amendment should become a part of the Constitution. Then suppose a state of facts similar to those in the case of Missouri against Holland. Would it be necessary, under the terms of the Senator's amendment, for the Congress to implement such a treaty by legislation before it would be of any effect?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. The Senate and the President of the United States can make a self-executing treaty. This amendment has nothing to do with the question of whether or not a treaty is self-executing.

Mr. COOPER. After the Senator's amendment had become a part of the Constitution, would he say that if a treaty similar to that involved in the case of Missouri against Holland were ratified, the Congress could pass legislation implementing the treaty which would be

superior to the laws of the State and the State constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Then, I ask, what is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose is to prevent the making of a treaty, or laws under a treaty which are repugnant to the Constitution, or which are in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly no treaty could become the law of the land until it had been negotiated, signed, and approved by the Senate. If that had been done, how would it then be repugnant to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. We come back to the proposition that if the President of the United States and two-thirds of the Senate approve a treaty, in the opinion of the Senator it cannot be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States. I do not share the Senator's view. The President and the Senate may be mistaken. The treaty may be repugnant to the Constitution; and the Supreme Court, the arbiter of the question as to whether or not the treaty conforms to the Constitution, would be the proper agency to allow our citizens to determine whether or not their rights were taken away in violation of the Constitution by a treaty which was repugnant to the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. The Supreme Court has full power to make such a decision now. I think perhaps I now understand the purpose of the amendment, if my judgment is correct on the Senator's argument. Is not the Senator really arguing that if a treaty is negotiated and approved, and such treaty strikes at the Constitution itself, or at the Bill of Rights, the treaty may overrule the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Is that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. If it strikes at the Bill of Rights, it is then in conflict with the Constitution, and the court should hold it void.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the Senator think the court can do so today and would do so?

Mr. FERGUSON. If this amendment is agreed to it certainly would. Otherwise the Court should be impeached.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that the great doubt in the Senator's mind is on the question whether a treaty is inferior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Is not that true?

Mr. FERGUSON. Inferior in this way, that the people's law, the Constitution, is the supreme law of the land; and anything else, either treaty law or statutory law, that is in conflict with the Constitution is void, as Justice Marshall said. That is constitutional government.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator entirely. I have no doubt in my mind that a treaty is inferior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But the Senator from Michigan does have that doubt.

Mr. FERGUSON. Today I do, because of words in certain decisions of the Supreme Court, and because of the attitude of certain persons in previous administrations in our Government. I do not wish to wait until the calamity happens.

Mr. COOPER. Is the Senator from Michigan afraid that the Supreme Court may hold that a treaty is of equal dignity or even the supreme law, over the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator must be familiar with all the decisions of the Supreme Court which, while not in direct point, yet in dicta—hold that treaties cannot overturn the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, and are subject to all the prohibitions of the Constitution. To further prove this truth, is it not correct to say that a legislative enactment by Congress can nullify a treaty?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not all treaties.

Mr. COOPER. It can nullify a treaty, is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not all treaties. I have a case in mind.

Mr. COOPER. What treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are certain treaties which Congress cannot nullify because they were made under the Constitution, and Congress does not have authority in that field.

Mr. COOPER. I believe there are some agreements which the President could make under his constitutional powers, which perhaps Congress could not nullify. I am not certain about it. However, the Senator will agree, I am sure, that a law passed by Congress can nullify a treaty which has been approved by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not go that far.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me inconsistent to say that a treaty which can be nullified by an act of Congress is superior to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not saying that it is superior. I say that there are people who say so. I am not willing to rely upon the dicta of Justices of the Supreme Court. I think we ought to make it clear. I think we ought to spell it out. It should be made clear and clearly spelled out so that anyone who reads it will know what we are doing, and will know that from now on all treaties and laws made under treaties must not be in conflict with the Constitution. The Senator from Kentucky apparently is willing to rely on dicta.

Mr. COOPER. No; I am not. I am relying on the Constitution as it is. I am troubled about the Senator's amendment. While under article VI, section 2, a treaty is held to be the law of the land, his amendment says that notwithstanding that fact it shall not be the law of the land unless pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. But today it could not be the law of the land unless it is pursuant to the Constitution. I take the position that it could not be the law of the land and so held unless it had been approved and is pursuant to the Constitution, because it is a creature of and inferior to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. What about Justice Holmes?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment adds a provision which says that notwithstanding that fact it shall not be the supreme law unless it is entered into pursuant to the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. What the Senator is saying is that in his opinion the law is now what we intend to make it.

Mr. COOPER. I think it is so without question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. I do not believe so.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's amendment raises questions and doubts where to my mind there is no doubt. I have not been able to find any case or situation, and the Senator from Michigan is not able to state one, where a treaty has invaded the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are treaties now in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate which would violate the Constitution of the United States and be repugnant to it and in conflict with it.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator does not believe that they would be permitted by the courts to stand, if repugnant, even if they were ratified, does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, wait a minute. The Senator from Kentucky is saying that the Senate would not do it. A President of the United States negotiated such a treaty and sent it to the Senate. Why should I not be fearful that the Senate might some day ratify the treaty? Therefore I say it is mandatory that we add to the Constitution the provisions we have proposed.

Mr. COOPER. But we still have the courts if such a treaty is repugnant and violates the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. But why would a President of the United States send a treaty to the Senate to be ratified which clearly would be repugnant to and in conflict with the Constitution, if he did not believe and if his Secretary of State did not believe that a treaty was superior to the Constitution? That is what I am concerned about.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Michigan have in mind a situation whereby a treaty could be negotiated under the authority of the United States but, so far as internal law is concerned, and the effect of it on American citizens within the United States was concerned, it might set up an international tribunal to try a citizen for an alleged offense created in the international agreement or treaty which had been negotiated?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Which would cut completely across the Bill of Rights and deprive the American citizens of the constitutional protections we have learned to be fundamental under our form of government?

Mr. FERGUSON. Exactly; that is what we are trying to prevent.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. The amendment would prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization. I wish to re-

peat that statement. The amendment would prevent the delegation of executive, legislative, or judicial power to an international organization, for under the Constitution those powers are vested exclusively in the President, the Congress, and the Federal courts.

The amendment would prevent the United States by treaty or executive agreement from depriving any United States citizen of any rights or freedoms guaranteed to him by the Constitution. It would prevent the United States from conferring, by treaty, jurisdiction on an international court, to charge, try, and sentence a United States citizen for an offense committed in the United States. I believe that answers the question of the distinguished Senator from California.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. My belief is that the statement is an assumption, and an incorrect assumption, which gives rise to arguments in favor of the amendment. When the Senator says his amendment would prevent the deprivation of individual rights, or change in the division of power then he assumes that under the Constitution a treaty can now take away the rights of individual citizens, rights guaranteed to them by the Bill of Rights. The Senator has argued that a treaty could destroy the structure of our Government and the division of powers under the Constitution. I cannot believe it. I do not believe that any person who has studied the cases could believe it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not believe it? Then why does the Senator object to our making it clear?

Mr. COOPER. Because I do not think it is the slightest bit cloudy now. The Senator assumes that there is a possibility of the Constitution being overridden by a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator believe that the Secretary of State in the previous administration, who sent a certain treaty to the Senate, had in mind that he could do it?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know what the treaty was, unless it was the genocide treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That is the only one.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That has never been ratified.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is saying that if airplanes were above us, dropping bombs, he would not go into the shelter until after they had been dropped. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. I did not say that. But I would want to know if the airplanes were coming before running to shelter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of State and the President sent a treaty to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. In fact, it came first to the Senate, and then it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COOPER. I would still ask the Senator this question: Is not his thesis based upon the idea that a treaty can be superior to the Constitution?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what we wish to cure.

Mr. COOPER. I do not accept that thesis.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak tomorrow with reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I do not want to address myself to them at this time, because my remarks have been more lengthy than I had anticipated.

In the case of *McCullough* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316), Chief Justice Marshall said:

> The Government of the Union, though limited in its powers, is supreme within its sphere of action * * * But this question is not left to mere reason: the people have, in express terms, decided it, by saying "this Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land." The Government of the United States then, though limited in its powers, is supreme, and its laws, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, form the supreme law of the land.

This generally shows Marshall's concept, that "in pursuance" means "within the area of powers given to the Government of the United States, including implied powers. In the case then at bar, Marshall, examining whether Congress had the power to incorporate a bank, specifically stated:

> The act to incorporate the Bank of the United States is a law made in pursuance of the Constitution and is part of the supreme law of the land.

Mr. President, this sphere of action is controlled or limited. The words "in pursuance" do not mean to carry out, but, as I said before, they mean that a treaty shall not be repugnant to the Constitution; that is, it shall not be in conflict with the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter which I received from the legal adviser of the Department of State relative to an agreement between Canada and the United States entered into on November 23, 1948, and immediately following that to have printed in the RECORD from the Federal Reporter, 2d Series, 204, beginning on page 655, the reference to the case of United States against Guy W. Capps, Inc., running over to page 661.

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

THE LEGAL ADVISER,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your request, I am sending you herewith copy of the agreement between the United States of America and Canada effected by exchange of notes signed November 23, 1948. This is the agreement involving the control of export of potatoes from Canada to the United States which was involved in the so-called Capps case.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN PHLEGER,
The Legal Adviser.

(Enclosure: Agreement between United States and Canada re potatoes.)

POTATOES: CONTROL OF EXPORTS FROM CANADA TO THE UNITED STATES—AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA

THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1948.

The Honourable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honour to refer to the discussions which have taken place between the representatives of the Government of Canada and of the Government of the United States of America regarding the problems which would confront the Government of the United States in the operation of its price support and other programmes for potatoes if the imports of Canadian potatoes, during this current crop year, were to continue to be unrestricted. After careful consideration of the various representations which have been made to the Canadian Government on this subject, the Canadian Government is prepared to:

1. Include Irish potatoes in the list of commodities for which an export permit is required under the provisions of the Export and Imports Permits Act.

2. Withhold export permits for the movement of table stock potatoes to the United States proper, excluding Alaska.

3. Issue export permits for the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes to the United States, but only under the following circumstances:

(a) Export permits will be issued to Canadian exporters for shipments to specified States in the United States and such permits will only be granted within the structure of a specific schedule. The schedule is designed to direct the shipment of Canadian certified seed potatoes into those States where there is a legitimate demand for certified seed potatoes and only during a short period immediately prior to the normal seeding time. A draft of this schedule is now being jointly prepared by Canadian and United States officials.

(b) Export permits would only be granted to Canadian exporters who could give evidence that they had firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes. Canadian exporters would also be required to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes.

(c) The Canadian Government would survey the supply of Canadian certified seed potatoes by class and consider the possibility of giving precedence to the export of Foundation and Foundation A classes of certified seed.

(d) The names and addresses of the consignees entered on the export permit would be compiled periodically and this information would be forwarded to the United States Government.

In instituting a system which has the effect of restricting exports of Canadian potatoes to the United States, the Canadian Government recognizes a responsibility to the Canadian commercial grower in certain surplus potato areas and is prepared to guarantee a minimum return on gradable potatoes for which the grower cannot find a sales outlet. Although the details of such a program have not been finalized, it is anticipated

that the Canadian Government will announce, at approximately the same time as potatoes are placed under export control, a floor price which will be effective April 1, 1949, for certain carlot shipping areas in the East. To implement this program the Canadian Government would inspect the potato holdings of commercial growers in Prince Edward Island and several counties of New Brunswick on or after April 1 and would undertake to pay a fixed price for every hundred pounds of Canada No. 1 potatoes found in the bins. It is not anticipated that any actual payment would be made at that time and it would be understood that if any of the potatoes examined were subsequently sold or used for seed purposes the owner would forfeit any claim for assistance on such potatoes. In other words, the Canadian Government would make no payment on potatoes which move into export trade, or which are used for seed purposes.

It should be noted that the Canadian proposals to institute export permit control on Canadian potatoes and to inaugurate a price support program are contingent upon assurances from the United States Government that:

(a) The United States Government will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop exported to the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes from Canada to the United States outlined herein.

(b) The Canadian Government proposal, as outlined herein, to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces would not be interpreted by United States authorities as either a direct or indirect subsidy and that in consequence there would be no grounds for the imposition of countervailing duties under section 300 of the United States Tariff Act of 1930.[1]

If the United States Government in its replying note accepts the Canadian proposals and gives to the Canadian Government the assurances required, as outlined above, this note and the reply thereto will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

H. H. WRONG.

THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE CANADIAN AMBASSADOR

NOVEMBER 23, 1948.

His Excellency HUME WRONG,
Ambassador of Canada.

EXCELLENCY: The Government of the United States appreciates the assurance of the Government of Canada contained in your note No. 538 of November 23, 1948, that the Government of Canada is prepared, contingent upon the receipt of certain assurances from the Government of the United States, to establish the controls outlined therein over the exportation of potatoes from Canada to the United States.

In view of the adverse effect which unrestricted imports of Canadian potatoes would have on the potato programs of the United States and the fact that it is anticipated that the Canadian proposal will substantially reduce the quantity of potatoes which would otherwise be imported into the United States, and in the interest of international trade between the United States and Canada and other considerations, the United States Government assures the Canadian Government that it will not hereafter impose any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop imported into the United States under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal.

The Government of the United States also wishes to inform the Canadian Government with respect to that Government's proposal to guarantee a floor price to certain commercial growers in the Maritime Provinces, that in the opinion of the Treasury Department, the operation of such a proposal as outlined by the Canadian Government would not be considered as a payment or bestowal, directly or indirectly, of any bounty or grant upon the manufacture, production, or export of the potatoes concerned and no countervailing duty would, therefore, be levied, under the provisions of section 303, Tariff Act of 1930, as a result of such operation of the proposal on potatoes imported from Canada.

The United States Government agrees that your note under reference, together with this reply, will constitute an agreement on this subject.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

[1] 46 Stat. 687.

UNITED STATES v. GUY W. CAPPS, INC., NO. 6541

(United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit. Argued March 18, 1953. Decided April 15, 1953)

Action by United States against corporation, for damages for breach by defendant of its agreement that potatoes imported by defendant from Canada would not be used for table stock purposes. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk, Albert V. Bryan, judge, directed verdict for defendant, and plaintiff appealed from judgment thereon. The court of appeals, Parker, chief judge, held that executive agreement between United States and Canada that Canada would allow export of seed potatoes to a United States importer only on condition that contract of purchase include an assurance by importer that potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes, which agreement was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of statute dealing with same matter, was void, and contract based thereon was unenforceable in United States courts.

Affirmed.

1. CONTRACTS

Treaties

Executive agreement between United States and Canada that Canada would allow export of seed potatoes to a United States importer only on condition that contract of purchase include an assurance by importer that potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table-stock purposes, which agreement was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of statute dealing with same matter, was void, and contract based thereon was unenforceable in United States courts. (Agricultural Adjustment Act, sec. 22, as amended by Agricultural Act of 1948, sec. 3, 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 624.)

2. UNITED STATES

No action can be maintained by United States to recover damages on account of what is essentially a breach of a trade regulation, in the absence of express authorization by Congress.

3. COMMERCE

Constitutional law

Power to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress, not in the Executive or the courts, and the Executive may not exercise the power by entering into executive agreements and suing in the courts for damages resulting from breaches of contracts made on basis of such agreements.

4. CUSTOMS DUTIES

Where purpose and effect of executive agreement between United States and Canada respecting importation into United States of Canadian seed potatoes, was to bar imports which would interfere with the agricultural adjustment program, failure of agreement to comply with provisions of Agricultural Act respecting limitations which might be imposed on imports which might interfere with the program, rendered agreement void. (Agricultural Adjustment Act, sec. 22, as amended by Agricultural Act of 1948, sec. 3, 7 USCA, sec. 624.)

5. UNITED STATES

Power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, expressly vested by Constitution in Congress, is not among powers incident to presidential office, and it cannot be upheld as an exercise of the presidential power to see that laws are faithfully executed.

6. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

The Executive may not bypass congressional limitations regulating foreign commerce by entering into an agreement with the foreign country that the regulation be exercised by that country through its control over exports.

7. CONTRACTS

Where contract was but the carrying out of an executive agreement entered into in contravention of policy declared by Congress, United States courts would not lend their aid to enforcing it against public policy of the country so declared.

8. CONTRACTS

Contracts permissible by other countries are not enforceable in courts of United States, if they contravene laws, morality, or policy of the United States.

9. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

United States

No cause of action exists under Federal law in favor of government suing in its sovereign capacity to recover damages which it claimed to have sustained while engaged in exercise of governmental powers, as result of violation of a contract made between other persons, nor can such cause of action be maintained by analogies drawn from private contract law permitting suit by one for whose benefit a contract is made to sue thereon, since such exercise of judicial power to establish new liability would amount to unwarranted intrusion by courts into field properly within control of Congress and as to a matter concerning which Congress had seen fit to take no action.

Joseph Kovner, attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. (Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General, A. Carter, Whitehead, United States attorney, and Austin E. Owens, special assistant to the United States attorney, Richmond, Va., and Edward H. Hickey, attorney, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., on brief) for appellant.

W. R. Ashburn, Norfolk, Va. (H. M. Jarvis and Ashburn, Agelasto & Sellers, Norfolk, Va., on brief) for appellee.

Before Parker, chief judge, and Soper and Dobie, circuit judges.

Parker, chief judge:

"This is an appeal by the United States from a judgment entered on a verdict directed for the defendant, Guy W. Capps, in an action instituted to recover damages alleged to have been sustained by the United States as the result of alleged breach by defendant of a contract with respect to the importation of seed potatoes from Canada. The district court denied a motion to dismiss the action (*United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* (100 F. Supp. 30)). Upon the subsequent trial, however, the court directed a verdict and entered judgment for defendant on the ground that there was no sufficient showing of breach of contract or damage to the United States.

"The contract sued on has relation to the potato price support program of 1948 and the executive agreement entered into between Canada and the United States through the Canadian Ambassador and the

Acting Secretary of State of the United States. Pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1948 (Public Law 897, 80th Cong., 2d Sess., 62 Stat. 1247) the United States committed itself to purchase from eligible potato growers, directly or through dealers, all table stock and seed potatoes that could not be sold commercially at a parity price. The purchase and disposal of potatoes under this program was carried out by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In a manifest attempt to protect the American potato market in which this price-support program was operating from an influx of Canadian-grown potatoes, the Acting Secretary of State of the United States, on November 23, 1948, entered into an executive agreement with the Canadian Ambassador, who was acting for the Canadian Government, to the effect that the Canadian Government would place potatoes in the list of commodities for which export permits were required and that export permits would be granted therefor only to Canadian exporters who could give evidence that they had firm orders from legitimate United States users of Canadian seed potatoes and that 'Canadian exporters would also be required to have included in any contract into which they might enter with a United States seed potato importer a clause in which the importer would give an assurance that the potatoes would not be diverted or reconsigned for table stock purposes.' In consideration of this agreement on the part of the Canadian Government, the United States Government undertook that it would not impose 'any quantitative limitations or fees on Canadian potatoes of the 1948 crop exported to the United States' under the system of regulating the movement of potatoes to the United States outlined in the Canadian proposal and would not consider the Canadian Government's guaranty of a floor price with respect to certain potatoes to be the payment of a bounty or grant and would not levy any countervailing duty on such potatoes under the provisions of section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930. On November 26, 1948, the Canadian Privy Council added potatoes to the list of products under export permit control and exporters of seed potatoes to the United States could not secure an export permit without complying with the conditions required by the executive agreement.

"Defendant, a corporation engaged in business in Norfolk, Va., entered into a contract in December 1948 with H. B. Willis, Inc., a Canadian exporter, to purchase 48,544 sacks of Canadian seed potatoes, containing 100 pounds each, to be shipped on the steamship *Empire Gangway* docking in Jacksonville, Fla., in January 1949. Defendant's officers admittedly knew of the agreement with Canada and stated in a telegram to an official of the United States Department of Agriculture that the potatoes were being brought in for seed purposes. Defendant sent a telegram to the exporter in Canada on the same day that the potatoes were billed stating that they were for planting in Florida and Georgia. Defendant sold the potatoes while in shipment to the Atlantic Commission Co., a wholly owned agency of Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., a retail grocery organization. No attempt was made to restrict their sale so that they would be used for seed and not for food, and there is evidence from which the jury could properly have drawn the conclusion that they were sold on the market as food displacing potatoes grown in this country and causing damage to the United States by requiring greater purchases of American-grown potatoes in aid of the price-support program than would have been necessary in the absence of their importation.

"1–3. On these facts we think that judgment was properly entered for the defendant, but for reasons other than those given by the district court. We have little difficulty in seeing in the evidence breach of contract on the part of defendant and damage resulting to the United States from the breach. We think, however, that the executive agreement was void because it was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of a statute dealing with the very matter to which it related and that the contract relied on, which was based on the executive agreement, was unenforcible in the courts of the United States for like reason. We think, also, that no action can be maintained by the Government to recover damages on account of what is essentially a breach of a trade regulation, in the absence of express authorization by Congress. The power to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress, not in the executive or the courts; and the executive may not exercise the power by entering into executive agreements and suing in the courts for damages resulting from breaches of contracts made on the basis of such agreements.

"In the Agricultural Act of 1948, Congress had legislated specifically with respect to the limitations which might be imposed on imports if it was thought that they would render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken pursuant to that act. Section 3 of the act, which amended prior statutes, provided in the portion here pertinent (62 Stat. 1248–1250, 7 U. S. C. A. sec. 624):

"'(a) Whenever the President has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title * * * he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

"'(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such * * * quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered * * * for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a), of this section * * * *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quanitity of any article or articles which may be entered * * * for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered * * * for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President.'

"4. There was no pretense of complying with the requirements of this statute. The President did not cause an investigation to be made by the Tariff Commission, the Commission did not conduct an investigation or make findings or recommendations, and the President made no findings of fact and issued no proclamation imposing quantitative limitations and determined no representative period for the application of the 50 percent limitation contained in the proviso. All that occurred in the making of this executive agreement, the effect of which was to exclude entirely a food product of a foreign country from importation into the United States, was an exchange of correspondence between the Acting Secretary of State and the Canadian Ambassador. Since the purpose of the agreement as well as its effect was to bar imports which would interfere with the agriclutural adjustment program, it was necessary that the provisions of this statute be complied with and an executive agreement excluding such imports which failed to comply with it was void. (*Morgan* v. *United States* (304 U. S. 1, 58, S. Ct. 773, 999, 82 L. Ed. 1129); *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388, 55 S. Ct. 241, 253, 79 L. Ed. 446).) As was said by Chief Justice Hughes in the case last cited: 'We are not dealing with action which, appropriately belonging to the executive province, is not the subject of judicial review or with the presumptions attaching to executive action. * * * we are concerned with the question of the delegation of legislative power. * * *'

"5. It is argued, however, that the validity of the executive agreement was not dependent upon the act of Congress but was made pursuant to the inherent powers of the President under the Constitution. The answer is that while the President has certain inherent powers under the Constitution such as the power pertaining to his position as Commander in Chief of Army and Navy and the power necessary to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress. It cannot be upheld as an exercise of the power to see that the laws are faithfully executed, for, as said by Mr. Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 177, 47 S. Ct. 21, 85, 71 L. Ed. 160), 'The duty of the President to see that the laws be executed is a duty that does not go beyond the laws or require him to achieve more than Congress sees fit to leave within his power.' In the recent case of *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, (343 U. S. 579, 72 S. Ct. 863, 867, 96 L. Ed. 1153), the Supreme Court dealt with the question in the following pertinent language:

"'Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. The first section of the first article says that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States * * *." After granting many powers to the Congress, article I goes on to provide that Congress may "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof."'

"The rule was well stated by Mr. Justice Jackson in his concurring opinion in the case last cited as follows:

"'When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject. Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system.'

"6. We think that whatever the power of the executive with respect to making executive trade agreements regulating foreign

commerce in the absence of action by Congress, it is clear that the executive may not through entering into such an agreement avoid complying with a regulation prescribed by Congress. Imports from a foreign country are foreign commerce subject to regulation, so far as this country is concerned, by Congress alone. The executive may not bypass congressional limitations regulating such commerce by entering into an agreement with the foreign country that the regulation be exercised by that country through its control over exports. Even though the regulation prescribed by the executive agreement be more desirable than that prescribed by congressional action, it is the latter which must be accepted as the expression of national policy.

"7, 8. It is argued that irrespective of the validity of the executive agreement, the contract sued on was a valid contract between defendant and the Canadian exporter, and that since the contract was made for the benefit of the United States, this country may maintain action upon it.[2] The answer is that the contract was but the carrying out of the executive agreement entered into in contravention of the policy declared by Congress; and the courts of the United States will not lend their aid to enforcing it against the public policy of the country so declared. As stated, the regulation of imports from foreign countries is a matter for Congress and, when Congress has acted, the executive may not enforce different regulations by suing on contracts made with reference thereto. As said by the Supreme Court in *Oscanyan* v. *Arms Co.* (103 U. S. 261, 277, 26 L. Ed. 539), 'Contracts permissible by other countries are not enforceable in our courts if they contravene our laws, our morality, or our policy.'

"9. We think the action for damages may not be sustained for the additional reason that Congress has created no such right of action and we think that the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California* (332 U. S. 301, 67 S. Ct. 1604, 91 L. Ed. 2067), are applicable here. This is not a case where the Government stands in the shoes of a private person and sues on a contract which it has made as much. It is a case where the Government sues in its sovereign capacity to recover damages which it claims to have sustained while engaged in the exercise of governmental powers, as the result of the violation of a contract made between other persons. No such cause of action exists under Federal law; and we do not think that analogies drawn from private contract law, permitting suit by one for whose benefit a contract is made to sue thereon, can properly be followed here. 'The exercise of judicial power to establish a new liability would amount to an unwarranted intrusion by the courts into a field properly within the control of Congress and as to a matter concerning which it had seen fit to take no action.' (*Gartner* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 166 F. 2d 728, 730)). In the case of *United States v. Standard Oil Co. of California*, supra, the Supreme Court, in denying recovery by the Government in an action grounded in analogies to private tort law, used the following language which we think pertinent, viz:

" 'Moreover, as the Government recognizes for one phase of the argument but ignores for the other, we have not here simply a question of creating a new liability in the nature of a tort. For grounded though the argument is in analogies drawn from that field, the issue comes down in final consequence to a question of Federal fiscal policy, coupled with considerations concerning the need for and the appropriateness of means to be used in executing the policy sought to be established. The tort law analogy is brought forth, indeed, not to secure a new step forward in expanding the recognized area for applying settled principles of that law as such, or for creating new ones. It is advanced rather as the instrument for determining and establishing the Federal fiscal and regulatory policies which the Government's executive arm thinks should prevail in a situation not covered by traditionally established liabilities.

" 'Whatever the merits of the policy, its conversion into law is a proper subject for congressional action, not for any creative power of ours. Congress, not this Court or the other Federal courts, is the custodian of the national purse. By the same token it is the primary and most often the exclusive arbiter of Federal fiscal affairs. And these comprehend, as we have said, securing the Treasury or the Government against financial losses, however inflicted, including requiring reimbursement for injuries creating them, as well as filling the Treasury itself.' [332 U. S. 301, 67 S. Ct. 1611.]

"For the reasons stated, we do not think that the United States can maintain the action for damages. The judgment for defendant will accordingly be affirmed."

Affirmed.

[2] There is a holding to that effect in a decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York in the case of *United States* v. *Carpenter* (113 F. Supp. 327).

THE CHARGE OF TREASON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to read, for the information of the Senate, an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning, February 16, 1954:

THE CHARGE OF TREASON

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN has been asking the Democrats for a list of names that he can use without making them angry. I am afraid Mr. HOFFMAN has not quite understood just why the President disavowed the charges of treason in the Lincoln's birthday speeches.

The list of names that one politician may call another is almost, but not quite, unlimited. The list, moreover, can always be enlarged whenever a politician comes along with a knack for calling names. He does not have to refrain because his epithets will make his opponent angry. Indeed, politics being a rough and manly game, he may use names with the intention of making the other fellow so angry that he becomes rattled and does foolish things. This is a very free country.

There is, however, a blacklist on name-calling. The test is not whether the name makes a man angry; or whether it is coarse, mean, insulting; not even whether it is untrue. The test is whether the name is one which—if it is untrue and is not retracted—a man of honor cannot forgive. As long as the libel stands, there can be between him and the man who made it only an implacable enmity.

Treason, like murder, is a capital offense. To call a man a traitor, to accuse him of aiding and abetting treason, is to make a mortal accusation. If the accuser is right, the traitor should be brought to trial and, if convicted, he deserves to die. And if the man is falsely accused, if he is libeled and traduced by a deliberate and calculated lie, he must resent it and he must not rest until the accusation is knocked out. It is not merely his private right to vindicate his honor. It is his public duty to vindicate his honor. For the making of false accustations, especially of capital crimes like treason and murder, is a subversion of freedom of speech and grave disorderly conduct which threatens the integrity of a nation.

It is necessary to spell out why the charge of treason—made deliberately and with knowing untruth by one party against another—is an intolerable political offense? For those who have forgotten why, or perhaps have never known, let it be said that to incite one half of the people against the other half, putting between them the mortal issue of treason, is to enter upon the commission of a political crime which can bring terrible consequences.

It is a gruesome irony that this organized incitement of a fratricidal division of our people was begun, with the blessings of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, at meetings in honor of Abraham Lincoln. It makes one shudder at the desecration of his memory—at having to hear cruel and calculating voices summoning the Nation to civil disunity in the name of the martyr of the American Civil War.

The seriousness of the offense lies in the fact that, despite the President's disavowal of the charge of treason, the campaign is sponsored by the chairman of the Republican committee. The evidence is not conclusive but it is very strong that the resort to this tactic, the use of MCCARTHY, JENNER, and the like to force and fix the political issues, reflects a deliberate and highlevel political decision. With the President himself reluctant and protesting, it would appear from their actions that there has been a radical decision by the politicians of the Eisenhower ring of the Republican Party.

Beginning with Mr. Brownell's Chicago speech and his use of the FBI files for partisan purposes, going on to Governor Dewey's unprecedented—unprecedented for him—political violence and venom at Hartford and then down to Chairman Hall's encouragement of the firebrands—there is a remarkably clear pattern.

The Brownell speech marked a radical turn away from the principles and the ideals General Eisenhower represents. It was made almost immediately after the ominous Republican political reverses in Wisconsin, New Jersey, and New York. Since then the underlying economic trends have not been favorable to Republican political prospects. It is only too evident that the politicians around the President are very much frightened. The Brownell-Dewey-Hall line since the lost elections of last fall can be explained only by supposing they are afraid not only of losing the House of Representatives to the Democrats but also of losing their own party position and perhaps their political heads to the extreme anti-Eisenhower and anti-Dewey wing of the party.

Their new line is explicable only in terms of something like panic, fear, or a profound feeling of political insecurity. Their line is designed as protection against the exploitation by MCCARTHY of a political setback in November. If the election goes better than they now fear, they will still be in the saddle though considerably bedraggled in appearance. If the election goes badly, they hope—though almost certainly in vain—to make MCCARTHY share the blame and not to be able to raise hell at their expense.

The President, who cannot be happy about all this, might find it useful at this point to invite his political advisers to read and to ponder the famous and oft-told tale of Dr. Faustus and his pact with a very slick and plausible gent.

EISENHOWER AND LINCOLN—ARTICLE BY RALPH McGILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article by Mr. Ralph McGill, entitled "Eisenhower and Lincoln," which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of February 12, 1954.

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

EISENHOWER AND LINCOLN

There is no intent here to compare him with Lincoln, but there are parallels.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, talking with the press but a few hours ahead of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, suggested that political parties with small majorities speak softly and declared his need of the Democratic Party in the Government.

This outraged Senator JOE MCCARTHY, columnist David Lawrence, and others who speak for, and represent, the extreme right wing, or old guard, of the Republican Party.

Lincoln faced a similar problem.

The extremists in his Cabinet and in the Congress, as well as the hostile elements of the press, were saying that the Southern leaders should be tried and hanged or imprisoned. They were crying for a conquered province status.

Lincoln stood against it. He was saying the Union needed the South and its people and that they should be brought back into the Union without unnecessary humiliation or punishment.

Senators and Congressmen, as well as Cabinet Members, went about crying for the hangman's noose, for prison and for the most extreme and cruel forms of revenge.

TREASON

Today, Senator MCCARTHY's voice and, to a somewhat lesser extent, those of JENNER and VELDE, along with some elements of the press, join in saying that the Democratic Party is "the party of treason."

"The party of treason, the party that sold our America, the party that brought in the Communists, the party of disloyalty."

It has a familiar ring. It sounds exactly like Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner of 1865–75.

But the President, speaking over the heads of these men, said that the Republicans, in office with a small majority, should speak softly. He needed the loyal American faith of the Democrats. Without them and their loyalty, the Government, with a bare majority, cannot go on.

He knew, for example, that Senator WALTER GEORGE, who brought forth the Democratic compromise in the BRICKER fight, was not a traitor because he stood there as a Democrat when he presented the compromise which saved the Republican Party from defeat.

The President, being a decent man, was trying, as did Lincoln, to deal with men driven by the lust of personal power. It was the excesses of Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens which drove the frustrated actor Booth to murder and thereby delivered the Nation into the hands of the extremists. President Eisenhower obviously recognizes the danger of the extremists in his own party.

LOYALTY

On the day the President so spoke, suggesting the extremists in his party cease their loud shoutings, it was revealed that of the 534 persons released by the State Department only 11 were in the security-risk status. Yet, the extremists have been saying to the Nation, "We have fired 2,200 for disloyalty." They were going out for their Lincoln Day speeches with this lie. It was a deliberate attempt to further their charges that the Democratic Party is the party of disloyalty and of treason.

An angry security officer shouts that the people aren't interested in why they were fired—they just wanted to be rid of them. Actually, most were fired for inefficiency, for drinking, and for other causes. But the Thad Stevenses and the Charles Sumners of today are saying all had been fired for security risks. They sought to make the firing of a drunk appear as the discovery of a traitor.

It was, and is, a Fascistlike lie—just as Thad Stevens and Charles Sumner used it to destroy the decent and reasonable policy of Lincoln.

The American people are loyal—Democrats and Republicans alike. They are confronted with men who would use, and foment, fear to attain unusual political powers for themselves. President Eisenhower sees it for what it is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as examples of what Mr. Lippman and Mr. McGill are talking about, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the following excerpts from speeches and press dispatches:

First. A statement by Stephen A. Mitchell at a press conference in Portland, Oreg., released by the Democratic National Committee on February 10.

Second. A quotation from a speech by Attorney General Brownell before the Executives Club of Chicago, on November 6, 1953.

Third. A quotation from a speech by Governor Dewey at Hartford, Conn., on December 16, 1953, from the New York Times of December 17, 1953.

Fourth. A quotation from a speech by Senator JENNER at Jeffersonville, Ind., on February 12, 1954, as reported in the New York Times, of February 13, 1954.

Fifth. A quotation from a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at Charleston, W. Va., on February 4, 1954, as reported in the Charleston Gazette of February 5, 1954.

Sixth. A quotation from a speech by Governor Dewey read to Brooklyn Republicans, as reported in the Washington Post of February 13.

Seventh. An article from the Washington Post of February 14, 1954, reporting a speech by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Eighth. An excerpt from an article in the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press, of February 9, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in St. Paul on February 8, 1954.

Ninth. An excerpt from an article in the Detroit News of February 7, 1954, reporting a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] delivered at a banquet in Mount Clemens, Mich.

Tenth. Excerpts from a United Press article in the Washington Post of February 8, 1954, reporting statements by Leonard W. Hall, Chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Eleventh. Excerpts from an article in the New York Times of February 14, 1954, dealing with speeches by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and Mr. Scott McLeod.

Twelfth. An excerpt from a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] delivered at San Mateo, Calif., on February 10, 1954.

Thirteenth. An excerpt from an article in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of February 8, 1954, reporting a speech by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] in that city.

Fourteenth. An excerpt from a speech delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] in Sarasota County, Fla., as reported in the New York Times of February 14, 1954.

Fifteenth. An excerpt from the New York Times of February 14, 1954, reporting on a speech delivered by Speaker MARTIN in Newark, N. J., on February 13, 1954.

Sixteenth. An excerpt from a speech delivered by Postmaster General Summerfield at New York on January 21, 1954.

Seventeenth. An excerpt from an article in the Washington, D. C., Times-Herald of February 5, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] in Charleston, W. Va., on February 4, 1954.

Eighteenth. An article appearing in the New York Times of January 24, 1954, reporting a speech delivered by Speaker MARTIN in Philadelphia, Pa., on January 23, 1954.

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

PRESIDENT QUOTED, HAS NOT SEEN ACCUSATIONS—STEPHEN A. MITCHELL AT A PRESS CONFERENCE IN PORTLAND, OREG.

It is amazing to read the President's statement that "he has not seen any accusations by members of his party charging that Democrats are tinged with treason." He can pick up any paper in the country and see these charges almost daily—even from his own official family. (Publicity division, Democratic National Committee, February 10, 1954.)

QUOTE FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL BROWNELL'S SPEECH BEFORE THE EXECUTIVES CLUB, NOVEMBER 6, 1953

Notwithstanding all this, Harry Dexter White was a Russian spy. He smuggled secret documents to Russian agents for transmission to Moscow. Harry Dexter White was known to be a Communist spy by the very people who appointed him to the most sensitive and important position he ever held in Government service.

GOVERNOR DEWEY AT HARTFORD, CONN., DECEMBER 16, 1953

Whenever anybody mentions the words "Truman" and "Democrats" to you, for the rest of your lives remember that those words are synonymous with Americans dying, thousands of miles from home, because they did not have the ammunition to defend themselves.

Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean bungling our country into war and the lack of courage or the capacity either to win the war or to win a truce.

Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean the loss of 450 million Chinese to the free world. Remember that the words "Truman" and "Democrat" mean diplomatic failure, military failure, death, and tragedy. (The New York Times, December 17, 1953 (from text of speech).)

SENATOR JENNER AT JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., FEBRUARY 12, 1954

We won in 1952 because the Fair Dealers made one mistake too many * * * they ordered American youth to engage in a war halfway round the earth, in territory the Fair Dealers had carefully stripped beforehand of every American soldier and virtually every American gun. * * *

That was bad enough but worse was to come. They put every possible handicap on our fighting men. They deprived them of air support, and a naval blockade. They removed their commander in mid-campaign.

But the Americans did not know they were supposed to lose the war, so they won it.

Then the Fair Dealers stooped to the ultimate depths—they gave away the victory our men had won with their blood. (The New York Times, February 18, 1954.)

SENATOR MCCARTHY AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 4, 1954

The Democratic label—and I hasten to add this label is not deserved by millions of loyal Democrats—is now the property of men who have been unwilling to recognize evil or who bent to whispered pleas to traitorous men. * * *

He said the "label" was controlled by Democrats who were too weak or unwilling to fight treason; men whose political heritage is stained with blood of men betrayed in Taejon (Korea); men who walked side by side with the betrayers of Yalta; men who wear the political label stitched with the idiocy of a Truman; rotted by the deceit of an Acheson; corrupted by the Red slime of Harry Dexter White.

The hard fact is that those who wear the label Democrat wear it with the stain of a historic betrayal. They wear it with the corrosion of unprecedented corruption; they wear it with blood of dying men who crawled up the hills of Korea while the left wing politicians in the Democrat Party wrote perfumed invitations to the Communists to join them at the United Nations. (The Charleston Gazette, February 5, 1954.)

GOV. THOMAS DEWEY IN A STATEMENT READ TO BROOKLYN REPUBLICANS

Gov. Tom Dewey, of New York, * * * said in a statement read to Brooklyn Republicans * * * that Republicans found "The Government payrolls were crammed with men and women who were described as security risks," and "in some cases that description was an out-and-out understatement." (Washington Post, February 13, 1954 (Lincoln Day talks).)

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST OF FEBRUARY 14, 1954

Wendell B. Barnes, head of the Federal Small Business Administration, wrapped together in one speech all the Republican accusations. * * *

In his prepared text, Barnes spoke, too, of Communist coddling and lit into "fuzzy-minded New Deal Democrats" as "gloom and doom people" who now are peddling a "Fear Deal" and "scare talk."

While playing politics with human misery and the safety of the free world, he said, "they are crying all over the place and threatening to sabotage needed legislation if the President doesn't halt these terrible accusations." * * *

* * * it was Barnes, sworn in only Friday as a member of the Administration family, who swung the hardest punches at the Democrats.

Democratic "croakers," he said, are "crying at the top of their lungs that 'depression is just around the corner'." With world safety resting on a sound American economy, Barnes asked, "What penalty could be large enough for those who, in criminal folly, could reduce Western civilization to ashes?"

People from "the side which did some of the most dastardly character-wrecking of all time," he said, should be able to "take it a little better and not cry and whine that they won't cooperate even on meritorious measures unless the Republicans let up on them."

SENATOR WILLIAM JENNER IN ST. PAUL, MINN., FEBRUARY 8, 1954

Commenting on conditions when Republicans took over, he said: "Never had a political party, newly come to power, found such heaps of evidence of the stupidity, the corruption, even the treason of its predecessors."

"For 20 years our beloved country has been governed by an invading army of alien intellectuals," he declared. "Their ideas were foreign to every principle that has moved our people since the days, 4 centuries ago, when Englishmen clustered in their villages and talked of the tyranny of kings." (As carried in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on February 9.)

SENATOR JOSEPH MCCARTHY IN SPEECH AT BANQUET IN MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH., ON LINCOLN DAY

He reiterated his stand that communism is the issue of this year's campaign and accused the Democratic Party of being "dedicated to whitewashing communism and espionage."

"Naturally," MCCARTHY said, he considers it his duty to "call upon all good Democrats to desert the party of betrayal in this election year and help the Republicans clean up this Commie mess.

"The once great Democratic Party that has fallen on such evil days disgraces every decent, honest Democratic officeholder by placing the odious, immoral label of dishonesty and treason upon the party as Truman did."

MCCARTHY was asked if his own language was not "intemperate."

"I wouldn't call it that," he said seriously. (Detroit News, February 7, 1954.)

FROM UNITED PRESS ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST

Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall said yesterday that alleged communism under Democratic administrations will be a GOP issue in the coming campaign and the Republican Party endorses Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, who is making speeches about it. Hall said, in reply to a question, that he considers MCCARTHY an "asset" to the Republican campaign. He said MCCARTHY "is in demand all over" as a speaker, and the Senator himself "decides where he will go." (Washington Post, February 8, 1954.)

ROUNDUP OF LINCOLN DAY TALKS

Senator MCCARTHY, speaking in Madison, Wis., charged that the "Democratic administration over the past 20 years has deliberately and knowingly allowed Communists to take any position in Government they desire.

"The Democratic leadership has betrayed the confidence of millions of loyal, decent American Democrats."

In Worland, Wyo., Mr. McLeod declared that people "aren't interested in whether loyalty risks are drunks, dope fiends, sex perverts, or Communists—but they are interested in getting them out of Government." (The New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY IN ADDRESS AT SAN MATEO, CALIF., ON FEBRUARY 10, 1954

How does it affect you, my good friends, that because of that over the past 20 years of treason Communists have been able to infiltrate every policymaking position in this Government?

SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY AS SPEAKER AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER AT MADISON, WIS.

As you know I and some others have been bringing hitherto undisclosed facts to the attention of the American people to show that the Democrat administration over the past 20 years has deliberately and knowingly allowed Communists to hold any positions in Government they desire—from handling topmost secrets to guiding our foreign and domestic policy. (Madison Capital Times, February 8, 1954.)

SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN IN AN ADDRESS PREPARED FOR A LINCOLN DAY GATHERING OF SARASOTA COUNTY, FLA., REPUBLICANS

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, today termed the Roosevelt and Truman administrations "twenty years of socialistic experimentation and disloyal conduct by men in high places." (New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

NEWARK, N. J., February 13, 1954.—Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, said tonight that 1954 was a year of decision against atheistic communism and added that "evil disbelievers crept into power in our land" in the last 20 years.

"I believe what happens this year * * * will profoundly affect the future of all religious faiths," he declared in a prepared Lincoln Day address before Essex County Republicans.

Of those he called "evil believers" the Representative said: "They achieved some of the highest, most powerful positions in our Government. There seemed no stopping them. And then President Eisenhower was elected. In the battle for men's minds and souls, the Communists received a major setback." (The New York Times, February 14, 1954.)

SUMMERFIELD AT NEW YORK, JANUARY 21, 1954

Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using up your tax money. I am here to tell you we are not hiring any new ones. Somehow I do not feel too amiably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation.

SENATOR MCCARTHY AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., FEBRUARY 4, 1954

The issue between Republican and Democrat has been drawn.

On the one hand it extends from the hearth where Lincoln learned his ABC's. On the other it extends from the atheist sinkhole that spawned the evil of Karl Marx. (INS article in Washington Times-Herald, February 5, 1954.)

[From the New York Times of January 24, 1954]

MARTIN CONDEMNS TALK OF A SLUMP—ASSERTS "LEFT-WING EGGHEADS" TRY TO PROMOTE HARD TIMES AS CUE FOR SOCIALISM

PHILADELPHIA, January 23.—Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., charged tonight that left-wing "eggheads" were "trying to promote us into hard times for political reasons."

Their aim, he declared, is "to lead us into socialism."

In a speech prepared for the 46th annual banquet of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board, the Massachusetts Republican said that despite pessimistic statements of alarmists "there is not a valid economic sign today * * * pointing to anything like the unemployment of 1949–50, when these people were so silent."

The Nation is now going through a period of readjustment, Mr. MARTIN asserted, and today's unemployment figure of 2 million "may vary upward in the next few months."

"Despite this period of transition," he added, "the year 1953 just finished was the most prosperous in the history of our country, and the fact is there are 62 million American civilians at work today at gainful occupations."

Representative MARTIN's speech was billed in advance by his office as a major address, with a Nation-wide broadcast arranged.

FOUR-ALARM PROPHETS DECRIED

In 1949 and 1950, under a Democratic administration, the Speaker said, unemployment reached 3,400,000 and 4,750,000, but the "four-alarm prophets of the left wing * * *

were silent. There were no cries of recession, no cries of depression."

"Each time you read one of these political utterances," he advised, "go back and check up the gentleman's statements in 1949 and early 1950. You will find that the color of the coat has changed."

Mr. MARTIN charged that such left-wingers "infest" the Americans for Democratic Action, the anti-Communist organization that backs the principles of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

He said he knew of no responsible businessmen who were pessimistic about the economic outlook. Politicians, he added, know less about the country's economy than businessmen and economists, "and do more talking about the subject."

"These four-alarm prophets" of hard times, Mr. MARTIN declared, "are of a political persuasion that is either downright left wing or friendly to it. In fact, these gentlemen have been steadily preaching this doctrine since July 1952. They preached it all through the 1952 campaign, they have predicted a depression for each quarter of 1953 and possibly because Eugene Varga, the leading Soviet economist, is also preaching it—they are predicting a depression for 1954."

FINDS PUBLIC IS CALM

Businessmen, housewives, and farmers, he said, are aware of the fact that "we have been in a period of readjustment for many months," but "our people have remained pretty calm on the whole."

Mr. MARTIN also reviewed the first year of the Republican administration and predicted that 1,000,000 homes would be built this year, with private enterprise performing in "a manner so outstanding that public housing soon will become only a memory of the unlamented days of the managed economy."

Because of the narrow political margins in Congress, he concedes, no one can predict with certainty the fate of President Eisenhower's legislative program. But, he said, "the American people will demand its enactment, and they will get its enactment, if not by the narrow majorities of this Congress, then by sufficient majorities in the next Congress."

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Robert N. Oerter, Jr., Sixth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we delight to come into Thy presence through Jesus Christ our Lord. As we come this day, our Father, we thank Thee that all we have comes from Thee. Do Thou give to us hearts filled with gratitude to Thee for Thy many and countless blessings. We ask Thy special blessing this day that as these men and women go about their work, Thou wilt grant to them courage and patience, that Thou wilt deliver them from any self-seeking and anything which would be contrary to Thy will. Grant to them the courage to do that which is right in Thine eyes. Grant, Lord, to them, profit from previous experience; grant to them wisdom; grant to them everything needful to perform this task of leadership for Thee. So, come into our hearts this day that we may be filled with joy and peace through believing in Thee. These things we pray in the name of the Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 12, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 6025. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7893) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1200), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill be the order of business tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, is that the bill that was just reported, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The unanimous consent request is to waive the 3-day rule?

Mr. CANFIELD. In effect, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and special orders heretofore entered, and also to revise and extend her remarks and include a statement by Mr. Richards, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I am introducing a bill with the approval and consent of the American Medical Association, to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education.

This organization is a voluntary, nonprofit association organized to interpret the needs of medical education to the American public; to encourage the advancement of medical training standards in the United States; to preserve academic freedom in the medical schools, and to foster the training of a sufficient number of competent physicians to meet the Nation's health needs. The National Fund for Medical Education was established in 1949.

Funds received by this organization are allocated annually to the Nation's 79 medical schools for unrestricted use in support of their teaching budgets in accordance with a grants policy approved by the fund's board of trustees. These awards are based upon the recommendations of a grants advisory committee, representing the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Medical Association, and the fund's advisory council.

As of December 31, 1952, the fund had distributed almost $3 million to the medical schools. These funds were contributed by industry, foundations, public-spirited citizens and the medical profession. While of substantial assistance, the grants made to date fall far short of the amount needed. Today, a minimum of $10 million is required annually if the schools are to maintain their academic standards and training programs.

Medical advances benefit society only if there is a large force of physicians to apply them. Without competent doctors, full realization of the benefits from the antibiotics, psychiatry, biochemistry and nuclear physics would be impossible—the great strides in public health, industrial medicine, and other important fields jeopardized.

This dangerous situation obviously cannot be met at the local level. The individual medical schools cannot obtain the funds necessary to restore medical education to a sound financial footing through separate, sporadic fund-raising endeavors of their own.

They must be supported by every element of our economy, on the same plane with the Red Cross, the Community Chest, and our other great public service agencies, as a national resource indispensable to our country's welfare.

I am convinced that this organization is carrying on work of vital importance to the welfare of the Nation. In view of its national character, its service to the medical life in all parts of the country, the National Fund for Medical Education is uniquely qualified for a national charter. I am of the opinion that such a Federal charter will be of aid in accomplishing the important objectives of this organization. Moreover, this endeavor, supported and managed as it is by private enterprise, is an effective answer to increasing public clamor for Federal subsidies for medical education. What the Government subsidizes it controls. My bill will not cost the Federal Government one dime.

RECIPROCITY MUST WORK BOTH WAYS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in my campaigns I never criticized any individual as a member of the Democratic Party and I did not do so during the past Lincoln Day meetings. I joined and continue to join both Republicans and Democrats who asked for a change from the socialistic trend of the so-called New Deal and Fair Deal administrations. This represents an honest difference of opinion as well as a difference in economic and political philosophy.

The people requested this change in an emphatic manner at the polls in 1952, and President Eisenhower and the 83d Congress are giving that change to the United States. This means an orderly transfer from a war economy to a peace economy, from a controlled-economy state to an incentive-economy state. It will provide, in due time, a dollar with increased instead of decreased purchasing power, and greater freedom for both the producer and the consumer.

All of these points and many other notable accomplishments formed the basis for Lincoln Day speeches. This type of presentation should and does serve as an encouragement and a stimulus to all people who are lending their efforts in this orderly economic transition.

However, the recent Democratic candidate for Vice President did not choose to follow any such reciprocal arrangement when he spoke in Indiana recently, if the newspapers correctly quoted him. Instead, he not only implied but accused the Republican Party of creating hard times, depressions, and other economic ills whenever they are in power by following certain policies. If not by direct charge he insinuated that times were bad. Why did he not tell the true facts—that 1953 was the best peacetime year; that, despite a decline of farm prices starting during their last 2 years in office, farm prices now are advancing and that the farmer is expected to have an even better net return for 1954; that less man-hours were lost in 1953 than in any previous peacetime year; and that industry now is expanding in a manner that will provide a steady instead of a fluctuating employment.

No; this defeated Vice Presidential candidate seems to prefer to criticize others, but his party does not want anybody to criticize them.

Reciprocity works both ways.

THE LATE GLENN MILLER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the late Glenn Miller, born in my district in Clarinda, Iowa, was a musician whose sensitive craftsmanship took him to the top of his art. Today, a decade after his untimely death, his records outsell all other orchestra compositions. A screening of Universal's production of The Glenn Miller Story, will open here in Washington, D. C., and all over the country tomorrow, February 17. I wish to commend to the attention of the membership an evening in the theater listening to the distinctive Miller arrangements and watching the fine story of his life, as portrayed by Jimmy Stewart and June Allyson. Hollywood can be proud of The Glenn Miller Story, just as Iowa is proud of Glenn Miller.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY WEEK CHARGES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, responsible Members would make a serious mistake if they allowed the spate of factional talk which took place during the Lincoln's birthday week to draw them into making communism in the United States of America the issue of the 1954 congressional campaign. I believe that the American people expect that responsible Republicans and Democrats will not be ricocheted—to use the idea in a popular song—into a bitter factional scrap based on sensational charges made by a few who wish communism to be the issue instead of the President's program. I cannot believe that men and women experienced in active political life would be distracted on the fundamentals by any such diversion, especially in view of the fact that the President himself, the leader of the party, and the Speaker have made so clear their own truly American understanding of the limits of partisanship; nor is it fair to consider the sensational charges made by a few the attitude of the rank and file of Republicans. I cannot believe that responsible Democrats will be diverted by these sensational charges from supporting an expansion of social security, a national housing program, improvement of unemployment insurance, a national health program, a review of labor-management legislation, a new farm policy, and vital measures concerning international security and trade.

The country and the Nation—indeed the whole free world—face vital decisions in these next months. Let us get to them and not risk serious injury to the whole cause of the free peoples by being distracted by a factional fight on shadows, fears, and bygones not documented with facts.

THE EISENHOWER BUDGET

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are recognizing that we are living up to our campaign promises. Figures show that Ohio's share of the last Truman budget would have been $4,951,800,000.

Under the Eisenhower budget, Ohio taxpayers would pay $4,139,360,000, a reduction of $812,440,000. This figures out to be $623 for every man, woman, and child in the State based on the 1950 census figures, under the Truman budget as compared with $521 under the Eisenhower budget.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are as of now, making an average saving of $102 per individual per year. I am of the firm conviction that we can do better than this, but a saving of $102 for every man, woman, and child in the 17th Congressional District, as well as our State, certainly merits the consideration of all.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday, February 24, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered; and that if the House should not be in session that day the special order be postponed until the next day, Thursday.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE MALE NURSES AND MEDICAL SPECIALISTS TO BE APPOINTED AS RESERVE OFFICERS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers in the three branches of our armed service. This measure supersedes

H. R. 4447, which has been pending before the Armed Services Committee since last April.

The committee has taken no action on the pending bill because they have not received a report from the Department of Defense. I have been in touch with the Department and understand they would prefer a bill to confer reserve commissions on male nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, whereas H. R. 4447 would commission male nurses in the Army Reserve only. My new bill would give Reserve commissions to men nurses in all three branches of the service.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the armed services have never given commissions to men who have had full nursing training, but have used them as corpsmen, wardmen, and specialists of various kinds, with the ratings of enlisted men. In many cases the qualified man nurse finds himself assigned to some duty which has no relation whatsoever to his nursing training. We simply cannot afford to waste our nurse power in this fashion.

Our giving the male nurse proper recognition in the armed services would have a strong influence on encouraging more well-qualified young men to enroll in schools of nursing. We can use all the nurses we can get—male or female.

For every 100 men nurses commissioned, 100 women nurses could remain in civilian hospitals as key nursing personnel. There is an important need for men in both the military and Veterans' Administration hospitals. The man nurse would be particularly useful in the NP wards.

The bill is not mandatory, it does not force the Navy to accept a change in what is a very fine and an entirely unique method; therefore, it is to be anticipated that there will be no objection voiced by the Department of Defense.

SCHEDULE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON PROJECTS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS BEGINNING WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1954, AT 10 A. M.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith a list of the projects to be heard.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, hearings on river and harbor authorizations initiated on February 2, 1954, will be continued beginning at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 24, 1954. These hearings will cover favorable reports submitted to the Congress by the Chief of Engineers subsequent to the enactment of the River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950.

The hearings will be before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of which the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, of Oregon, is chairman, and will convene at 10 o'clock each morning in room 1302, New House Office Building. All proponents and opponents of a project, including Senators and Representatives, will be heard on the day scheduled for the consideration of that project following the presentation by the representative of the Civil Works Division of the Corps of Engineers. All proponents and opponents should submit their names before the hearing to the clerk of the committee indicating the projects in which they are interested. If convenient, it will be helpful if local witnesses provide the committee with 20 copies of prepared statements at the time of their appearance.

Wednesday, February 24: Sheboygan Harbor, Wis., House Document No. 554, 82d Congress; Town River, Quincy, Mass., House Document No. 108, 83d Congress; Weymouth Fore River, Mass., House Document No. 555, 82d Congress; Hudson River, N. Y., House Document No. 228, 83d Congress.

Thursday, February 25: Savannah Harbor, Ga., House Document No. 110, 83d Congress; Mobile Harbor, Ala., House Document No. 74, 83d Congress; Mississippi River, damages at Louisiana, Mo., House Document No. 251, 82d Congress; Mississippi River at Chester, Ill., House Document No. 230, 83d Congress.

Friday, February 26: Green and Barren Rivers, Ky. and Tenn., Senate Document No. 82, 83d Congress; Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., Senate Document No. 81, 83d Congress.

Tuesday, March 2: Holland Harbor, Mich., House Document No. 282, 83d Congress; Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex., House Document No. 89, 83d Congress; Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., Senate Document No. 80, 83d Congress.

Wednesday, March 3: Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex., House Document No. 478, 81st Congress; Turtle Cove, Tex., House Document No. 654, 81st Congress; Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., House Document No. 161, 83d Congress.

Thursday, March 4: Columbia River at the mouth, Oreg. and Wash., House Document 249, 83d Congress; Gold Beach, Oreg., Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress; Umpqua River at Schlfield, Oreg., Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress; Bellingham Harbor, Wash., House Document No. 558, 82 Congress; Columbia River between Chinook and Sand Island, Wash., Senate Document No. 8, 83d Congress.

Friday, March 5: Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash., House Document No. 569, 81st Congress; Port Angeles Harbor, Wash., House Document No. 155, 82d Congress; Quillayute River, Wash., House Document No. 579, 81st Congress; Shilshole Bay, Wash., House Document No. 536, 81st Congress.

Tuesday, March 9: Copper River, Alaska, House Document No. 182, 83d Congress; Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii, House Document No. 717, 81st Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

LANDS IN HAWAII

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SAYLOR, D'EWART, HOSMER, REGAN, and ASPINALL.

PARTISAN POLITICAL STATEMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made an excellent point.

The man in the street does not necessarily share the excitement of political partisans. General statements of accusation against an entire political party, being inaccurate, are largely ineffective.

May I, as a former chairman of the political party, propose a fair swap?

I suggest that Republicans agree that Democrats generally are loyal Americans, that subversion and treason are personal to the offenders, and that these offenders are no longer in the Government.

I suggest that Democrats, in grateful return, stop trying to scare people into reducing employment by cutting out accusations against Republicans as alleged promoters of hard times.

Suppose Democrats stopped running against Hoover, and Republicans stopped running against Truman? Could we not just get on with mutually constructive efforts on behalf of all the people?

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today a number of Members of the House are giving speeches on the subject of Lithuanian independence. At this time I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be grouped together at one place in the RECORD.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. When the brave Christian nation of Lithuania achieved its independence in 1918 it proceeded to advance with admirable celerity in every worthwhile avenue of progress. Herbert Hoover testified before our Baltic Committee that the three Baltic States had made more progress from the very low beginnings they had had 19 years before, than probably had ever been made by any series of states on record. But Lithuania lost her independence in 1940 to Soviet aggression and is now a captive nation: the Communist juggernaut mercilessly crushed defenseless Lithuania and then proceeded to sovietize her people. Lithuania symbolizes the cause of the captive nations, the cause of the captive nations that followed, such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and others. The cause of these captive nations is the cause of freedom. Until these nations which are entitled to their independence regain their freedom, the world is not going to have real peace. Their freedom is essential to world peace.

LITHUANIA FIGHTS ON FOR FREEDOM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we honor the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence.

"How can those heroic people be independent," some might ask, "when their nation has been enslaved for many years, held in forced and unjust captivity by Communist Russia?"

The answer is that no nation can ever be conquered as long as the faith and the will of the people is stronger than that of their oppressors. Lithuania is occupied temporarily by an alien power, but it will never surrender.

Every suppression of human rights by the Communists, every indignity forced upon the Lithuanian people, and every material weapon that is employed to crush their spirit merely steels them in their determination to fight on toward the inevitable day of liberation.

Stalin is gone, as Malenkov will go, and others like them, as the dynasty of fear and terror that they have established reaches its peak and then declines, being mortal, for it has no identification with the eternal spirit that gives true life to mankind.

Knowing this, the Lithuanian people endure their present misfortunes, secure in the belief that communism with all its material might, cannot last.

We in the United States admire the courage and the faith of the Lithuanian people, because it is akin to that which fought for, won, and now maintains the independence of the United States.

As the future unfolds we will find ways to come to the aid of the gallant Baltic people so that they will regain their rightful place in freedom's family.

The record of Communist atrocities will be the nemesis that will turn on the tyrants and hunt them down to their inevitable doom.

The 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence points toward that day of reckoning.

DENYING THE REPUBLICAN CHARGE THAT THERE ARE COMMUNISTS AND TRAITORS IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have been rather nonplused, disturbed, and chagrined at so much talk by the Republicans to the effect that the Democratic Party is Red. Being a Democrat, this worries me somewhat. I am just wondering if this is not some kind of scheme whereby all Democrats are going to be branded as Reds, subversives, and traitors. I notice that the mugwump Governor from Texas has proposed that you hang all Reds.

Now that brings me to this thought: Is this a scheme to designate all Democrats as Reds and then hang them? You have made so many Democrats in the last 6 months by the manner in which you have handled the affairs of state that you are going to have to exterminate them or hang them, or else you are going to lose the election this fall. When we return in January, we will find many new faces—and those new faces, in my humble opinion, will be those of Democrats replacing Republicans who engaged in such idle and unfounded talk.

They talk about sweeping back the tide of waste and bankruptcy. I would like to call their attention to the days of President Herbert Hoover, when more banks went broke in a given time than have ever gone broke in the history of this Nation, before or since. Millions walked the highways and byways and begged for a job to earn a living, but no job could be had. Then, for 20 long years under the Democratic regime, plenty of jobs and plenty of money for industry were available. Why are they afraid to talk panic? This country cannot be talked into a panic. That depends on economic conditions. I remember that they talked about the same way during the Hoover administration. The statement of Sherman Adams, the adviser to President Eisenhower, inspires me to ask: Who said grass would grow in the streets if the Republicans did not win in 1932? Why, Herbert Hoover, who in 1928 promised two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pot. We did not get the car and we did not have the chicken. Who said in 1944 that if Franklin Delano Roosevelt were reelected, we would have no more free elections in the United States? You probably remember that it was Thomas Dewey, who wanted Mr. Roosevelt's job. Who said that social security was a conspiracy to put a dog tag on the people? Why, the GOP, and today it says it will extend and improve the same act. Who advised young Americans to quit their country and go to Australia if Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected? Who for 20 years has been saying this Nation is losing its liberties and becoming engulfed in socialism? Who recently declared that if we do not adopt the Bricker amendment, the President and two-thirds of the United States Senate will barter away our freedom? Who has been charging that the Government of the United has been infiltrated by Communists, thereby not only spreading fear and making good Americans fearful of Government employment but also encouraging the world to believe that America is going Communist? Who, in a Lincoln Day address recently under this title "Twenty Years of Treason," contended that the American people for 20 years through the free choice of their leaders have been traitors? Why—Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, of course. Who are the Fear Dealers? Who are the political alarmists? Those who ever since their attempt to put the American people to sleep with the lullaby "Prosperity is just around the corner" have preached fear to the American people.

I think it is about time that the Republican Party, if it expects to win, base its claims on facts. They promised to reduce taxes but, by far, the majority of taxes reduced up to this time has benefited the large corporations and not the little man or laborer. The Republican Party cannot deny, in my humble opinion, that it is the party of big business. They still operate on the theory that if you let the fellows at the top, the big boys, make a lot of money, it will trickle down and all will be happy. But we still see that it will not work, as it has failed in the past, and today we face a panic because of the hard dollar created by the Republican Party. I have noted, with interest, that Mr. H. L. Hunt and other millionaires in Texas aid the Republican Party with their bankrolls. This is no different from the familiar pattern of a century or more of rich Americans contributing to political campaigns, senatorial and congressional as well as presidential.

The Republicans promised to balance the budget despite the warnings of leaders in the Democratic Party who said that it simply could not be done. But, still, they said they knew better. We have not seen their solution.

Now they cry that we left a mess. If there was a mess, then they are covering up that mess with a bigger mess. I, for one Democrat, am ready to meet this issue. Unless they about-face and support their leader, Dwight D. Eisenhower, they are doomed to defeat. Only one thing can save the Republicans; and I say in all candor, it is that they follow the leadership of the President of the United States, the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all remarks with regard to Lithuanian independence appear together at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not—as I understand it, the gentleman's position before was that they should be included in the body of the RECORD and not in the Appendix of the daily RECORD?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Lithuanian Independence Day.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a special order today at which he expects to address the House at some length on this subject. I take it that the request of the gentleman from New York will not interfere with that special order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I will amend my request to except those who have special orders.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Lithuanian-American Council and its membership of nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that today marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

As a member of the Special Committee To Investigate Atrocities in the Baltic States, my colleagues and I have been engaged for several months in investigating the facts concerning the communization and so-called incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. The facts which have already been brought out in our hearings clearly indicate that the attitude of this Government in refusing to recognize this act of Communist annexation has been eminently just and correct. The brutal grab of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors by the Kremlin was done in violation of long-standing treaties and against the expressed will and desires of the overwhelming majority of the people of those areas.

Although the Soviets attempt to give the impression that Lithuania is today an integral part of the U. S. S. R., I am convinced that the spirit of freedom and independence burns as strongly in that country today as it did 36 years ago when the Lithuanian people achieved their independence following World War I. I, therefore, express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the plight of Lithuania and other Soviet satellites will not be forgotten by the Congress and the American people and that this Government will pledge itself to firm conviction that the people of Lithuania and all other Communist satellite peoples should and truly will one day regain their freedom and independence. May that day come soon.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, at this time the Republic of Lithuania at present enslaved by the Soviets is marking its 36th anniversary and it is fitting and proper that our great freedom-loving Republic should remember this liberty-loving people now dominated by the Communists. Permit me to briefly review Lithuanian history and its gallant struggle to remain free.

During the middle ages, Lithuania, whose boundaries extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea, was one of the great nations of Europe. Later, Lithuania and Poland were united under a common monarch, and when Poland was partitioned in 1795, Russia occupied Lithuania. For 123 years Lithuania remained under oppressive Russian domination and any ideas of a liberal and democratic nature which had been attained under the Polish union were ruthlessly suppressed by an intense policy of "Russification."

The study of the Lithuanian language was prohibited and the Lithuanian press was abolished. However, despite this bloody reign of terror the indomitable spirit of independence persisted and the growth of the underground movement in the country prepared the people for eventual freedom which came after the end of World War I.

It was during the German occupation that Lithuania proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918, and by December 1922 she received de jure recognition by all the great powers.

For a period of 20 years definite progress was made in political, economic, and cultural fields, and Lithuania took her rightful place in the family of nations. However, independence was short-lived. The nonaggression pact signed between Hitler and Stalin in 1939, by which those two dictators agreed on a division between them of the smaller countries of eastern Europe, spelled the doom of Lithuanian independence. The collapse of Poland, brought about by the German and Soviet invasions, was followed by Soviet territorial demands upon Lithuania, which set into motion forces that led to her complete seizure in June 1940. Almost all the leaders of the country and other patriots were either deported to Russia or ruthlessly murdered.

The consistent and determined efforts of the Lithuanian people to achieve freedom was evidenced when the Germans invaded Russia in June 1941. They revolted against their Soviet oppressors and set up a provisional national government. However, a new oppressor, the Nazis, quickly extinguished any form of independence. Consequently, the underground now turned its efforts against Nazi tyranny.

Unfortunately, the later withdrawal of the German forces was not to be the end of Lithuanian suffering, for in October of 1944 when the Soviets drove the Nazi invader out of the country, they converted it into a Soviet republic.

Remembering the mass deportations under initial Soviet rule, over 80,000 Lithuanians fled to the Western Zone of Germany and the Soviet secret police screened the whole population and deported all persons suspected of enmity toward the Soviet regime.

Nevertheless, despite seemingly insurmountable odds the Lithuanians continue to resist Soviet oppression. Evidence presented before the House Baltic Committee last December indicates that the old underground organization which was so effective against the Germans and Russians during World War II, is still operating effectively. In fact, it has been estimated that more than 30,000 Lithuanians have been murdered for being members or suspected members of the underground. However, despite these severe losses new members quickly fill the ranks. One leading member of the Lithuanian Government in exile has stated that "he dreams of the day when his country will be a free member of the United Nations, but until that day comes, active and passive resistance will continue until the country's liberation or the extermination of the Lithuanian people."

In the light of such determination and devotion to freedom, in the presence of such courage and love of country we can all join with President Eisenhower when he voiced the present administration's feelings in a message before the Baltic Freedom Committee Congress held in New York in June. He stated that the seizure of the Baltic States was in violation of solemn treaty agreements and that we would maintain our steadfast policy of continuing to recognize the diplomatic representatives of the independent Baltic Republics; and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, when he said in a statement before a committee of the House:

> The Baltic peoples, in the face of every imposition, retain their will to be free and maintain their steadfast opposition to Soviet despotism. Terrorism has been prolonged now for 13 years. Many of their courageous and noble representatives have been executed, deported, or driven into exile. But their martyrdom keeps patriotism alive.

Today with all the freedom-loving people on the earth, we salute this gallant country which, though small in area, is great in faith, the faith that removes mountains and which in due time will restore liberty, justice, and peace to this stricken land.

LITHUANIA ENSLAVED, SHALL RISE AGAIN

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Lithuanian origin today will celebrate the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence by their native land.

On February 16, 1918, shortly before the end of World War I, the Lithuanian people made known to the world their intention to avail themselves of the right to self-determination, which was one of

the few benefits accruing from that conflict. Thereafter, for 22 years the Lithuanian Republic, small as it was in both territory and population, bore itself proudly as a member of the society of free nations.

In 1939 Adolf Hitler and his Nazi legions set forth on the road of armed aggression which led ultimately to destruction of the German state. A year later, as a result of the iniquitous agreement, whereby Russia and Germany were to divide Eastern Europe between them, the freedom-loving Lithuanians were taken behind the Iron Curtain.

Afterward Russia fought in World War II on the side of the free world, ostensibly for the purpose of securing freedom for all time to all men, everywhere. But Lithuania remained prostrate beneath the iron heel of communism. Even in the heat of battle for human liberty the Communist conspirators of the Kremlin dishonored their word.

Only the people of Lithuania know in full the story of their sufferings at the hands of the Communist tyrants. Only they know the dire poverty to which they have been brought; the political executions; the planned starvation and torture; and the forced labor, from which only death brings release. Only the people of Lithuania know this story in full, and it is one they never will forgive or forget.

But the love of individual liberty, the initiative, and the energy of the sturdy Lithuanian people will not be forever held in tyranny. The same spirit which proclaimed Lithuanian freedom 36 years ago again will rise out of the darkness of slavery. Again the Lithuanian people will take their place among the free nations of the world.

For this reason let us pray for an early restoration of Lithuania as a nation of freemen, as a nation dedicated to the cause of human liberty throughout all the world for all time to come. Let us as the leading nation of the free world, do all in our power to further that cause, in Lithuania as elsewhere, so that suffering and slavery no longer may be the lot of even a few among the peoples of earth.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago today, out of the holocaust of World War I a new democratic republic emerged when Lithuania declared its independence. The new republic took its rightful place in the family of nations and its achievements of the next 20 years gave the promise of an ever more glorious future. But the continuing progress of this sturdy little republic was to be cruelly interrupted. The hard-won independence which had been gained in one global war was lost in another, and today Lithuania is ground under the heel of the Soviet oppressor.

We of the free world today know that there can be no peace on this earth so long as any people or any nation remains in subjection to another power, or enslaved by the tyrannies of a dictatorial regime. We also know that freedom and independence cannot come to those valiant people who have so long fought for it until universal peace is once again established. It is for this peace, and for the liberation of the enslaved millions of the world, that all freemen are striving today. Universal liberty is the concern of all free men. The cause of Lithuania is ours, nor can we, or any democratic country, rest until that cause has triumphed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Lithuania now a captive of Soviet Russia celebrates in exile on February 16 the 36th anniversary of her national independence.

The history of this courageous nation, written in the blood of its patriots, is replete with its never-ending struggle to retain independence and bespeaks the fortitude and perseverance of a God-fearing and liberty-loving people.

Roman historians as early as the first century spoke of Lithuanians as being skilled in tilling the soil while her independence as a state is recorded as dating back to the 11th century.

Down through the centuries this valiant nation has been a pawn in the hands of avaricious nations who continued to keep her in an almost continuous state of subjugation.

Partitioned, devoured, and kept in bondage, Lithuania has never allowed the fires of freedom to die out in her troubled heart. With an abiding faith in Almighty God Lithuanians from one generation to another have devoutly prayed for the day of liberation from their oppressors.

Their hope was kindled from time to time only to be rudely shattered by the deceit of the leaders of nations that posed as their liberators.

The shackles of serfdom were forged by Russia in 1795 and for 120 years the czars dominated Lithuania, ruling her with an iron fist.

In 1915 the Germans lifted the yoke of Russian oppression when they occupied Lithuania but it was 3 years later that the independence of this brave nation was proclaimed at Vilnius on February 16, 1918.

Two years later, the Polish conquest divided Lithuania, forcing the abandonment of the ancient capital at Vilnius and the moving of the independent government to Kaunas.

Russia, despite its signing of the Treaty of Moscow with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, in which it recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent nation, reneged on its solemn declaration by conspiring with Hitler in 1940 to acquire Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

There followed a series of proposals from Hitler and Russia, all of them deceitful and based on false promises that Lithuania could regain the territory wrested from it by the invader, if she would abandon her neutrality and become an ally of Germany.

Hitler answered Lithuania's refusal by allowing Russia to invade her and permitting Red troops to attack and seize the ancient capital of Vilnius then in possession of Poland.

Once in Lithuania the Russians abrogated the mutual assistance pact they had signed with the Lithuanians and proceeded to replace the Lithuanian Government on orders from Moscow.

Fake elections in true Moscow style followed with the result that the doom of Lithuania was sealed when all political parties were outlawed and a new party called the Working People's Union was declared to be the only official party. The fake elections attracted only 16 percent of the voting population but Moscow concealed this fact, announcing to the world that 95 percent of the people voted for the new regime.

The Russian puppets now in control of the government through the rugged elections quickly passed a Moscow-prepared resolution imploring the admission of Lithuania to the Soviet Union. The resolution was promptly forwarded to the Kremlin on August 13, 1940, and approved just 13 days after the so-called new elections were held that sounded the death knell to Lithuania's independence.

For the past 14 years Lithuania has been behind the Iron Curtain and is subjected again to the tyranny and oppression that has haunted her down through the centuries. As a nation in shackles and chains Lithuania's history is written in the tears and blood that accompanies ruthless persecutions.

It is a sad spectacle for freedom-loving people as they behold with horror the plight of Lithuania and other nations who, like her, are in chains and under the iron heel of Soviet Russia.

The members of the select committee of the Congress of the United States now engaged in an investigation of the ruthless conquest of Lithuania and other Baltic nations are shocked as the bitter story of terror and atrocity is being unfolded and documented before the eyes of the world.

Meanwhile, Lithuania with its 3 million God-fearing people and over a million American citizens of Lithuanian descent have the sympathy and prayers of the American people, not only on the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence but until the day of liberation from her cruel oppressor. May God speed that day when Lithuanians everywhere can supplement their pleas for divine aid with a fervent prayer of thanksgiving for their deliverance from serfdom and the return of Lithuania to her former status as a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago today the Republic of Lithuania was founded, and I wish to join with my colleagues who have spoken briefly on the importance of this anniversary. The great tragedy of our times is not the great nations, whose people are to some extent the masters of their destiny. It is the small nations of the world, whose people are so often trampled underfoot. Let us, on this anniversary, remember again that our Nation is solemnly dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And, indeed, it is not inappropriate to link this anniversary today with the memory of the great spirit who first said those words, and whose birthday we have so recently celebrated.

Abraham Lincoln is the great emancipator to the oppressed and the downtrodden of today, even as he was the great emancipator in his own time with respect to the narrower issue of out-

right human slavery. Let us assure our friends in Lithuania that the teachings and traditions of Lincoln are still alive among us. Let us make it clear that we shall never waiver from the high purposes and great resolves that guided him, and that have made the United States of America a symbol of light and hope and liberty ever since.

We are the great Nation which has never gobbled up a small neighbor or ally. We have stood resolutely throughout our history for the principle of self-determination for all peoples. It is important that we keep affirming this principle and that we miss no chance to demonstrate that we have not forgotten our friends who are enslaved by the Communist monster at this moment. We shall never forget them. And we cannot rest until the second great emancipation has been achieved and no corner of the world remains enslaved.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, four blocks from the Capitol, at St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church, is Father John Znotenas, whose life is a dramatization of the story of events in a small country during a world at war, and of life behind the Iron Curtain. On this day of anniversary tribute to the land of Lithuania and the spirit of the heroic Lithuanian people I know my colleagues will be interested in and moved by the story of his experiences.

In 1940, when Russia invaded Lithuania it was a peaceful agricultural Republic. It was building contentment and prosperity for its people through public education, advanced agricultural methods, promotion of the arts, the theater and the press. That was the year of Father Znotenas' ordination.

The young priest had been assigned as a teacher in a college near his home. When on June 15 the Russians took over, Father Znotenas was told that he could no longer be a teacher. Relying on the Russian Constitution which "guarantees" freedom of religion, Father Znotenas moved into the church and taught his classes from the pulpit. For this he was summoned by the Russian police. When he explained that he was conducting church service he was told: "I know the kind of service. If you don't want to be sent to Siberia, stop."

In 1941 the Germans came and Lithuania was between two hostile countries. In 1943 the Germans retreated. By that time the cattle had been slaughtered, the horses confiscated, food had been shipped to Germany and very short rations were left for the native population. The fire of independence burned underground. Proclamation of the Atlantic Charter revived hopes. But these hopes were dashed by the second Russian invasion.

In despair Father Znotenas, with 250 priests and 25,000 other people decided to make a break for freedom among the Allies. This decision was made after he had witnessed the intelligentsia of his town—doctors, lawyers, teachers, both men and women—loaded 70 to 100 into boxcars. The windows, which had been open to give oxygen to the cattle, were nailed shut. No one was permitted to bring food or water to the unfortunates. Those who cried out were shot down. For 2½ days the Lithuanians were forced to witness the suffering of their friends and relatives; then the cars moved off to Siberia and prison camps.

On his bicycle Father Znotenas skirted a procession of 15 to 20 miles long of refugees in cars and carts. The Russians parachuted on them from the air and charged them with tanks. The priest escaped into Germany where he found refuge in a Franciscan convent; from there to Switzerland, and finally as a DP, he came to the United States.

Besides his mother, Father Znotenas had 2 sisters and 2 brothers. The only news he has had from them is sad news. His mother was executed by the Russians for harboring a Catholic priest. One brother was slain. The others have disappeared.

Thirty-six years ago today, Lithuania was declared an independent democratic Republic. As a result of Russian occupation she has lost not only her independence but one-third of her population. Lithuania must be restored as a land of free people.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I can speak with some authority about the characteristics of the Lithuanian people. In my State of Rhode Island, where men and women of so many racial strains live and work together in peace and mutual respect, descendents of the ancient race of Lithuanians make a splendid contribution to our common culture.

We who know them see daily the evidence of intelligence and the industry for which they are renowned. They are a rugged people, able to withstand hardship—and in the happy life of America, their sons excel in every field of endeavor.

But more than their intellectual prowess, their willingness and ability to do hard work well, more even than their ancient valor for which they are renowned, they contribute to America in an outstanding way because they prize as sacred the things of the home. To them the family is the center of life. Children are brought up in the fear and love of God. They are good neighbors. They are good Americans, and America is the richer for having them with us.

Today, February 16, 1954, persons of Lithuanian extraction are celebrating the 36th anniversary of the independence of their mother country. This sturdy and freedom-loving people proclaimed their independence during the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian Czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freedom, Lithuania is again under the iron heel of the oppressor. It is a sobering thought that for the people of Lithuania, this day cannot be other than a day of sadness. We in America, who so rightly cherish our own Independence Day, can well realize the feeling of sorrow that all Americans of Lithuanian birth must have at the realization that that great nation has been denied the very right to exist as an independent nation under a government of their own choosing.

The regime imposed upon Lithuania by communistic Russia has violated every man's individual freedom. It has persecuted religion, enslaved labor, and destroyed democratic principles. It has endeavored to instill hatred in the hearts of the Lithuanian people toward the western democracies. That they have not been successful is due only to the strong inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principles of freedom and liberty. Although the people of this nation are held in subjection by the ruthless Soviet power, the spirit of freedom imbedded in the hearts of all patriotic Lithuanians continues to carry on its fight for liberty.

It is more than a decade since tragedy struck Lithuania but history will assuredly show that his valiant nation cannot long remain in subjection. Tyrants can destroy men and institutions, but they can never destroy the love of liberty which springs eternally in men's hearts. The Lithuanian cause is not just a matter of concern for the people presently residing in that country. It is the equal concern of all freedom-loving peoples. Please God, may the day soon come when Lithuania can throw off the shackles of her oppressor and take her rightful place once more in the family of free nations.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, it is fitting that we pause to pay tribute to a people who 36 years ago achieved national independence, although in this year 1954 there is little cause for the rejoicing and celebration with which a freedom-loving people might be expected to commemorate its achievement of the inalienable rights of all men the world over. Once again the people of Lithuania must remember the anniversary of their independence by praying for the day when these inalienable rights will be restored to their land.

At Vilna on February 16, 1918, after over a century of domination by the Russian czars, the independent Republic of Lithuania took its rightful place in the family of free nations, a place it enjoyed for 22 years until, with the advent of World War II, Lithuania was overrun by in turn Russian and Nazi aggressors. And, in 1940, the Soviet Union began the systematic program, which we have come to recognize all too well—planned starvation, collectivization, and physical enslavement, which program continues to the present day.

But although Lithuania is physically occupied by the Soviet Union, there can be no enslavement of the proud spirit of a people who have struggled so heroically for many generations past against the foreign conqueror's yoke. The United States Government by refusing to recognize the forcible annexation of the free Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union proclaims the faith of the American people in the eventual restoration of that nation to the freedom and prosperity which she has so dearly earned.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 36th anniversary of the day which all Lithuanians remember and revere because it is commemorated as the inauguration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuanian culture is one of the oldest on the European Continent. Unfortunately, Lithuania has been a victim of powerful neighbor nations extending back through the centuries.

Thirty-six years ago, when Lithuania became an independent nation, it immediately made progress and became one of the most progressive and cultured nations of Europe. Liberty-loving Lithuania was again taken over by a powerful, selfish and aggressive tyrant in 1940. For the next 4 years, Lithuania was desecrated by the Nazis and Soviets until in 1944, its usurpation became complete and the Kremlin has dominated Lithuania until the present day. Over a million of its people have been murdered or taken prisoner by the Communist dictators in an effort to dominate and liquidate the national identity of this patriotic and liberty-loving people. Deportations, arrests and humiliations have been inflicted, but the spirit of all true Lithuanians cannot be crushed. Lithuanians both in and beyond the borders of the motherland will never give up their fight for an independent and free government.

As chairman of the Katyn Forest massacre committee during the 82d Congress, I heard testimony of hundreds of witnesses revealing the barbaric and criminal mind which controls the leaders of the Soviet Union. Again, as a member of the Baltic committee which was recently created in this Congress, I heard witness after witness testify as to the brutalities, the massacres and the murders which were inflicted upon the Lithuanian people during the last 14 years. Testimony recorded by the Katyn committee and the Baltic committee has been broadcast throughout the free world and also behind the Iron Curtain and today the minds of the millions of people have been rekindled with knowledge of the barbarism which is the basic foundation underlying communism. The Baltic committee will hear further evidence and before its work is completed, a great deal of additional testimony will be assembled in order to completely unfold the horrid proceedings and aggressions that forced Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other subjugated countries under the heel of the Kremlin.

The fight must continue and with the aid of all free nations and the underground behind the Iron Curtain, the day will arrive when Lithuania and other Communist dominated nations will be restored to liberty and freedom.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on this the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania we send our message of hope to those unfortunate people who are suffering under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. Once again, as in the past, the people of Lithuania are making untold sacrifices for the sake of their independence and their national home. Lithuania has for centuries been the pawn of the great European powers. As a principal passageway from East to West, Lithuania has often been the scene of bitter conflicts between these two areas. As a result, she has for centuries been under the heel of a foreign despot.

And yet, the people of Lithuania, inspired by the democratic impulses of freedom, have remained steadfast and true to the traditions of their great nation. Although the land of Lithuania was enslaved, her soul remained free.

Today, the stories that come out of Lithuania are tragic ones—mass deportations, ruthless collectivization, suppression of every aspect of Lithuanian national life. But this is not the only news. The underground which was organized during the war is still in effective operation. By sullen resistance the Lithuanian people have greatly impeded the process of the sovietization of their beloved homeland. This is not a new process to them. Under the czars the Lithuanian people were subjected to the same measures—then it was called Russification. But no matter what the name of the attempted denationalization, it has never met with any fundamental success. We do not know when the Soviet tyranny will come to an end, any more than the men who proclaimed the first republic knew in advance the hour of their triumph. We do know, however, that now, as in the past, the Lithuanian people will hold true to their traditions and to the heritage of their forefathers.

It is our fervent hope, on this commemorative occasion, that the hour of Lithuanian freedom and independence is not far off. Until that longed-for day when Lithuania, once again, takes her place in the society of free nations, we must keep alive the hope of this gallant people. It is for this reason that the United States still recognizes the legality of the prewar Government of Lithuania. It is for this reason, and for the cause of justice, that our Congress has taken upon itself to study the illegal and ruthless seizure of the Baltic States. Let the people of Lithuania rest assured that we have not forgotten them, nor broken faith with them. Their cause is our cause—the universal cause of freedom and justice. No free nation can rest until all men are again at liberty to pursue the paths of their own destiny.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, a privilege for me to greet Lithuanian Americans on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence day.

May this day, which means so much to the enslaved people of Lithuania, revive their hopes to look forward to the day when their people will be completely liberated from Soviet domination, and, in fact, when all freedom-loving people will once more be free to determine the type of government under which they wish to live.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent will commemorate this anniversary pleading to the consciousness of the world to restore freedom to this brave and gallant country from the clutches of the Kremlin rulers.

Lithuania's history as an independent state dates back to the 11th century, always God-fearing and courageous, having been subjected from time to time to such a reign of terror that only their unfailing faith in Almighty God has sustained them. Just like Poland, Lithuania lost its independence in 1795 when they were partitioned and became pawns in the hands of Russia, Prussia and Austria. The Russians devoured the greater part and the smaller went to the Germans.

Lithuania's subjection to Russia lasted 120 years, that is from 1795 to 1915, when the German armies occupied the country. This interval coincided with perhaps the darkest period in earlier Lithuanian history. Yet Lithuania never lost hope of regaining her freedom and independence. Such hopes were revived when Napoleon crossed Lithuania in 1812 on his way to Russia. With the defeat of Napoleon the grip of Tsarist Russia grew tighter. In 1831 and 1863–64 open rebellions took place and were ruthlessly suppressed. In 1832 the university of Vilnius was closed. In 1840 the Lithuanian Statute—an elaborate system of laws first codified in 1529—was abolished and Russian law was substituted. The Lithuanian language was banished from the schools; officials were sent from Russia, and by a special decree it was forbidden even to use the name "Lithuania"; in its stead Russia imposed the style of the "North-West Provinces." In 1864 the infamous edict prohibiting the printing of Lithuanian books and newspapers in Latin characters was put into force and lasted for 40 years. Edict ended in 1904, therefore, 1954 marks the 50th anniversary of freedom of the printed word. It failed, however, to prevent the smuggling into the country of Lithuanian literature printed abroad, especially in Prussian Lithuania and the United States of America. An interesting phase of the national resistance movement, universally known as The Ausra—Dawn—Period, takes its name from the publication so styled, for which the great Lithuanian patriot, the late Dr. Jonas Basanavicius, was chiefly responsible.

The signing of the treaty of Moscow on July 12, 1920 wherein Russia recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state, renouncing forever all claims to Lithuania's territory, was but a short-lived agreement, for 20 years later all agreements, peace, and her independence were rudely shattered. Lithuania, the Baltic countries, including Latvia and Estonia, found themselves again political pawns when they were driven into the clutches of Soviet Russia through negotiations of the 1939 nonaggression pact between Germany and Russia, which was signed at a time when Anglo-French representatives were in the Kremlin trying to obtain Russia's aid in curbing Hitler's desire to rule all of Europe.

The history of this brave and gallant little nation is written in the blood of its valiant patriots, whose only desire was for freedom and independence and never reaching out to grab or annex neighboring territories. Today the same spirit of sacrifice is a dominant characteristic of the Lithuanian people.

It is a proud privilege that I can freely stand before you in this House of Representatives and join with you in saluting the Lithuanian people on their National Independence Day and I pray that it will not be too long before peace and freedom will be restored to Lithuania and the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania and to the nearly 1 million

citizens of Lithuanian origin on this, the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Since the end of the Second World War, the hard-won peace we fought for has been constantly jeopardized by the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union's Communist overlords. The heart of our foreign policy has been to maintain the liberty and strengthen the unity of the free world in the face of this terrible threat.

Unfortunately, there are some freedom-loving peoples who were swallowed up by the Soviet Union during the war and cannot take their rightful place in the ranks of the free world at this time. For them this is a period of darkness because the light of liberty has been eclipsed. Until they win their fight for freedom, we must seize every opportunity to send them messages of hope and encouragement.

Accordingly, I am happy to join in the commemoration of the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence day. Thirty-six years ago, on February 16, 1918, the independence of Lithuania was declared after more than a century of forced annexation to the Russian empire. Her independence was recognized by the great powers, including the United States. The republic, founded on principles of self-determination, justice, and democracy, assumed her rightful position in the community of nations as a sovereign state. For 20 years the deep-seated nationalistic yearnings which had too long been frustrated were fulfilled.

Unhappily, Lithuania's geographical propinquity to the Soviet Union caused the proud new nation to be one of the first victims of Communist expansionism. By typical, devious methods which we have come to know so well in later years, the Soviet Union imposed its way of life on Lithuania during the turmoil of the Second World War, and even annexed it as the 14th Soviet Republic. The United States has steadfastly refused to recognize this annexation.

As in the rest of the Communist empire, justice has been trampled and freedom extinguished throughout Lithuania. Economic and cultural freedom has been suppressed, and tyrannical measures taken to prevent the free expression of the deep religious feelings of the people. Thousands of Lithuanians in the years since 1940 have been reported slain or banished in a never-ceasing effort to communize the people.

All these measures, however, have not been able to quench the patriotic spirit of the Lithuanians. Although news from behind the Iron Curtain is sparse, reports have steadily filtered through of continued national resistance.

Here in the United States, Americans of Lithuanian origin are doing all they can to encourage the Lithuanian people during their present captivity just as they did when Lithuania suffered earlier oppression at the hands of Russia. Charitable and fraternal organizations are dedicating themselves to maintaining the spirit which the Communists are trying to eradicate. I would like to call particular attention to the work of the Knights of Lithuania, a national organization founded in 1912, in organizing support for the fight for freedom.

The undaunted courage and faith of the Lithuanian people and their kinsmen in the United States deserves every tribute it will receive today. Because their kind of spirit cannot long be kept in shackles, we can be sure that some day this anniversary of independence will once again be celebrated in an independent Lithuania by a free people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the First World War came to an end in 1918, out of its wreckage emerged many new states in various parts of Europe. Of these newly revived, self-governing, and independent nations, Lithuania claims our attention because today, this 16th of February, is the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's political independence.

The Lithuanians, as the most numerous of the three Baltic peoples—the Estonians, the Latvians, and the Lithuanians—have secured for themselves a very significant place in the colorful and turbulent history of the Baltic region. Surrounded by powerful neighbors they have, during most of the past several hundred years, been subjected to foreign rule and have suffered much. Yet in that long period of subjugation they have successfully managed to keep alive their love of liberty and their patriotism. Their unyielding and uncompromising spirit on certain principles, their fervent devotion to their national traditions, and their firm belief in simple Christian tenets have served them well throughout their long history. And toward the end of World War I when they saw the chance of regaining their national independence, they took full advantage of it, and fortunately were able to make good.

The history of independent Lithuania for the next twenty years was one of growth and progress. In that short period, through sheer hard work and determination on the part of the industrious Lithuanians, the country prospered economically and made advances in social and cultural fields. It maintained good relations with its immediate neighbors and did its best to be at least on correct terms with the Soviet Union. In short, in the course of two decades Lithuania became a model democratic state in northeastern Europe.

But this blissful period of national independence came to an end at the outbreak of World War II. Lithuania, with her two weak neighbors, was the first victim of Soviet aggression. In October of 1939 the Soviet Union undermined Lithuanian independence when that weak country was forced to agree to the establishment of certain Soviet military and air bases in Lithuania. And in June 1940 when Lithuania was unjustifiably annexed to the Soviet Union, it ceased to be an independent country. In mid-1941 the Soviet armies were driven out by Nazi forces, and the Lithuanians had to suffer under nazism for 3 years. Finally, in August of 1944 the Red army returned once more, and since then Lithuania has been a part of the Soviet Union.

Today, under the oppression of Communist Russia, Lithuania has been completely sealed off from the free world. The whole country has become a large concentration camp. Ruthless tyranny is trampling under its feet everything sacred to the Lithuanian nation. Religious and political freedom are things of the past. All prominent national leaders are either imprisoned in distant concentration camps or have been shot. A large part of Lithuania's population, reportedly some 600,000, have been deported to slave-labor camps in Siberia and the country is being colonized by Asiatic immigrants. Nevertheless, in the face of all such tyrannical measures the mass of the people are still carrying on their resistance to their oppressors. They are still striving hard to hold on to their national ideals and aspirations. I am proud to state that this country has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union, and we still accord diplomatic recognition to the legal government of that country. This fact alone is heartening proof that the Lithuanian nation, which is today celebrating its independence day, has the sympathy and support of the people and the Government of this country.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as freedom-loving people all over the world prepare to join with the people in Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry everywhere in taking appropriate notice of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, there is cause for hope that there has been some progress made during the year just past in the struggle for freedom and for peace.

The people of the United States admire and respect the Lithuanian people, not only through the valiant contributions which they have made to the pages of history through hundreds of years, but also because many Americans have had the opportunity to know thousands of men and women of Lithuanian ancestry as neighbors and to understand and appreciate their fine qualities. In my own State, official records confirm that there are more than 10,000 persons living in Connecticut who were born in Lithuania, and their native-born children and grandchildren number several times that many.

To these and to all others who glory in a free and independent Lithuania, I send the warmest greetings on this 36th anniversary, which is an occasion for all Americans to give thought to their friends and neighbors here who are of Lithuanian ancestry and whom we count as among our finest citizens.

The people of the free world will continue to strive with every effort, joining with their prayers, to bring about at the earliest moment the lifting of the Iron Curtain and the attainment for the people of Lithuania of full and final liberation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 36th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day. However, it is an anniversary unmarked by the jubiliation and ceremony befitting such an occasion. For today, independence in the Lithuanian homeland dwells only in the stanch but sad and heavy hearts of an enslaved people.

Since the forced incorporation of this freedom-loving Nation into the Communist orbit, many hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been murdered, starved and deported. A most carefully planned and executed program of genocide has been relentlessly pursued so as to completely exterminate the Lithuanian nationality. Communist Russia knows that by nothing less than total extinction of the language, customs, culture and ideals of this people can she hope to keep them subdued. Yet even these extreme and inhuman measures have not extinguished the hope and brave spirit which sustains the Lithuanians in their resistance to complete annihilation and the struggle for eventual freedom from Communist tyranny.

As we Americans join our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent in the hope that their homeland shall one day regain its freedom and liberty, let us not be unmindful of the responsibility that we, as free men and a free Nation, have in the restitution of independence to all nations now enclosed behind the Iron Curtain. If I might venture to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln's famous words that our Government "cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," I say we cannot as Americans insure an enduring peace for our own Nation in a world half slave and half free. Therefore, on this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, let us resolve henceforth to conduct our foreign affairs and assume our world leadership with strength and integrity, with no more compromises, no more Yaltas, Teherans, and no more inaction as when we allowed Russia to annex Lithuania and her Baltic sister nations. Only in this way can we hasten the day of liberation for our enslaved Lithuanian allies, and all who are enclosed behind the dark curtain of godless communism.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to incorporate the following statement regarding Lithuania.

Thirty-six years ago the people of Lithuania declared their independence and enjoyed twenty-odd years of independence as an exemplary nation, honorably fulfilling all her obligations as an honored member of the family of free nations. Her progress in economics, education, and agrarian reforms were remarkable.

Today, however, there is no free Lithuania, any more than there is a free Poland, Hungary, or Czechoslovakia. All are crushed beneath the heel of the Russian tyrant. Freedom, as we know it, is denied these unfortunate people, and this anniversary, which should be one of rejoicing and celebration, is filled with sadness for not only the Lithuanian citizens behind the Iron Curtain but also their friends and loved ones in our great free country.

We liberty-loving Americans are deeply concerned about the enslavement of the heroic people of Lithuania and others in like situations and we express the fervent prayer and hope that soon they will be reestablished as a free member of the family of nations.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, brave nations may be conquered by force of arms, their liberties curtailed by the oppressor's iron will. But never will the minds of free men be captured so long as their hearts burn with zeal for liberty.

As we pause today to commemorate the 36th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence, let us make it an occasion for hopeful contemplation of the future. We who are free must hold high the glimmering torch so that the oppressed shall not lose sight of freedom.

We must continue to plan with unqualified resolution the ultimate peaceful liberation of those who are determined to be free.

In the people of America is vested the honorable responsibility of helping to restore to the downtrodden the measures of dignity which is their due.

As Americans of Lithuanian descent well know, liberty is not easily come by. It is a cherished intangible whose possession and perpetuation requires more struggle, more care, more effort than does the forceful annexation of physical bodies; more strength than that required for geographic conquests.

The spirit of independence will forever be part of Lithuania's people. With abiding faith and the will to be free, and with the unfaltering aid of the United States, Lithuania one day again will be independent.

So, on this day of commemoration, let us not reflect on the loss of liberty—let us pray for the future fulfillment of freedom to a brave and courageous people.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, 36 years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was proclaimed. Out of the tragedies of the First World War had sprung some blessings, among them the opportunity for this great Baltic nation to determine its own destiny once again, an opportunity which had long been denied by their Russian masters. I am sure that independence was never more welcome than it was to the heroic Lithuanians who had suffered under forced annexation to their aggressive neighbor since 1795.

For over a century the Russian rulers had carried out a policy of "Russification" by which they attempted to extinguish the Lithuanian culture just as they had its national identity. By this cruel policy the language was outlawed and the beautiful name "Lithuania" was officially abolished. More than once the courageous people of Lithuania rebelled in an effort to throw off the oppressive yoke. The failures they met did not discourage them, but instead strengthened their determination to be free.

Finally, on that day in February which we are commemorating now, the goal of freedom was achieved and Lithuanian independence was declared. The next 20 years constituted the happiest period in Lithuania's recent history. Outstanding achievements were made in the fields of economics, and government, and the Lithuanian culture flourished as a plant seeing the sun after years of darkness.

Unhappily, Lithuania has been deprived of its cherished freedom by the evil forces of communism against which we have mobilized ourselves and the rest of the free world. Its years of freedom are now a precious memory. But more than that, they are an inspiration, for true Lithuanians everywhere have faith that some day freedom will be theirs once again.

In the meanwhile, there is hope to be derived from a comparison of Lithuania's present captivity with the captivity of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Just as the earlier attempts at Russification did not succeed, the current attempts at communization will not succeed. Although Lithuanian patriots are killed, although worship is suppressed, although freedom is denied, the spirit of Lithuania can never be crushed. In their hearts the Lithuanians will maintain their religious faith and their love of liberty. Just as the Lithuanians rebelled against their conquerors in 1830, 1863, and 1905, they will continue their heroic resistance to Communist tyranny.

Here in the United States, Americans of Lithuanian origin, who have contributed so much to their new homeland, are performing a great service to all who love freedom, as well as to the country of their forefathers. They are keeping alive the spirit of 1918 when the forces of democracy triumphed and Lithuania attained its rightful stature as a sovereign state. They are reminding all Americans of every national origin of the dangers of communism. They are sending hope and encouragement to a very gallant people. I am proud to join with them in commemorating this 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my felicitations and greetings to my Lithuanian American friends upon the observance of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

One cannot fail to be profoundly interested in the destiny of the people of this brave little nation and to share the sorrow of the many Lithuanian-Americans gravely concerned over the fate of their kinfolk who have been enslaved by Soviet communism. The ceaseless struggle of the people of Lithuania against Soviet atrocities and their fight for the preservation of their ideals of liberty and equality should on this anniversary imbue the freedom-loving people of the world with fresh admiration for their courage and indomitable spirit.

We here in the United States must continue our steadfast adherence to morality and democracy and never hesitate to raise our voices in protest against such atrocities as those perpetrated against the Lithuanian people.

A glorious page of history will be written when justice and humanity finally triumph over the forces of communism and evil. It is my fervent hope that the day is not far distant when the people of Lithuania will be released from their Soviet bondage and regain the liberty and independence so cruelly extorted from them by the Soviet rule of terrorism.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is Lithuanian Independence Day. To the people of Lithuanian descent it is both a day of joy and a day of sadness.

It is a day of joy because history recalls that it was on February 16, 36 years ago, that started an era of happiness and freedom for Lithuania, an era of more

than a score of years of independence to a little country that had been under Russian rule since 1795.

It is a day of sadness because the independence of their fatherland does not exist any more. The Soviet fist is today clenched tighter than ever over their country.

On this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence—we who live in liberty and freedom extend to the people of Lithuania our assurance that we shall continue to support them in their fight for liberation so that they may once again be free to enjoy freedom and peace.

We assure them that we have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship and we feel confident that the day will come again, as it did in 1918, when the people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and break the yoke which the Soviets have placed around their necks.

We know that the present government of Lithuania is not one of the will of the people but one that has been imposed on them by brute force.

The history of Lithuania is one of struggle by a freedom-loving people to get along with their neighbors. It is also the story of a people that has been subjected to persecution at the hands of greedy nations who not only took over control of its government but also stifled religion by closing its churches, raided its libraries expelled thousands from the country, drove thousands into slave labor and armed services and chased into the forests other thousands of men and boys who refused to fight under the Germans or the Russians. These latter preferred to become guerrillas and to suffer undue hardships in order to carry on the harassment of the invaders.

The Lithuanians are fine people—industrious, conscientious, peace-loving, and loyal. These fine qualities are evident in the nearly one million Americans of Lithuanian descent who are in this country, as well as in the 26,000 Lithuanian displaced persons who have found a haven in the United States.

I am happy that our Government adheres to its statement made on July 23, 1940, in which the United States protested against the annihilation of the three Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia.

To the people of Lithuania we say: "Have hope. Your country will rise again. We are your friends."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the occurrence of Lithuanian Independence Day in this 15th year of the invasion and conquest of that proud nation by brutish Soviet aggressors reminds the whole civilized world once again that none of us can count himself really a free man until freedom is restored to all who yearn for it. Nowhere is this yearning more sincere than in occupied Lithuania.

As a member of the House Baltic Committee—a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R.—I have been profoundly shocked by the grisly facts our committee has been bringing to light on the cruelty, inhumanity, and depravity of the Communist invading and occupying forces. We have uncovered incontrovertible proof of the heinous crimes committed against the dignity of mankind and the peace of the world by the Red army and its political commissars in the enslavement of this sovereign nation.

Not since the trials of the Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg, in which I had the honor and satisfaction to participate, has any tribunal, I believe, uncovered a more shocking story of international barbarism.

The conscience of the world may occasionally seem to slumber or grow callous in the face of such long-continued oppression of a people as has been suffered by those of Lithuania these past 15 years. But Lithuania's tragedy is not forgotten. not ignored. The facts as they have emerged from our hearings have reawakened free men everywhere to the urgent need for Lithuania's restoration as a free, independent, sovereign people if truth and justice are to emerge triumphant over the forces of darkness and evil. We know that if any of us in any land are to feel secure in our own freedom, then Lithuania, too, must be free.

The Lithuanian people, throughout their history and throughout many periods of conquest and subjugation by alien hordes or godless oppressors, have always demonstrated that they prize liberty and human decency above all in their service to Almight God and to their nation. On their independence day I am proud to salute them for their courage and their faith, and to pray with them for their early deliverance from a bondage as severe and inhuman as visited on any people anywhere in the history of mankind. Through their sufferings, however, they live in the certain knowledge that they will prevail.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with my friends of Lithuanian descent in the United States and in the free world in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independent of Lithuania, a celebration which, so far as the homeland is concerned, can only be observed secretly in the hearts and souls of its citizens.

Everywhere in the free world, free people will continue to hope and to pray for the liberation of this great nation, and in so doing give expression of our concern and friendship for a brave and good people shackled temporarily by a godless tyrant.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to express heartfelt sympathy and sincere admiration for the enslaved people of Lithuania. The courage and strength they are displaying today, in the face of trial and tribulation we dare not even try to comprehend, truly manifest the caliber of this nation.

We thought the Hitler regime was the epitome of cruelty. Today, with continued perpetrations of Soviet-controlled leaders who dominate their citizens with terror, force, and brutality, the Lithuanians realize now that Hitler's regime was just the forerunner to the sadistic, inhuman, regimented tactics currently employed by the Communist regime as it rules the minds and bodies of the some three millions who plead for survival in this Soviet-infested country.

I am proud, yet a little humble, that many of my constituents come from this oppressed country. For those who have been fortunate to come to a country wherein there is no fear to worship, to speak or to live as humans should, I thank God. I pray that more of their brothers may know soon the freedom they enjoy. And I welcome them today on the 36th anniversary of their gallant country.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1954, marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. On this day 36 years ago the brave people of this ancient land proclaimed their national independence after 160 years of Russian rule.

During the 22 years that followed Lithuania clearly showed its right to a place among the democratic nations of the world. The splendid record of performance and the steady progress made were hailed by friends of freedom everywhere. This independence was cruelly brought to an end in 1940 when Lithuania became a tragic victim of Russian aggression.

I am proud to join with the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in their commemoration today and in the prayer that a new day of liberation will soon dawn for their relatives in their native land.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again the free world celebrates Lithuanian Independence Day, as we have been doing for the past 36 years on February 16th. It was in 1917 that the rebirth of that small but gallant nation took place.

Unfortunately, for the last 14 years this day has been celebrated under different circumstances and in a different atmosphere than all of us would have liked to see. While here in the United States 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent are able to cherish and enjoy the liberties, the freedom and the rights of mankind offered to them by our laws and our way of life, there, in the country of their forefathers for the past 14 years, the brutal Soviet might has been keeping its grip on some 3 million people. These have been 14 years of slavery, privation, deportations, and fear of tortures inflicted by the MVD. To those who live there and have experienced it, these 14 years seemed like ages.

Last year on this very day of the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I suggested that Congress should enact necessary legislation to investigate the circumstances under which the seizure of the Baltic States was performed. Today I can happily say that this was done by the Baltic committee which last December concluded its hearings on that case. The wealth of information thus obtained was certainly beyond expectations. The report of the committee should serve as a warning to all those who deal or may have to deal with Soviet diplomacy and their politicians. These hearings provided a striking example of Soviet gangsterism in the field of their foreign relations. I attended a hearing in Chicago when testimony was taken from Gen. Stasyz Hastikis, former head of the Lithuanian Army. The general told the committee

in detail how he was a member of the Lithuanian delegation to Moscow in 1939 was blackmailed by Stalin and Molotov, into agreeing to sign a requested mutual assistance pact. The technique of persuasion used by the Soviet leaders against the Lithuanian delegates, was the same as applied earlier, in 1938, by Hitler, when he ordered President Hacha of Czechoslovakia to come to Berlin, only to request from the latter a signature which was to end Czechoslovakia's independence. Although Hitler, in order to achieve his goal threatened the Czechoslovakian delegation with the dispatch of 1,000 bombers over Prague, as far as the Lithuanian delegation to Moscow was concerned, both Stalin and Molotov used other methods. For an entire day they kept their "guests" waiting at the hotel, and finally at 11 p. m. they ordered them to come to the Kremlin. There, taken by surprise, they were informed that according to the Soviet-Nazi agreement, Lithuania was to come under the Soviet sphere of influence, and therefore a mutual assistance pact between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was necessary. But this was not the end of it. To do what he called protect Lithuanians properly and secure the Soviet Union, Molotov demanded that the Lithuanians admit Soviet troops into their country. When in the course of that meeting, which lasted till 2 in the morning, the Lithuanian Ambassador to Moscow protested, Stalin's temper got out of hand and he said: "You, young man, sit down and be quiet." How strange to us and ironically ring the following words taken from paragraph 7 of that pact:

> Fulfillment of this treaty shall not in any way affect the sovereign right of the contracting parties, in particular their state organization, economic and social system, military measures and generally the principles of nonintervention in internal affairs.

Molotov, raising his toast on the same occasion, had this to say:

> We stand for an exact and honest fulfillment of the agreement signed by us on a basis of mutuality and declare that foolish prattle of sovietization of the Baltic States is of use merely to our common enemies and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

On June 15, of the following year, 1 day after the Germans occupied Paris, the Soviets marched into Lithuania and immediately after that staged their "elections." However, 24 hours before the close of polls in Lithuania, the London office of the Tass news agency announced the results: "Ninety-five and five-tenths percent of all eligible votes were cast for the Working People's Union Party," the only party on the ballot. Thus, Lithuania's sovereignty and independence was finally sealed.

There is no use to repeat how ridiculous sound Molotov's promises and good intentions, how cynical his speeches. One crime after another has followed, yet we still do debate with Molotov and with those who claim to represent the view of over 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Statistics of the first year of Soviet occupation of Lithuania show that 34,260 Lithuanians were deported to Siberia. By 1950 this figure grew to 500,000, including women and children. In other words one-sixth of the entire Lithuanian population has been moved to Soviet slave labor camps. As I already have indicated, the pattern remained always the same: It has happened before in Poland, then in Lithuania and in other Baltic States, it has been repeated in Korea and it may happen to us should we remain unprepared against the Russian threat.

As an American of Polish origin, I feel I must say a few words of the close relationship between Lithuania and Poland which prevailed in the past. The elements of history, the oppression experienced both under the czars and now under the Bolsheviks may well help both countries to think along the same lines. Where else in the world can we find an example of a union between two different countries that has lasted over three and one-half centuries? When in 1413 at Horodla the union between Poland and Lithuania was signed freemen with freemen and equal with equal, none of the deputies of either the Polish Sejm or the Lithuanian Diet dreamed that it will last almost four hundred years, and were it not for foreign interference the union would have lasted to this day. Both countries had their common foes and their common friends. Together they concluded treaties and together they participated in wars. Although they kept separate laws in each country a mutual administration was formed, yet with a separate monetary system, a separate army, and separate judiciary. The two shared one crown and elected their own kings whenever there was no heir to the throne. This unique union, unknown to this day in Europe's history, did not come into existence by physical force of one country over the other, but through the strength of the spirit and willpower of their respective people. The union was not molded by the sword, but by means of an ethical code of established laws and self-respect. Thus, this union between Lithuania and Poland became the prototype of a European federation, only on a small scale.

Today, while both countries have to face their own hardships in their struggle against the Red dictatorship, I am most happy to hear that only a month ago, here in the United States, efforts have been made between political leaders in exile from both Lithuania and Poland for future relations of both countries. On January 16, through the initiative of Lithuanian political leaders, a meeting was held with their Polish counterpart. The Lithuanians proposed a closer cooperation in the common struggle for the independence of their respective nations, as well as the furthering of a friendly atmosphere in a future free world. It is my sincere desire that this example might well be followed by other eastern European countries, because through unity only they will be able to throw off the shackles of slavery and preserve their independence in the future. It was this unity which kept both Lithuania and Poland alive and prosperous for 360 years.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the annals of history contain many examples of how large and powerful states have conquered and subjugated their neighbors in a desperate march toward world conquest. The tyrannies which engaged in these imperialistic adventures were, in most instances, completely frank about their purpose. They conquered for the sake of conquest, and freely acknowledged their selfish aims.

On this 36th anniversary of the start of Lithuania's brief 20 years of independence, however, we are sorrowfully reminded once again of the unspeakable deceit and treachery of the Soviet Union, which loudly proclaims on the one hand its opposition to imperialism while ruthlessly suppressing freedom and liberty in every nation where it has gained control. It has sought to destroy the national character of the Lithuanian people it holds in bondage. It has made Lithuania into a slave state.

Here is an instance of a powerful military force seeking to swallow up the entire free world, yet at the same time professing its love of peace and its regard for other peoples. What better proof could there be than Lithuania of the duplicity of the Communist aggressors, of the emptiness of their pretensions?

Although Lithuania today is even forbidden to observe this anniversary, this day which should be its greatest national holiday, throughout the civilized world, and particularly here in the United States where we have refused to recognize the legitimacy of the forced annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union, friends of Lithuania and all who believe in freedom will mark this day and observe it in tribute to a brave people,.

As our Congress has established through hearings of the Baltic Investigating Committee, Russia's bloodstained guilt in Lithuania is a blot on all mankind—a shameful illustration of the bestiality which characterizes atheistic communism in all of its works.

Lithuania remains in chains, but the proud spirit of the Lithuanian people will survive, heralding a new day of liberation. We hope and pray the time will not be too far distant when Lithuania, free and strong and dedicated to liberty and justice, will once again take its rightful place in the concert of sovereign nations. I shall always consider it my duty to do everything I can to speed that great occasion.

In the meantime, and with profound sympathy for the plight of her helpless and cruelly abused citizens, I am proud today to join in America's tribute to Lithuania on Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, this day is for the Lithuanian people a day when they look back with pride to the 16th day of February 1918, when the people of Lithuania, after 123 years of Russian domination, declared their independence and formed a democratic state of their own. But it is also a day of sadness for them, when they reflect upon the terrible sufferings which the people of that nation have undergone since 1940, when they were occupied and taken over by Communist Russia.

On this day, many of us pause to pay tribute to that gallant nation and express our fond hopes for a return of their

freedom and independence. That is as it should be, but is it enough?

For many years our Government has followed a policy of containment of communism. With a change of administrations, hopes were expressed for the discarding of that policy for one of liberation.

The happenings of the last year have, however, given little factual evidence of any such change. There is, indeed, not much new that the people of Lithuania, or of any other nation behind the Iron Curtain, can find to buoy their hopes for early liberation.

My experience as a member of the congressional committee to investigate the seizure of the Baltic nation by Soviet Russia convinces me that there is much that we Americans can learn from the sad fate of the Baltic nations.

There was unfolded to our committee, from eyewitnesses, an almost unbelievably cruel story of brutality, inhumanity, and treachery, of mass murders and deportations, of torture, slavery, and hunger.

In these days when we still think we can do business with the Communists, through treaties and agreements, it would be worth our while to consider the way the Soviets treated their solemn agreements with Lithuania.

Between 1920 and 1939, the Soviets entered into at least eight separate agreements with the free Lithuanian Republic. In these agreements they solemnly agreed to a nonaggression pact and to mutual assistance. As late as October 10, 1939, they pledged to respect the independence of Lithuania. But only 7 months later, on June 14, 1940, their armies marched into Lithuania and the reign of terror began.

In the light of these historical facts, which have been confirmed in the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles before our committee on November 30, 1953, how can we expect these same Communist leaders today to show any more respect for any agreement they may sign with us, whether it is in Berlin or anywhere else.

I pay my deep respects to the courage, patriotism, and love of freedom of the Lithuanian people. I share the fond hopes and prayers of those who express faith in the restoration of freedom and liberty to that gallant nation.

But, with all that, I pray for a more realistic approach on the part of the western nations to the solution of the problem of the Communist menace, a menace which is gradually but surely moving nearer and nearer to us.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the little Republic of Lithuania declared its independence and it was free and independent until May 15, 1940, when it was ruthlessly occupied by the Russian Communists.

On this 36th anniversary of her independence I recall that the undying spirit of the brave Lithuanian people more than once in her history has made manifest its fervent patriotism. On this day as in days gone by throughout the world wherever a Lithuanian heart beats it is an indication and an assurance that Lithuania will shed her shackles forced upon her by a savage, merciless, and gigantic foe. But like the Bible story of David and Goliath, little Lithuania will meet the challenge and one day with the help of God she will destroy her enemy as David did Goliath. Miracles will never cease to happen as long as God is in His heaven and the faith of the Lithuanian people lives.

Communistic Russia will one day disintegrate and fall into dust but Lithuania and her brave people will come back into their own and assume their rightful place among the free peoples of the earth and live and expand as they are destined to do by God's will.

Therefore, people of Lithuania, because you have had faith in God you have never been abandoned by our Creator. You are destined to rise while the godless Communist forces which have temporarily dominated your native land must not and will not endure because they have acted contrary to God's will and because they have turned their faces away from God and his revealing truth.

So gird yourselves for the coming day and the great battle. Maintain your spirit like your faith, and the day will come when victory shall bring back as your reward, freedom, independence, and lasting peace.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuanians in this country are observing an anniversary which is forbidden in their mother country. We are all fully aware of the tragic conditions in that part of the world and we share with Lithuanian-Americans their grave concern over the fate of their relatives in the homeland suffering under Soviet tyranny. Their fight for freedom is not only for their own liberation but it is a fight which all free men share throughout the world.

At this time I wish to renew my pledges of active assistance at all times to the courageous people of Lithuania in their struggle between freedom and slavery.

In this connection, I was very happy to work and support the adoption of the Baltic resolution passed by the House and feel a great deal of good can be accomplished by it. This action by the House brings a ray of hope for the liberation of enslaved Lithuania and the other captive countries. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to express by direct action my unwavering support of their cause.

I urge this Congress to continue to do its utmost in behalf of the people of this valiant nation and to take the proper steps to bring about the formulation of a vigorous policy program for the liberation of all enslaved people.

Great care should be exercised so that there will be no pacts with Bolshevist imperialism. So far leaders of various nations have failed through the United Nations to halt Soviet Russia.

The only way we can accomplish the liberation of Lithuania and other nations now in servitude is by completely defeating Soviet Russia in her attempts to communize and enslave the world. This is proving to be a costly and painful process but with the common efforts of all freedom-loving nations of the West, coupled with the faith and leadership of millions of liberty-loving Americans, we cannot help but eventually defeat the Communist menace.

Lithuanian-Americans are to be congratulated upon the excellent work they are doing to further the Lithuanian cause. Representing the million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in our country, they have formed various councils who have demonstrated splendid organizational ability.

This evening, my wife and I are attending a banquet in Baltimore of the Council of Lithuanian Societies in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania. We are indeed proud to have the privilege of joining with these fine people of Lithuanian descent, also, those in their native land, in hoping and praying for the return of Lithuania's independence and freedom.

On this occasion, let us, as citizens of the greatest democracy on earth, unite in rededicating ourselves to the cause of universal peace, never forgetting that the preserving of liberty and freedom is everybody's business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest crimes ever perpetrated in the history of the modern era has been the willful seizure of the Baltic States and the willful destruction of their independence by Soviet Russia.

On this day upon which we celebrate the independence of one of those states—Lithuania—it is fitting that we demonstrate once again to the world at large the enormity and the infamy of the Soviet crime. For us of the free world this is a compelling moral duty, for those less fortunate than we must keep their patriotic tributes locked within the solitary sanctuary of their grief-ridden breasts.

The evil that men do often lives after them, and so it is in even greater degree with the evil that one nation visits upon another. Nations live on; they are something of the flesh and the spirit, while in a physical sense the life of man is by comparison no more than a fleeting adventure upon this unhappy earth. That the evil done to the people of Lithuania by Soviet Russia will vanish through the years is a prospect not likely ever to occur. Never shall the people of Lithuania forget. Never will the people of America forget this Communist treachery and infamy. Never will the free people of the world forget.

Soviet Russia did an abominable thing when, in the darkening days of world crisis in 1939–40, her leaders forcefully imposed upon the Lithuanian nation an arrangement, illegal and immoral, and one that breached the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian people. In an air of sublime innocence, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, the archpriest of Communist tyranny, assured the people of Lithuania in October 1939 that the Soviet Union's military occupation of Lithuania through a forced pact of mutual assistance in no way implied the intrusion of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Lithuania, as some foreign interests, he said, were trying to make her believe. He went on to assert

that this pact was inspired by mutual respect for the governmental, social, and economic system of each of the contracting parties, and that Soviet Russia stood for an exact and honest fulfillment of its agreements on a basis of reciprocity. He further declared that foolish talk of sovietization of Lithuania was useful only to the enemies of Russia and Lithuania and to all kinds of anti-Soviet provocateurs.

But this assurance, like so many other Soviet assurances before and since, was worth no more than that measure of expedience which suited Soviet policy at the time. Before the next summer had been spent and before the harvest had been gathered, Soviet Russia annihilated with one great blow the strong legal structure that had been so carefully and so hopefully constructed by Lithuanian statesmen through 20 years of diplomatic intercourse. Soviet Russia tore asunder every obligation, legal and moral, that bound her to respect the inviolability of Lithuanian territorial integrity. Driven on by deep-seated, aggressive ideological motives, Soviet Russia willfully destroyed the independence and sovereignty of the Lithuanian nation.

Indeed, the crime that was committed there in distant Lithuania during the summer of 1940 is one that the world will long remember and few will ever forget. This was a crime without forgiveness, for it was not committed against one person, but rather against an entire nation. So grave was this misdeed that the entire Lithuanian nation has long since suffered with unmeasured pain and sorrow from its consequences. During the intervening years from that fateful summer of 1940 to this very hour there has been visited upon the Lithuanian people a catalog of injustices that would make the most mogorous nation feel its enduring burden. Suppression of political freedom; unwarranted restrictions upon economic life; destruction of cultural ideals and the persecution of religion—all are part of the cross that presses so heavily upon the Lithuanian nation. These are great burdens for a great nation of courageous people to bear. The time will come, and let us hope it is not far off, when the Lithuanian people will once again stand upon the native soil of their great land and breathe the atmosphere of freedom.

A courageous people who have once experienced the free way of life cannot be turned away from freedom or defeated by the mental and physical tortures of communism. Communism may reach the body, yes, it may even reach the mind, but it can never touch the soul of men who were once free. Just as surely as sunshine lights up the darkness, so too, will the bright clean flame of freedom, burning in the souls of men, light forever their pathway of duty and hope. Never will communism succeed in putting out this bright clean flame burning in the souls of freemen.

Before the tribunal of world history, however, the case of Lithuania will some day be decided. Until that happy hour, it is upon us, the free, that rests the obligation of not letting mankind forget the crime against Lithuania and the guilt that Soviet Russia must bear before humanity.

In our duty, we must ever be true.

In our cause, we must ever be determined.

In our resolve to do what is right and just, we must never falter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea lives a people who today, if they were free to do so, would be waving flags and rejoicing. For this would be their Fourth of July—their day for celebration of national independence. Instead of an air of happy rejoicing, however, a fearful stillness hangs over this land—for it is no longer a land of freedom and its people have little to rejoice about. Nevertheless, in the memories of Lithuanian people—for it is they of whom I speak—there yet remains a symbol of the freedom they have had, and, if it please God, will have again. That symbol is the day February 16, the day on which 36 years ago Lithuania became an independent republic.

Down through the years Lithuanians have kept their distinctive national character intact in spite of the harsh tribulations of their history. They can look back proudly to an ancient culture which developed in a great country—a country which at its height stretched all the way from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For centuries Lithuania suffered hardships at the hands of stronger and more aggressive neighbors. The country came to be greatly reduced in size. For well over a hundred years of its history immediately prior to the First World War, it was dominated by Russia. Then for a brief interval during that war, Lithuania was occupied by the Germans. Following the war, the unstable conditions in Eastern Europe gave this small country a chance that it had waited for; in 1918 the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. Self-determination for these hopeful people became a reality. The future looked bright indeed. For a period of 20 years the country flourished; land reform was put into operation with a large degree of success. Transportation and communication flourished; the cities grew. Programs in education and health made notable strides.

Unfortunately for the Lithuanians and for all people who uphold the rights of national self-determination this period of progress for Lithuanians came to an abrupt end. All too short-lived was this brief interlude of freedom. The Soviet Union in 1939, violating a treaty with Lithuania, served an ultimatum on the government and proceeded to occupy the country. Lithuania had no choice but to comply with the demands which the Soviet Union made upon her; later the little country was forcibly incorporated in the U. S. S. R. Except for 3 years during the Second World War during which the Nazis overran Lithuania, the country has since remained under the complete domination of Communist Russia.

The harsh treatment which the Lithuanian people have suffered at the hands of Soviet Russia has been a source of deep despair and concern to all the free peoples of the world. Thousands of Lithuanians are reported to have starved to death, and other thousands to have been killed or deported out of their beloved country into the interior of the Soviet Union. These gross violations of the human life and dignity of a small defenseless land will remain forever as a blot on the pages of human history.

And yet, we ourselves gather a measure of hope when we are constantly made aware that there are thousands of Lithuanians whose spirits are not crushed by this heavy oppression—there are thousands, both inside and outside Lithuania, who are working in a spirit of patient devotion to keep alive and active the national traditions and aspiration of this sturdy little nation. From inside Lithuania we have reports of a flourishing underground. In our own country there are numerous groups acting on behalf of Lithuania in her fight for freedom. As long as this is true—as long as there remain hope and the will to work for this hope in the bosom of this people—then we need never despair—for such a spirit is the first and fundamental requirement in a movement to reestablish the rights of enslaved human souls.

HAIL LITHUANIA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to make acknowledgment today of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence and to join with millions of liberty-loving people in this Nation and all over the world in hailing this stalwart nation and great people.

While Lithuania has been shackled with the chains of oppression, the spark of liberty which was planted years ago in the hearts of her people will ever shine brightly despite the disappointments and disillusionments of our times.

The brave Lithuanian people know that human liberty is indestructible; that it may be suppressed for a while, that it may be visited with religious persecutions and bloodshed, but in the end it will reemerge more glorious than ever.

In keeping with our time-honored custom of helping the oppressed and victims of tyranny, it must be the province of this Nation always by word and by deed to keep alive the courage and to nurture the faith of millions of loyal Lithuanians, as well as other struggling peoples throughout the earth who are striving and fighting for liberation from dictatorship.

As a Member of this House, I pledge myself anew to the cause of Lithuania and I urge all our Members, indeed all Americans everywhere, to render determined support to the Lithuanian cause so that through our intercessions and the help of the Almighty that great nation and its noble people may once again breathe the air of freedom.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to put in the RECORD a letter I addressed to Miss Mary M. Kizis, director, Lithuanian American Information Center, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

NEW YORK, *February 12, 1954.*

Miss MARY M. KIZIS,
Director, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MISS KIZIS: After the First World War, an independent Lithuania announced that she intended to be a republic of free citizens, assuring justice to all; that the

aim of the state would be to give every citizen an opportunity to rise to the highest moral and material level and share in creating values which would add to the progress of all mankind. Independence strongly whetted the creative talents of her richly endowed people and they quickly started along the road to achievement in all fields of national endeavor.

In the autumn of 1939 the full force of Hitler's mania burst upon the civilized world and in the space of a few nerve-shattering months Europe was a quivering ruin. None felt the impact of this staggering event with greater effect than the peoples of the Baltic States, especially when der fuhrer revealed his secret relationship with the Soviet Union. The Lithuanians, through the years, have been stanch in their devotion to their national ideals, and this spirit still prevails with a ferocity of an emotion deprived of natural and normal expression.

The calloused masterminds of the Kremlin issue communiques with increasing regularity, making every effort to enhance our opinions as to the "happiness" of the various people they hold in ruthless subjugation. To the everlasting credit of the American people, we have not fallen for the party line. We have countered by never recognizing the annexation of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. We have granted haven to their displaced peoples, accepting 26,000 Lithuanians. With devastating logic, the House of Representatives of the United States adopted the Baltic resolution, creating the select Baltic committee to investigate the sordid spectacle of Soviet aggrandisement.

We say to the Lithuanian people, longing for cherished freedom: "Difficult as it is, hold fast to your hopes. The current exponents of sadism and corruption must soon be swept from the political arena. It is not in the nature of things that they long survive. Lithuania will again be able to say to the world that she is a republic of free citizens, assuring justice and dedicated to liberty."

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

SOVIET INFIDELITY AND LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to maintain faith in one another in all human relationships is the simplest means for assuring universal justice and tranquillity. From faith is derived confidence, trust, charity, and love—all elements necessary for the continuation of an elevated society and a progressing civilization. Without faith in one another, society is debased; for, when men begin to distrust one another, when men are motivated more by the counsels of suspicion and fear than they are by higher ideals, elements are then abroad that will most assuredly harm, if not destroy the bonds of social unity. In a democracy faith in one another is a cardinal virtue, for what would become of the democratic way of life if man could no longer trust his neighbor?

Among the great powers of the world today and in past history Soviet Russia epitomizes the very essence of infidelity. Deceit, falsehood, immorality, all have been governing principles in Soviet relations with other nations. With a guileful sense of dedication to evil purposes, Soviet Russia has persisted in her course of conquest and tyranny, and of all the nations of the world that had fallen victim to Soviet tyranny, none more ably demonstrates the real essence of Soviet immorality in international relations than the case of Lithuania. By the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R., Soviet Russia has won for herself the abomination of mankind.

The gravity of the transgressions upon Lithuanian sovereignty and independence was well demonstrated by a review of the instruments of diplomacy, recognized by international law, that had been concluded between Soviet Russia and the Lithuanian Republic and had governed their relations during 20 years of Lithuanian independence.

By the terms of the treaty of peace between Soviet Russia and Lithuania, the Soviet Government pledged that it recognized the independence of the Lithuanian Republic and that it would in no way violate Lithuanian sovereignty. In 1926 Lithuania and the Soviet Government concluded a pact of nonaggression, which reaffirmed Soviet pledges of inviolability of Lithuanian territory and sovereignty and added another stone to the structure of international relations between the two nations. By other international agreements—the Litvinov protocol which outlawed war as an instrument of national policy; the convention defining an aggressor, and others—Soviet Russia pledged its word to recognize and keep inviolate Lithuanian independence. And, of course, like any peace-loving people, the Lithuanian Nation had faith in Soviet promises.

To the misfortune of Lithuania, however, the pledges of Soviet Russia could not then, and never can be, taken as the honorable and faithful promises of an honorable and faithful nation. In October 1939, 1 month after German forces seized the western half of Poland and the Red army seized the eastern, the Soviet Government made the first breach in Lithuanian sovereignty when, by forcefully imposing upon the Lithuanian Nation a pact of mutual assistance, the Soviet Government acquired bases on Lithuanian territory for garrisoning Soviet military forces.

To the world Soviet authorities proclaimed that this was not a violation of Lithuanian sovereignty. In an effort to prove the purity of their action and to resanctify the illegality of their act, Soviet statesmen incorporated an article in the pact which said that the enforcement of the pact of mutual assistance would in no way impair the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, or more especially, their economic system or political structure.

This pledge, purely propaganda, was a faithless gesture of Communist expediency, for before the close of summer in 1940, Soviet Russia broke not only this pledge but all others. In one blow the Soviet Government destroyed all the instruments of law that had governed Soviet-Lithuanian diplomatic relations for 20 years, and with it destroyed the freedom of the Lithuanian nation.

That Americans should honor Lithuanians on this day commemorating the independence of their nation is an honorable and noble duty. That the real nature of Soviet menace should be bared before the world is no less a duty. In paying tribute to the great and courageous people of Lithuania on this day of patriotic dedication, let us, therefore, not be unmindful of those evil men who destroyed the independent republic we commemorate. In Lithuania, Soviet Russia has proved herself worthy of the appellation "abomination of humanity"; In Lithuania there is for the world to see a classic example of Soviet infidelity.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I want to join other Members of the House in their expressions of admiration for all those who did so much to establish this independence and for those who today, inside Lithuania, still cherish and encourage the spirit of independence and freedom. I am confident that Lithuanians, as well as all freedom-loving people now under Communist domination, will regain the freedom of their country. I know that all Americans look forward to that day and want to do everything within their power to bring it about.

LITHUANIAN LIBERTY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a few comments on this, the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

This Baltic nation at present is enslaved by the Soviets who seized the reins of power unjustly in 1940. This seizure has not been recognized by the United States Government.

Because of Communist aggression this freedom-loving people is forbidden to celebrate this occasion. Free people throughout the world today are joining with the 1 million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in assuring the people in their homeland of their continued support in fighting Soviet suppression.

All of us who love freedom and liberty should work together to free the enslaved, no matter where they may be, and strengthen the spirit of independence in the hearts of men all over the world.

We must never forget that an attack upon liberty anywhere is an attack upon liberty everywhere.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Lithuania. Now enslaved by Soviet imperialism since 1940, the tradition of freedom and national independence has not died among the Lithuanian people. The experience of the bitterness of long years of Communist domination of this once free Baltic nation has intensified the desire for freedom among her brave people. As a Member of this Congress I am proud that the United States has never recognized the Soviet seizure and incorporation of Lithuania. And those of Lithuanian origin everywhere can be proud, too, that their people have not accepted this domination, even though the presence of brute force enforces a temporary silence on the expression of their desires for freedom which they feel so earnestly. Americans will not forget Lithuania in her Soviet prison and looks, with her, to her ultimate liberation and reemergence as a member of the family of free nations.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's tragically short-lived independence there are

some encouraging evidences that the lesson of Lithuania and of other victims of Soviet duplicity are being taken to heart and are finding expression in the much more forthright and realistic American foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration.

At least on two different occasions during the current conference of foreign ministers in Berlin, Secretary of State Dulles specifically cited Russia's betrayal of Lithuania as a reason why no reliance can be placed on her promises of freedom and self-government. Mr. Dulles threw in Molotov's teeth the phony assurances given Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Molotov himself in 1939, only a few months before the independence of those countries was lost.

The new firmness in rejecting Russian proposals for German unification and so-called freedom suggests that the lesson of Lithuania is at long last being heeded. That means infinitely more, for America and for the ultimate hopes of peoples enslaved by communism, than the most eloquent and sincere tributes of the brave Lithuanian people.

From other quarters, also, there are evidences of a new firmness and realism in American foreign policy. For example, a recent, little-publicized statement by a high official of the State Department gives additional assurance that the Eisenhower administration has no intention of extending diplomatic recognition to the Communist Government of China or of acquiescing in U. N. membership for Red China.

An article in the January 11, 1954, official Department of State Bulletin, written by Walter P. McConaughy, Director of the Office of Chinese Affairs of the State Department, flatly rejects either move and insists that the existing United States ban on trade, shipping, and financial relations with Communist China must be maintained. His article reflects straight thinking and straight speaking of a type deplorably lacking under the two previous administrations.

Mr. McConaughy points out that the Chinese Communists, while currently in control of the mainland of China, completely fail to measure up to the three important requirements for diplomatic recognition. They fail to meet the criteria of sovereign independence, consent of the people to the government, and adherence to treaty obligations.

On the contrary, as the State Department official notes, the Chinese Communists "are subservient to Moscow and international communism; they impose an alien minority rule by force and falsification on an intimidated, isolated, and misinformed populace; and they openly flout every Chinese treaty obligation, every principle of the U. N. Charter, and every clause in any reasonable formulation of human and property rights for aliens."

Mr. McConaughy points out that American recognition of Red China "would be an unthinkable betrayal of the Chinese Government and its people on Formosa and a grave disservice to the mass of Chinese people on the mainland," adding that the Formosan Government "is the only Chinese Government which represents in any measure the authentic aspirations and the bona fide national interests of the Chinese people."

All this is evidence that the State Department, under President Eisenhower's administration, is at long last coming into line with overwhelming public sentiment on this issue—sentiment expressed many months ago by unanimous vote of both Houses of Congress. It is a far cry from the Acheson policies which brought the Nation to the verge of recognition of Red China.

The first gross violation of sound principles governing diplomatic recognition occurred when President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia in 1933. He abandoned the policies of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover and gave the Communist regime in Russia desperately needed support by his action.

I was the first Member of Congress to publicly advocate withdrawal of this recognition. I believe the very factors which argue convincingly against recognition of Communist China still support my advocacy of withdrawal of recognition of Soviet Russia.

Meanwhile it is substantial progress in a return to sound foreign policy to have the Director of the important Office of Chinese Affairs of the State Department so forcefully on record against recognition of Red China. It bolsters the faith that we will achieve still further realism and adherence to sound American principles in world affairs.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, no foe, however great, can for time without limit impose its will upon a nation of people who have the fierce and consuming ambition to be free.

The yoke of Soviet tyranny will be lifted from Lithuania; let no man dispute that.

This is the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, a day to be celebrated by freemen everywhere. In 1918 the Lithuanian people formed an independent republic and adopted a constitution fashioned after the one we revere so greatly.

Let me cite the preamble of the Lithuanian Constitution to demonstrate very vividly the thoughts which prompted independence and freedom in the hearts of these fine people:

In the name of Almighty God, the Lithuanian people, thankfully recalling the glorious efforts and noble sacrifices of its sons, made to deliver the motherland, having recreated its state independence and desiring to extend the firm democratic foundations of its independent life, to develop conditions of justice and equity, and to guarantee the equality, freedom, and well-being of all citizens, and suitable state protection for human labor and morality, through its authorized representatives, convened in the constituent assembly, August 1, 1922, has adopted the following constitution of the Lithuanian republic.

When I contemplate the friends I have of Lithuanian origin and their loyalty to the causes of freedom and justice in the United States, I know that by personal example they keep burning the flame of freedom in their native land. Lithuania cannot fail to be free. This Nation cannot fail to assist these brave people.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, the little Baltic State which was unjustly occupied by Soviet Russia back in 1940, and which has since been ruthlessly enslaved.

The United States has never recognized the fake annexation of Lithuania by Communist Russia. In fact, the American people have on numerous occasions protested against the atrocities perpetrated against the Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples. The Congress of the United States has granted a haven in this country to many hundreds of thousands of displaced persons and refugees since the end of World War II, and among these some 26,000 Lithuanians entered our country and are today loyal and productive citizens.

More recently, Congress has set up a Select Baltic Committee, which is now conducting an investigation of the forced seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union.

On the occasion of Lithuania's anniversary, we reaffirm our solidarity with these heroic people and we renew our greetings and wishes that Lithuania will soon regain its independence from the yoke of communism. Their cause is a righteous one, they deserve our support and encouragement in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial appearing in the February 16 issue of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call captioned "Lithuanians Look Forward to Independence":

LITHUANIANS LOOK FORWARD TO INDEPENDENCE

This is the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Lithuanians living throughout the free world are holding patriotic meetings and raising funds to free Lithuania from the yoke of tyranny imposed on her people by Communist Russia. Their battle cry—"The Russians will not succeed in subjugating the Lithuanian people. They tried once before and failed. They will fail again."

February 16, 1918, carries as much significance to the Lithuanians as July 4, 1776, means to every American. But while we continue to enjoy our priceless freedom, Lithuania is again an enslaved nation, her people living under conditions far more terrible than her darkest days prior to World War I. For 40 years her churches were burned, her priests transported to Siberia, her press, language, and prayer books suppressed and her youth compelled to serve 25 years in the Russian Army.

Mayor Titus by proclamation has proclaimed today as Republic of Lithuania Day. Lithuanians of this area will observe the anniversary in a program on Saturday at school 20. Their efforts will speed the day when Lithuania takes her place as a peaceful country in a European community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the 36th anniversary of this brave little nation's declaration of independence is being commemorated by the Lithuanian Citizens Independent Aid Club in Paterson next Saturday night. Unable to attend the event due to a prior commitment, I also include the following copy of a letter I addressed

to Mr. Anthony Gustus, chairman, under date of February 8:

FEBRUARY 8, 1954.

Mr. ANTHONY GUSTUS,
Chairman, Lithuanian Citizens Independent Aid Club,
Paterson, N. J.

DEAR MR. GUSTUS: I was delighted to receive the invitation to join with my good friends at home in commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. My only regret is that another commitment made sometime ago will make it impossible for me to be with you.

I would, however, be most appreciative if you would convey to my many friends of Lithuanian descent my best wishes on this memorable occasion.

Like so many free men throughout the world, I cannot look upon the cynical seizure of Lithuania and her Baltic sister states, Estonia and Latvia, by Soviet Russia without being sensibly moved. Indeed, what happened in those fateful months from September 1939 to August 1940, when the Soviet Government planned and willfully carried out schemes leading to the destruction of Lithuanian independence, will surely go down in history as one of the greatest crimes that one nation could ever commit against another.

Our duty, however—yours and mine—is clear: we must never cease in our efforts to dramatize to the world at large, and especially to those nations less inclined to see the intrinsic danger of communism, the case of Lithuania as being a clear illustration of Soviet faithlessness, cynicism and immorality. We must also continue to pay homage to this great nation, Lithuania, and to her courageous people so that by doing our duty as free men we might keep alive the flames of resistance within the breasts of those less fortunate than we; for it ought never to be forgotten that so long as we raise our voices in honor, and in protest, so long will those now enslaved be inspired to look into the future with undiminished hope.

With kindest regards and all best wishes, believe me,

Very sincerely yours,

GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence is an occasion for special observance. The people of the United States, through their elected representatives in the Congress, have expressed unmistakably their abhorrence of the enslavement of the peoples of Lithuania and of her sister republics of the Baltic. Last July a memorable resolution, introduced by Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, was adopted by this House to create a committee to investigate fully the circumstances of the seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and the treatment accorded their peoples during and after their forced "incorporation" in the U. S. S. R.

In Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, eyewitnesses, masked or from behind screens, have told this committee of monstrous crimes committed by the Red army in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Films, smuggled out in the closing days of the war, have explained in detail how the Soviets take over a country. Stories have been told of continued deportations from Lithuania during the past year.

But a note of hope has also emerged. Witnesses have told of a courageous and active underground movement continuing in Lithuania.

As this dramatic and terrible story unfolds, the American people will have before them incontrovertible evidence of the cruelty, duplicity, and evil purposes of Soviet communism. They will also see an unforgettable picture of the courage and steadfastness of the Lithuanian people.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on today and tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE FOOD SITUATION IN SOUTHEAST MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. During the past several days a lot of unfavorable publicity brought about by exaggeration and distortion of the facts has emanated from around my home community in Dunklin County, Mo., where various types of surplus commodity foods are being distributed to unemployed persons whose need is being certified by the local Red Cross chapter.

Due to the fact that the metropolitan press, as well as the national magazines, together with radio and television, seem interested in presenting only the spectacular and sensational, it has apparently been impossible to present a true picture of the situation to the public.

For this reason I would like to read a letter written by T. E. Miles, president of the Kennett Chamber of Commerce, and Jack Stapleton, Jr., publisher of the Dunklin Democrat in Kennett, which should serve to clear up some of the many exaggerations concerning this area of southeast Missouri and the needy families which have received help.

The following letter has been mailed to all of the metropolitan newspapers circulating in that area and also to the radio and television programs which have heretofore carried adverse publicity. The letter follows:

DEAR SIRS: For the past several days, Dunklin County has been very much in the limelight in the national press, radio, and television. Much of the information which has been published has been erroneous and distorted beyond fact.

It is very regrettable that such distortions have occurred, and we would appreciate any clarification you may be able to give this area.

Let us say first of all that Dunklin County is taking care of its own needy residents. All outside help, with the exception of Government surplus foods, is being refused or returned. Through donations from local residents and a newly organized public-works program, we intend to solve our own problems.

The decision to solve our own problems was reached this week at meetings held by businessmen and public officials.

We should also like to state that the number of persons actually needing food has been exaggerated by many mediums beyond all proportions. As can best be determined, approximately 600 families could be placed in the needy status, but very few of these could be classed as destitute.

This situation is characteristic of many agricultural counties, but from press reports, one gets the impression that the situation just started. Because of our seasonable demand for laborers, the lack of savings by some of these persons has caused the same situation year after year. Only the conflict about securing the actual food was new to this year's condition.

This county has the largest bank deposits of any rural county in the State of Missouri and is one of the richest—if not the richest—agricultural areas in the Middle West and Midsouth. Our land is not barren and is not waste land, as stated in some reports.

The fact that some few Dunklin Countians are hungry at this time of year cannot be attributed to the cottonpicker, although again this has been cited as the reason behind our situation. Our farm experts tell us that the cottonpicker plays little part in this situation.

The laborer who finds himself hungry at this time of the year actually makes more during a 12-month period than many laborers in other agricultural and industrial areas. Unfortunately, the pay comes at only two seasons of the year, and therefore, there is more temptation to spend it faster instead of saving for a time of need.

We hope this clarifies our situation better than many of the distorted reports which have been published or broadcast. We find it inconceivable that a reporter can visit our area for a few hours and return as an expert.

Let us restate that Dunklin County, which admittedly does have a problem, is solving it without outside help. We have recognized our problem, and like many other American communities, we are resolved to find a solution. We are finding that solution now.

Very truly yours,

T. E. MILES,
President, Kennett Chamber of Commerce.

JACK STAPLETON, JR.,
Publisher, Dunklin Democrat, Kennett, Mo.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated and that it be transferred to tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this time in order to call the attention of my colleagues to the following United Press dispatch from Caracas, Venezuela. This is in the nature of a threat by Venezuela, to cancel trade relations over our attitude in considering quota limits on coffee and residual oil which they export to the United States. The brief dispatch follows:

CARACAS, February 12.—Venezuelans today threatened to cut off their $500-million yearly purchases from the United States if Washington adopts restrictive measures affecting Venezuelan exports such as oil and coffee.

Resentment mounted and became more articulate here against the Gillette bill, subjecting coffee trading to Federal regulation and against efforts by independent American oil producers to curb imports of Venezuelan oil.

Despite this Nation's rights under our Reciprocal Trade Act to flood our markets with cheap fuel oil, they are as a nation one of the worst offenders in placing restrictions on United States exports. Only a few months ago, they boosted import duties on American-made aluminum articles as much as 350 percent.

In face of such brazen disregard of treaty provisions I wonder why we go on calling our trade policy a reciprocal one.

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF HOOVER COMMISSION TASK FORCE ON POWER AND NATURAL RESOURCES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at its annual meeting in Miami, Fla., adopted a resolution on January 14, 1954, urging the Hoover Commission to enlarge the membership of its task force on water resources and power in order to provide for representation of public and cooperative agencies in the power field. The NRECA also requested that opportunity be afforded it to testify in hearings before the Commission or the task force.

As a member of the Hoover Commission, I have taken the position from the start that the task force on water resources and power should be broadly representative of the major viewpoints in this controversial field, including public as well as private power. Although the Commission has not accepted my proposal to enlarge the membership of the task force to include individuals with a public-power viewpoint, it directed, on February 8 that public hearings be held, with ample opportunity for all interested parties to be heard, and a verbatim transcript of the testimony to be available for examination by the press and the public.

Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Hoover Commission to direct one of its task forces to hold public hearings marks an unprecedented step in its procedure, and I wish to call it to the attention of the members. Although the task force on water resources and power is the only task force for which public hearings are mandatory at the present time, other task forces may decide to follow the same procedure. I am hopeful that public hearings will contribute to a series of balanced and well-rounded reports of the Hoover Commission.

I include with these remarks the correspondence of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association relating to presentation of testimony at task force hearings:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

As you know, the rural electric systems are locally owned and controlled. Their relations with REA have been twofold—REA has been the agency from which they borrowed all their capital funds, and REA has provided them with certain essential technical services which have helped to insure the security of the Government's loans and also aided the systems to do such a fine job of electrifying rural United States and Alaska. This job is far from completed; there are still over one-half million unserved farms and rural establishments, and also the loads of the rural electric systems are doubling every 4 years, which means there has to be REA loan funds available for the necessary heavying-up and other system improvements.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, the rural electric systems purchased and generated approximately 11½ billion kilowatt-hours. They purchased 50.4 percent of this from the power companies and 28.1 percent from Federal agencies (TVA, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation). Because of the importance of this power purchased from agencies of the Federal Government, we have definite interest in the Federal power program and the agencies concerned with it. Also, they purchased 7.9 percent from other public agencies and they generated 13.6 percent themselves.

It is our understanding that your Commission will examine the policies and administration of the REA and the agencies concerned with the Federal power program. Our people are vitally interested in the deliberations of your Commission in these areas. At our recent annual meeting in Miami, Fla., which was attended by over 5,000 farm people, they passed the attached resolution instructing us to request time for their representatives and members of our staff to appear before your Commission and the task forces on water and power and the lending agencies, and present the views of the rural electric systems.

We would appreciate your arranging suitable times for such hearings and notifying us of such dates far enough in advance so we can notify our people in various parts of the country.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT NRECA ANNUAL MEETING, MIAMI, FLA., JANUARY 14, 1954

Whereas there has been formed a commission commonly known as the Hoover Commission to examine the administration of the agencies of the Federal Government and to make policy recommendations concerning the functions of the Federal Government, and there has been created a task force of this Commission on water and power to examine in particular the administration and policy of the agencies of the Federal Government concerned with power such as the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commission be urged to enlarge the size of the task force on water and power so as to provide for adequate representation of public and cooperative groups which at the present time are not represented on that task force; and be it further

Resolved, That it is essential in a democratic government that the people have the right to present their views before a commission with such sweeping authority. Therefore we strongly urge that the Commission permit us sufficient time to present our views before the full Commission and also the task force on water and power.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Mr. CHARLES D. CURRAN,
Task Force Administrator, Task Force on Water Resources and Power, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURRAN: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

We, of course, are interested in the deliberations of your task force because of our relations with the REA and also, in many areas, the Federal power agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation, Southwestern Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, TVA, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Our members, assembled at their annual meeting in Miami, Fla., on January 14, 1954, directed us to request time for a hearing both before the full Commission and the task force on water and power. A copy of their resolution is attached. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to request time for the rural electric systems to appear before your task force and present their views on matters of interest to them and within the jurisdiction of your task force.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1954.

Mr. PAUL GRADY,
Task Force Director, Task Force on Lending Agencies, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, General Accounting Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRADY: The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association represents 91 percent of all the rural electric systems in this country and Alaska which are financed by loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The 900 rural electric systems which we represent serve over 3½ million farm families and rural establishments.

As you are probably aware, the rural electric systems borrow the capital they require from REA and repay it over 35 years with interest. At the end of calendar year 1953 loans in the amount of $2,780,000,000 had been approved by REA. Included in this total was $2,251,000,000 for distribution lines, $508,000,000 for generation and transmission facilities, and $21,000,000 for consumer facilities (loans which the systems make to their members for the purchase of wiring materials, plumbing, appliances, etc., where adequate local credit is not available).

We feel the relationship between REA and the rural electric systems is a healthy one. The systems are locally owned and controlled. Their relations with REA have been twofold—they have borrowed the necessary capital funds from REA and REA has provided certain services necessary to insure the security of their loans and assist them in accomplishing the fine job they are doing of electrifying rural United States and Alaska. But their job is far from completed—there are still over one-half million unserved farms and rural establishments and also the loads of the rural electric systems are doubling about every 4 years. This means that loan funds must be available for heavying up the lines and other system improvements.

We understand your task force will examine the administration and policies of the REA program. Our people, of course, are vitally interested in the deliberations of your task force. At their recent annual meeting in Miami, Fla., which was attended by over 5,000 farm people, they passed a resolution instructing us to request time for them and members of our staff to present their views before the task force on lending agencies.

Therefore, we would appreciate your arranging suitable time for such a hearing and notifying us far enough in advance so we can notify our people.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
Executive Manager.

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS SPREADS GLOOM AND DOOM

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in its investigation of the manner in which the Associated Press has reported on the various internal combustions of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I wonder if the committee has also made any effort to determine whether, under the guise of reporting news, the Associated Press is guilty of that much-discussed leftwing tendency to spread gloom and doom.

I do not ask this lightly, Mr. Speaker, for I understand that throughout last week prominent leaders of the Republican Party assured us there was no basis for either gloom or doom in the current economic situation—a self-correcting inventory adjustment, and that anyone who believes we are not enjoying remarkable prosperity is possibly subversive and certainly mistaken.

Under these circumstances, I was surprised, not to say shocked, that the Associated Press, already suspect of exercizing some rather uncomplimentary objectivity in its coverage of congressional activities, had the effrontery last week to report the fact that business failures in the preceding week were the highest for any week since April 1942.

This is, without doubt, a typical piece of gloom and doom reporting and I wonder if we should not investigate to determine if some hidden fear dealer wrote it.

The use of the April 1942 date is particularly suspect, Mr. Speaker, because as I understand it, many of the business failures of that wartime period were due to the inability of the businesses involved to obtain either materials to process or goods to sell or labor to do the necessary work.

On the other hand, those businesses which the AP included last week in its tabulation of those which went broke were not bothered by any shortage of goods or materials, or by any inability to find people to employ. They must have gone under, then, for entirely different reasons from those which went out of business during the previous record-high week of business failures in April 1942.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that businesses in so shaky a condition should have had the good grace and consideration to fail at some other time and not right in the midst of those assurances from the White House and the Republican National Committee that only gloom and doom spreaders see anything but the rosiest economic rainbows over our shoulders.

I suppose we cannot expect the Associated Press to suppress news of this nature, since the news services in this country make something of a fetish out of reporting just about everything that happens that anyone might be interested in reading about. Nevertheless, when next an investigator from the Committee on Un-American Activities does a rundown on how the AP handled some item involving the committee's affairs, it might be worthwhile for him also to examine into the authorship of such gloom and doom pieces as this one on business failures.

FORECLOSURES ON LAND CONTRACTS, DETROIT, MICH., AREA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one more indication of the seriously deteriorating economic conditions in the Detroit, Mich., area appears in an article in the Detroit News of Sunday, February 14, entitled "Foreclosures Rise on Land Contracts."

The circuit court commissioners in Wayne County who handle the preliminary foreclosure steps, report a 60-percent increase in the number of suits filed in December and January.

Stories like this have an ominously familiar ring to me. I was in the real estate business in Detroit at the start of the last depression and my office was the destination of a parade of home buyers, some with a considerable equity in their property, who came in to drop their land contracts in my lap as their economic security collapsed around them.

Bills have been introduced in the Michigan legislature for a moratorium on these foreclosures—does not that sound familiar—and I am studying this problem to see what possible Federal legislation may be of assistance.

I ask unanimous consent to include the article from the Detroit News at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The article follows:

FORECLOSURES RISE ON LAND CONTRACTS

(By Louis Tendler)

The effects of unemployment in the Detroit area were shown in a sharp rise in the number of land contract foreclosure suits being filed in the circuit court, a survey showed Saturday.

The 4 circuit court commissioners who handle the preliminary steps in the foreclosures of land contracts report a 60-percent jump in the number of suits filed in December and January, and some days the increase over the same period a year ago runs to several hundred percent.

"Until recently, we rarely got more than 2 or 3 land contract foreclosures a day," said Commissioner A. Tom Pasieczny, "but now it's not unusual for me to get as many as 35 in a single day."

MORATORIUM URGED

The plight of many Detroit factory workers who are having trouble meeting home payments contracted for during the lush wage-earning period of the last several years moved one State legislator to call for restoration of the depression-born mortgage moratorium.

Representative Stanley Novak, Democrat, of Detroit, has introduced 2 bills to this effect, 1 providing for a moratorium on mortgage payments in distress cases and a companion bill providing similar relief on land contracts. The bills would expire March 1, 1955.

Under both bills the distressed property buyers could go into circuit court, state their reasons for default, and, if the reasons are deemed adequate, obtain postponement of threatened foreclosure for any period up to a year within the discretion of the court.

During the moratorium period, the property buyer would be required to pay a fair rent and to keep up taxes, insurance, and the condition of the property.

The two bills are now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

"These bills are based on sound social principle and I am in favor of them," said Pasieczny. "They would give us the authority to give unemployed and distressed property buyers the kind of relief we cannot give them now."

MOST SELLERS PATIENT

Pasieczny said that only by adjourning foreclosure suits can the court commissioners provide any relief for distressed buyers. Some of the suits in his court have been postponed as many as 16 times to give buyers a chance to raise money to meet their defaulted contract payments, he said.

"I do what I can for them," he said, "but if I grant too many postponements, the lawyers for the other side go into the circuit court and get injunctions that take the suits away from me."

Generally, Pasieczny emphasized, sellers have been patient with their defaulted buyers but often they have obligations of their own to meet and this forces them to press for settlement.

Many of the home buyers, Pasieczny explained, purchased their homes on land contracts because they could manage only small downpayments, leaving themselves with large balances and correspondingly large monthly payments.

Pasieczny cited a recent case in which a veteran, his wife and two children appeared in his courtroom in response to a foreclosure suit on his $10,000 home. The veteran paid $3,500 down, spent $3,000 putting another bedroom in the attic, and regularly met his $75 monthly payments until he was laid off.

SIXTEEN ADJOURNMENTS

"I had adjourned that case 16 times because the veteran felt sure he could find another job," Pasieczny said. "But the plaintiff was pressed for money and threatened to appeal any further adjournments to the circuit court.

"I had to order that foreclosure despite those four anxious faces staring at me. I felt terrible."

Unlike land-contract cases, mortgage foreclosure suits have not increased appreciably in recent months. Homes purchased on mortgage usually carry a larger downpayment, leaving a larger equity in the hands of the buyer. Monthly payments usually are smaller and the larger equity gives the buyer greater incentive to retain his property.

TRANSPORTATION TAX ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to eliminate the 3-percent transportation tax on agricultural products. I believe this is a matter worthy of the attention of the House at this particular time and in this session of the Congress. Regardless of some claims to the contrary, the income of the American farmer has been on the decline. Wheat last year sold for $1.50 and $1.65 a bushel in my district, compared with $3 in 1948, and many other prices such as cattle have similarly declined. At the same time the farmer has to pay more for machinery, fertilizer, clothing, and other finished products. So I think anything that might help the farmer and encourage him at this time would be a very worthwhile undertaking. This 3-percent tax on transportation affects farmers in every State, the citrus fruit farmers in California, the livestock people, and the producers of wheat and corn. This tax should be removed without further delay as this step would help the depressed farmer when the future for him is not too bright.

SECURITY RISKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of correspondence.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the U. S. News & World Report magazine for February 12, 1954, at page 72 thereof, is quoted a verbatim interview with R. W. Scott McLeod, top security officer of the Department of State. I read the question that was then asked him: "When a man is fired as a security risk, does not that in the public mind mean the same as a loyalty risk?" I now read you his answer to that question: "It is confused with loyalty—I think that is true."

That, gentlemen, was on February 12, 1954. I now read a true and correct copy of a letter by me to the President of the United States dated January 15, 1954:

JANUARY 15, 1954.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am a member again of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Therefore, you will understand that, to me as such committee member, it is of utmost importance and concern to have an itemized breakdown of the 2,200 Federal employees which you are understood to have related publicly were cut off the Federal payroll under the administration's security program. That is, I believe it is important to the people of our great Nation that all of us know specifically how many of this number which you have quoted in your state of the Union message were cut off the payroll because they were found as actually subversive, and how many resigned before they had hearings, how many were found to be security risks because of habitual drunkenness, or lack of discretion, or homosexuality, or other specific causes.

This should include how many were cut off because of Communist affiliations or connections.

Mr. President, I am frequently asked the question whether or not conditions are improving with reference to the Communist conspiracy or subversive activities of the Communist Party in government. And you, sir, many months ago (I believe properly) stated that the executive department would handle its own problem in this regard.

But, to take out the uncertainty, the lack of present specific information, and in order to give the people the actual analysis of those who were cut off because they were actual security risks or on account of subversive activities or connections, I respectfully ask that you communicate to me by prompt mail, or that I be promptly informed with an itemized breakdown of them within the purview of this letter; to wit, the 2,200 Federal employees cut off the Federal payroll since you took over your very heavy responsibilities as President of our great Nation.

Respectfully,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1954, I received the following letter, dated January 19, 1954, signed by Gerald D. Morgan, Administrative Assistant to the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1954.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This is merely an acknowledgment of the receipt of your letter of January 15 addressed to the President. You may expect a full reply shortly.

With kind regards,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I will say that since I received that letter I have neither received a "full reply," nor any reply.

And now I read you a letter dated January 16, 1954, which I wrote to the Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.:

JANUARY 16, 1954.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: I am a member again of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Therefore, you will understand that, to me as such committee member, it is of utmost importance and concern to have an itemized breakdown of the 2,200 Federal employees which the newspapers and other sources relate you have announced have been cut off the Federal payroll within the last year. Also the President in his state of the Union message made the same announcement.

I believe it is of utmost importance to the people of our great Nation that all of us know specifically how many of this number were actually found as "subversive," and how many resigned before they had hearings, how many were found to be security risks because of habitual drunkenness, or lack of discretion, or homosexuality, or other specific causes.

This should include how many were cut off because of Communist affiliations or connections.

I am frequently asked the question whether or not conditions are improving with reference to the Communist conspiracy or subversive activities of the Communist Party in Government. I am also frequently asked how many Communists or other subversives have been found within the Government and discharged within the last year.

But, to take out the uncertainty, the lack of present specific information, and in order to give the people the actual analysis of those who were cut off because they were actual security risks or on account of subversive activities or connections, I respectfully ask that you communicate to me by prompt mail, or that I be promptly informed with an itemized breakdown of them within the purview of this letter, to-wit, the 2,200 Federal employees cut off the Federal payroll since the inauguration of our distinguished President of the United States, President Eisenhower.

Respectfully yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, but not until February 4, 1954, did I receive any reply thereto. On that date I received the following reply, dated February 3, 1954, from Philip Young, chairman, acknowledging receipt of a letter very similar to the one I wrote the President of the United States the day before:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1954.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: This will acknowledge your letter of January 16, 1954, requesting an itemized breakdown pertaining to the number of Federal employees released under the employees security program. I will get in touch with you at a later date.

Sincerely,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Young said: "I will get in touch with you at a later date." I have heard nothing further from Mr. Young, nor anyone for him.

Certainly the text of my letter to the President of the United States and also my letter to the Civil Service Commission, clearly shows that I was seeking important, pertinent information which I am still certain the American people are entitled to promptly and fully receive. I called attention in both letters

that I am a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee which deals with the problem of "subversives" under Public Law 601. Under the law it is the legal duty and responsibility of members of that committee to investigate the extent of subversive activities. I wrote these letters on my own responsibility and not on behalf of the committee.

Now a month has passed since the date of my two aforesaid letters. Also, I am aware that by later resolution of the House Un-American Activities Committee some weeks ago, said committee asked the same information, with a breakdown of the number actually found as "subversives." The committee has not yet received such information. Whereas, since the date of my letters to the President and the Civil Service Commission, over a month ago, there has been frequently reported in the daily press, over the radio, and otherwise, statements and claims by high Government officials charged with such matters, by Attorney General Brownell, by the Civil Service Commission, and other governmental departments, to the effect that it would take a good deal of time, work and analysis to answer the increasing demand by Members of Congress and by the public also that it be publicly announced as to how many of the 2,200, or the 1,400 figure frequently used, were discharged on account of "loyalty" as contrasted with the discharging under the definition of "security," I wish to now say, that I am this day critical of the fact that it is now apparent that in the discharge of these 2,200 Federal employees as announced by the President and others in high office, there evidently was not kept any immediately available separate lists of those who were discharged on the grounds of "loyalty." Mr. Speaker, the term "loyalty" in the minds of the general public, I am sure, carries with it the implication of "subversive" conduct. And certainly whatever number of employees were discharged on the grounds of "loyalty" should, therefore, have been carefully and immediately listed and kept separate from those who were merely "security risks" on the grounds announced by Mr. McLeod, in the magazine article.

There is radical difference and distinction between the factors presently used under Executive Order No. 10450 to discharge those who are separated from their jobs on account of security and integrity reasons and those who are separated from their jobs on grounds of disloyalty. Under such order, I hesitate to believe that those in high office today and who are responsible for firing those persons, however few or many there were, on the grounds of loyalty, neglected to, or did not, keep a very close and immediate and careful list of those who were discharged on loyalty grounds. If they did not, Mr. Speaker, why did they not? If they did keep such separate lists, it would be a comparatively simple and easy matter to total the number of such loyalty cases and announce that number. As I said, anyone found sufficiently disloyal to our beloved Nation to be discharged under Executive Order 10450 should, in my judgment, be immediately listed on separate and distinct lists. And these names should not only be promptly sent to the Civil Service Commission, but also to the FBI.

Assuming, therefore, that this brief analysis of the difference between loyalty cases and the security and integrity cases under Executive Order 10450 is correct, I now state that I believe it is in the interest of our national security, it is in the interest of giving the people of our beloved Nation the actual facts, for the administration to immediately release to the people of our Nation the number of loyalty firings and discharges which were listed by the governmental departments at the time that the persons were fired on the grounds of loyalty. Such a list should not have taken more than a very few days to assemble. I, of course, do not expect, nor ask, that their names be made public, but I do ask that further delay be eliminated and that forthwith the number of these persons be given to the public. Otherwise it will still stand in the public minds as a matter unnecessarily confusing. In fact, it is dangerously confusing. Whatever the facts the public should have them immediately. I am not afraid of the full information. Democracy is strengthened only in proportion as full honest-to-God facts and information are given the citizens of our Nation.

The factual truth will not hurt. The keeping from the public of the factual truth as regards "loyalty" and as regards "subversion," and as regards communism will continue to hurt. I cannot believe that anyone in the administration of our Government has a deliberate desire or intention that the American people be either misled or misinformed, or kept from having the full truth. Knowing the truth is what will help keep us a free people. It will keep us a freedom-loving people.

Furthermore, it is certainly in the interest or accurate information and guidance of the thinking and the actions of the American people that the announcement made of the numbers of those employees discharged on the grounds of loyalty shall specify how many of the total so discharged were persons the investigation of whom had commenced or been finished during the Truman administration, and how many were commenced and finished during the new administration. Until such full announcement is made it appears to me that it is as clear as crystal that four results will remain in full force and effect until the uncertainty is dissolved; to wit: First, the people will be confused as to what percentage of persons of the total number of 2,200, or 1,400, announced by this administration were found to be really disloyal under President Eisenhower's Executive order as contradistinct from the previous Truman loyalty orders; second, the American people will continue in a state of more or less anticipating fear that it is possible that the number or percentage thereof is very much larger than it may actually prove to be; third, unless they learn the facts promptly, millions of American people will no doubt conclude that the fight being put up against subversion and conspiratorial communism, for which so many hundreds of thousands of dollars of tax money has been spent, and is now being spent, is being unwisely expended, or on the contrary, when the announcement for which I now speak is made, the American people may have cause to conclude that the tax money is being wisely spent; and, fourth, the uncertaintly which now continues in the minds of the people as to what percentage of these employees were fired as being subversives, Communists, or disloyal, cannot but pyramid and do irreparable damage.

Mr. Speaker, how can we members of the House Un-American Activities Committee adequately or efficiently perform our official duties under Public Law 601 if such pertinent information as aforesaid is not promptly available to us? Why, Mr. Speaker, should it not be promptly available to the American people who pay the bills?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am making this inquiry for the purposes of inquiry only and not to object to any request. How much space can we take in the RECORD in making 1-minute speeches and in incorporating other matter?

The SPEAKER. Generally, the rule limits the remarks to 300 words unless unanimous consent is obtained to extend beyond that point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I ask for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, does that mean that I can go on for a page or two?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that on those days when the House has a legislative program, the remarks are to be limited to 300 words. When there is no legislative program, then there is not that limitation placed on remarks made by Members in 1-minute speeches.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I ask do we have any such legislative program today?

The SPEAKER. Yes, we do have a legislative program today.

WHO GETS THE RELIEF?—FORTY-THREE MILLION FAMILIES DO NOT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, who saves taxes from partial tax relief on taxation of dividends?

When the Ways and Means Committee proposal for partial relief of taxation of dividends becomes fully effective after 3 years, the total loss in revenue to the Federal Government will be $1,200,000,000. A fair question to ask is: who will get the benefit from this tax proposal? Obviously, the people who own

publicly held stock and thereby receive dividends from corporations.

According to a survey made by the Federal Reserve Board, there are 47 million families in America. Ninety-two percent or 43 million of these families own no stock in any publicly held corporation in the United States.

Just 4 million families own all the publicly held stock in America. However, the Federal Reserve Board reports that a little over 300,000 own 80-percent of the total stocks, each of which owns more than $25,000 worth of stock.

In other words, 80-percent of the $1.2 billion in tax relief, or almost $960 million, will go to 300,000 families.

The other $240 million in tax savings will go to 3,700,000 stock-owning families, leaving 43 million American families receiving absolutely no benefit whatever from this provision to grant relief on the taxation of dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members will hesitate to approve such an obviously discriminating proposal.

If Members make known their concern to the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, it still may be possible to reverse this unfair decision.

NAME CALLING

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our delightful colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] admonished the Republicans, and he was joined in that reprimand, as I understand it, by the President, that the Republicans should be a little more careful in what they said. I assume however, that whatever the Democrats said would be all right for us to repeat. Would they call Republicans bad names—make unfair charges?—Oh, no.

On the 22d day of September, 1948, former President Harry Truman was commenting about the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee. We all know that that committee has been and is engaged in trying to uncover and expose Communists, Fascists, and all other subversive groups including those harboring traitors. This is what the President said:

> That committee is more un-American than the activities it is investigating.

I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I note they are both on the House floor, to tell us sometime if that is not a charge of treason made by the former President against the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Did either of the gentleman ever chide the former President for his use of those words?

CORNELIO AND LUCIA TEQUILLO

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1160, an act for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no idea what this is. I trust in the future that we will be given some notice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his request until the gentleman from Texas has had an opportunity to examine the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know that I have any objection. But I would like to be notified when things like this are coming up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair anticipated that both leaders had been notified.

Mr. RAYBURN. If it has been cleared with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], I will have no objection.

Mr. WALTER. It is a very simple amendment. It simply makes the age of this child conform to the language of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, after "alien", insert "minor."

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

PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. J. Res. 238, joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to call attention one more time to the fact that there is no such thing as "H. J. Res." It is a House joint resolution. I thought I would just make that suggestion again for the information, and amusement, perhaps, of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER.

AMENDING TITLE VI OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2175) to amend title VI of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, with respect to the retirement of employees in the legislative branch.

THE PRICE OF COFFEE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from a constituent, and a coffee coupon. There is nothing new or startling about coupons obtained at food stores, but this one is rather unusual. Let me read the letter from this constituent:

> WATERLOO, IOWA, *February 8, 1954.*
> Congressman H. R. GROSS,
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. GROSS: This coupon was enclosed in a sealed can of Maxwell House coffee, purchased recently by a friend at one of our leading grocers.
>
> Notice the expiration date, December 31, 1951.
>
> Where has this coffee been for more than 3 years?
>
> Thought this might interest you in view of the present coffee situation.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> C. J. NELSON,
> *1012 Williston Avenue.*

Mr. Speaker, I suggest one of the committees investigating the coffee situation might well look into this and ascertain how much coffee has been put away for this day of rocketing prices.

TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I hate to disturb the possibility of getting back to tranquillity in the House but I do not think the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, reckless as it is, should go unchallenged.

I think the people should know the facts as to the effort of the present administration to reduce taxes in a fair and equitable manner for all of our people. This is exactly what has been done.

I remember that it was the Republican 80th Congress that gave the people the first tax reduction they had had in 18 years of Democratic rule, when we controlled the House and Senate. We felt then that the people had gone long enough without a tax reduction, even though the party in power, when it had the power did not seem to think so. They called that bill a rich man's tax bill, even though it gave a much greater reduction to those in the lowest tax bracket, and to the working people.

The facts are it was the Republican Party in the 80th Congress that raised the tax exemption from $500 to $600, and by that act we exempted 5 million taxpayers in the lowest bracket from paying any tax at all, and that $600 exemption is still on the books. Yet they said, strange as it may seem, that it was a rich man's tax bill.

They, of course, are trying now to make the people believe the same futile

argument, and some of them seem a little disappointed that it is, again, a Republican administration that has effected sufficient economies in Government to, again, give the people a $5 billion tax reduction, which became a fact on January 1 of this year, and we're going forward with, perhaps, another one and one-half billion dollar tax reduction before this session adjourns, which will amount to a total tax reduction in the second year of the Eisenhower Administration of about $6½ billion.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand this may be a little embarrassing to some of the members of the opposite party, who during their twenty years of power continued to increase taxes and seldom, if ever, sought to give the people a tax reduction. However, we of the present administration must continue our policy of reducing the cost of Government and of reducing taxes, as often as the economy of our Government will stand it.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that those in the lowest income-tax bracket, and every laboring man began receiving a reduction of about 10 percent in their income tax last January 1, 1954; that those in the higher tax brackets receive a much lower percentage income-tax reduction.

The wage earners know that their increased social-security deductions go to their credit in that fund for their future.

Mr. Speaker, the point the gentleman from Pennsylvania was trying to make was that inasmuch as social-security taxes had been raised from 1½ to 2 percent that the increase holdout of the wage earner for social security just about offset the reduction in taxes he received. Yet he still received the 10-percent tax reduction and the extra contribution that he pays in social security is not only his for the future, but his employer also contributes from his business 2 percent, an equal amount for the sole benefit of the wage earner in the future.

Practically all heads of labor organizations in the Nation insisted that the Congress permit social-security deductions from wage earner and the employer to automatically increase under the law to 2 percent.

To try to mess up the social-security deduction and to claim that the wage earner and those in the lower bracket do not receive a tax reduction is completely erroneous and is done only to deceive the wage earner and those in the lower tax bracket when this administration has done two things he wanted done. It has reduced his taxes and allowed the social-security tax to advance from 1½ to 2 percent which amounts to greater benefits in social security for him or his family in the future. The workers know this, and they appreciate it.

When this administration returned to power a little over a year ago, we stopped unnecessary and wasteful spending, reduced the budget and the cost of Government for the very purpose of again following our policy of giving all the people a tax reduction, again giving the greatest percentage of reduction to those in the lowest bracket and the smallest percentage to those in the highest bracket.

What the laboring man wants first is a job, steady employment. Our tax policy is to give small business and big business enough of a reduction in taxes to give them the incentive to expand and make more jobs. We want an expanding economy.

We want the little-business man and the medium-sized-business man to feel that the Government does not want to take all of their profits, but is willing to reduce in a small way his taxes to encourage him to expand his business and make more jobs for the laboring man.

Mr. Speaker, if we can cause business to expand, we can give the working people what they want and must have. That is more jobs.

The laboring man is more interested in a good job so that he can pay a reasonable amount of taxes and yet have enough left to provide the necessities and some of the luxuries for his family.

Those who want to tax business to death, if they are successful, will stop the expansion of our economy, will stop the making of more jobs, and the laboring man in greater numbers will have no jobs, consequently no taxes to pay.

That is exactly what the workers of the country do not want.

The Eisenhower administration in its tax policy has two main points in view, one to reduce taxes and allow the people to have more money to spend in their own way, rather than to give it to the Government to be wastefully spent as has been the policy for the past many years. The other is to give reasonable relief to business so that it may expand and make more jobs for the laboring men and women.

That is our policy, and the critics who oppose this policy are opposing the best interest of every wage earner and taxpayer in the Nation from the lowest to the highest.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask this time in order to query the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] concerning the program for the remainder of the week. Someone mentioned to me the conference report on tomorrow. Will that be brought up?

Mr. ARENDS. At this time I cannot say surely, but it is possible to bring that up tomorrow after we complete consideration of H. R. 4646. I understand there is going to be an extension of the time. There is a question whether we can finish it today; then we will complete it tomorrow. I shall try to inform the gentleman a little later about that.

Mr. RAYBURN. What is the program after that, if I may ask the gentleman?

Mr. ARENDS. The appropriation bill, which was reported to the House earlier, and which will be taken up on Friday, instead of tomorrow, because of the objection made this morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. On Friday, if not earlier?

Mr. ARENDS. If not earlier; yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

SOCIAL-SECURITY FUNDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for many years our Republican friends have been making the charge that money paid into the unemployment-compensation fund, old-age assistance, or earned-annuity funds and invested in Government bonds has been wasted, or there have been serious charges of that nature.

On pages 18, 19, and 20 of the hearings on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill for 1955 just released appears some very interesting testimony from Secretary of Treasury Humphrey in response to questions. He states:

> The difference is just this. The difference is that it is less inflationary to sell that $4 billion of bonds to these trust funds and park them there. That money has already gone out of circulation so far as the public is concerned.
>
> Mr. GARY. Has it been the policy of the Government all along to invest those fiduciary bonds in Federal bonds?
>
> Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes; it has been done all along and it is a perfectly proper procedure.

Secretary Humphrey goes on in his testimony and completely refutes the fallacious arguments that have been made in the past. Here is a Republican Secretary of the Treasury who absolutely confirms what has been done for the past 15 years with money paid in under the social-security law.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS

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.

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. BYRNES of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF HOSPITAL AND 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 this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN RIGHTS AND INTERESTS IN AND TO CERTAIN LANDS CONVEYED TO THE 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 this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

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 this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER HIGHWAYS WITHIN WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7305) to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 2689, to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, is an identical bill to the House bill and has already passed the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of Ohio a retrocession of jurisdiction over the portions of highways described below within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover:

(A) State Route No. 4, beginning at Huberville, approximately 3,000 feet northeast of the intersection of Harshmanville Road with State Route No. 4, thence northeast to the Greene County and Montgomery County line, the above section of road being in Montgomery County, Ohio;

(B) All that part of State Route No. 4 lying between the Greene County and Montgomery County line and the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad underpass and being within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundaries, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(C) Beginning at the point where State Route No. 4 passes the extreme south corner of the original Wilbur Wright Field boundary, said point being approximately 1,700 feet northeast of Huffman Dam, thence northeasterly to the corporate limits of the village of Fairborn, Ohio, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(D) State Route No. 235, beginning at a point where State Route No. 235 intersects and crosses an easterly boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, said point being approximately 1,700 feet north of the intersection of State Route No. 235 with State Route No. 4, thence westerly to the extreme west line of the reservation, excepting that part of the road lying between Haddix Road and the Osborn Road, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(E) State Route No. 69, beginning at the intersection of State Route No. 69 and original State Route No. 235, thence southwesterly with the east one-half of the road to the extreme southwest corner of the reservation boundary, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(F) Harshmanville Road, beginning at the intersection of Harshmanville Road with Yellow Springs Road in the village of Riverside, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road a distance of approximately 1,400 feet, thence continuing southerly the full width of the road to Airway Road;

(G) Yellow Springs Road, beginning at the intersection of Yellow Springs Road with Harshmanville Road in the village of Riverside, thence easterly with the south one-half of the road to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary;

(H) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with Harshmanville Road, thence easterly with the north one-half of the road a distance of approximately 2,000 feet, thence continuing easterly with the full width of the road to the Greene County and Montgomery County line;

(I) Spinning Road, beginning at the intersection of Spinning Road with the south right-of-way line of Airway Road, thence southerly with the west one-half of the road 1,973 feet to a south boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation;

(J) Glendean Avenue, beginning at the intersection of Glendean Avenue with the north right-of-way of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, thence northerly with the east one-half of Glendean Avenue, a distance of approximately 1,700 feet;

(K) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the Greene County and Montgomery County line, thence easterly to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, the point of ending being approximately 450 feet east of Skyline Drive;

(L) National Road (Huffman), beginning at a corner in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, said corner being in the National Road and approximately 200 feet north of its intersection with Airway Road, thence, with the west one-half of the road, northerly 4,400 feet, thence continuing northerly with the full width of the road to Old Route No. 4;

(M) Zink Road (New Germany Road), beginning at the intersection of the New Germany Road with the south right-of-way line of Old Route No. 4, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road, a distance of 890 feet, also beginning in the New Germany Road at a corner in the reservation boundary, the beginning point being approximately 1,400 feet southerly from the south right-of-way line of Old Route No. 4, thence continuing southerly with the westerly one-half of the road a distance of 1,587 feet;

(N) Old Route No. 4, beginning at the intersection of Old Route No. 4 with the southerly right-of-way of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad, thence easterly the full width of the road to the part of the road right-of-way owned by the Commissioners of Greene County, Ohio;

(O) Sand Hill Road, beginning at the intersection of Sand Hill Road with an east boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation, the same being the west boundary line of the abandoned Cincinnati & Lake Erie Railroad, thence westerly to State Route No. 235;

(P) Haddix Road, beginning at the intersection of Haddix Road with State Route No. 235, thence northeasterly with the right one-half of the road to the Greene County and Clark County line;

(Q) Elizabeth Road (Johnson Street), beginning at the intersection of Elizabeth Road (in Old Osborn) with State Route No. 235, thence northwesterly to Haddix Road;

(R) Osborn Road, beginning at gate No. 260 at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, thence northerly with the west one-half of the road to State Route No. 235;

(S) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the southerly right-of-way of Old Route No. 4, thence southerly with the westerly one-half of the road to the extreme southeast corner of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D" reservation boundary;

(T) Old Route No. 4, all that part of Old Route No. 4 that may be within the boundaries of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D". The location of the highways and the bounded areas are shown and identified by corresponding letter symbols on sheet No. L of a drawing designated: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Basic Layout Plan, drawing No. EWFE 150, dated December 2, 1952, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. This

act is effective only as to those portions of the highways and areas indicated in this act over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of highways and areas, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Ohio.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in this act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 7305) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING FEE FOR EXECUTING AN APPLICATION FOR A PASSPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 423) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport or a visa from $1 to $3.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections numbered 2 and 3 of the act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved June 4, 1920 (22 U. S. C., secs. 214 and 215), are amended by striking out "$1" wherever it appears in such sections and by inserting in lieu thereof "$3."

With the following committee amendments:

On line 3, strike out "sections" and insert "the first proviso of section"; strike out "and 3."

On line 6, strike out "secs." and insert "sec."; strike out "and 215."

On line 7, strike out "are" and insert "is,"; strike out "$1 wherever it appears in" and insert "the fee of $1."

On line 8, strike out "such sections"; also strike out "$3" and insert in lieu thereof "a fee of $3."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS AT CAMP BLANDING, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7512) to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the Armory Board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey, upon the terms and conditions and for the consideration set forth in section 2 of this act, to the Armory Board, State of Florida (hereinafter referred to as the "board"), all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as "Federal land") situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Florida, and more particularly described as follows:

All of sections 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 5 south, range 23 east; all of sections 19 and 30, township 5 south, range 24 east; all that part of section 31, township 5 south, range 24 east, lying north of Florida State Highway Numbered 550; all that part of section 6, township 6 south, range 24 east, lying north of Florida State Highway Numbered 550; all of sections 1 to 12, inclusive, except the west half of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 2, and except the south half of the northeast quarter in section 10; section 17, except that part lying east of Florida State Highway Numbered 551 and south of Florida State Highway Numbered 48; all of sections 18 and 19; that part of section 20 lying west of Florida State Highway Numbered 551, except a triangular parcel in section 20 lying west of the right-of-way of Florida State Highway Numbered 551, south and east of the right-of-way of the north fork of Florida State Highway Numbered 48, and north and east of the right-of-way of the south fork of said Florida State Highway Numbered 48; and sections 28 to 33, inclusive, township 6 south, range 23 east; all that part of sections 16, 17, and 18, township 6 south, range 24 east, lying south of Florida State Highway Numbered 48, except the west half of the southwest quarter of aforesaid section 18; all of sections 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and section 28 except the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter thereof, township 6 south, range 24 east; and sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, and those portions of sections 9, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 30, township 7 south, range 24 east, lying west and northwest of Florida State Highway Numbered 68; excepting from all the above-described area all lands within the rights-of-way of State roads traversing the area described; all being in Clay County, Florida, and containing forty thousand one hundred forty-five and fifty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less.

Reserving unto the United States, however, all uranium, thorium, and all other materials determined pursuant to section 5 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 761) to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable material, contained, in whatever concentration, in deposits in the lands above described, and further reserving unto the United States through its authorized agents or representatives at any time to enter upon the lands above described and to prospect for, mine and remove said materials before referred to, making full compensation for any damage or injury occasioned thereby, provided, however, such lands may be used, and any rights otherwise acquired by said Board pursuant to any conveyance of said described lands as herein provided for, as if no reservation of such materials had been made; except that, when such use results in the extraction of such material from the land in quantities which may not be transferred or delivered without a license under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as it now exists or may hereafter be amended, such material shall be the property of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and said Commission may require delivery of such material to it by any possessor thereof after such material has been separated as such from the ores in which it was contained, and also provided that if the said Commission requires the delivery of such material to it, it shall pay to the person mining or extracting the same, or to such other person as the said Commission determines to be entitled thereto, such sums, including profits, as the Commission deems fair and reasonable for the discovery, mining, development, production, extraction and other services performed with respect to such material prior to such delivery, but such payment shall not include any amount on account of the value of such material before removed from its place of deposit in nature, and further provided that if and in the event the said Commission does not require delivery of such material to it, the reservation hereby made shall be of no force or effect.

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 the event of the existence of any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress, the use of the Federal land, or any part thereof, shall, upon the request of the Secretary of the Army to the board, revert to the United States for the full period of such national emergency without cost to the United States. Upon the expiration of such national emergency such use of the Federal land shall cease in favor of the board, and the United States shall be under no obligation to restore the premises or to compensate the State for any waste or any damage to the property arising out of the use and occupancy thereof by the United States.

(2) In consideration of the conveyance of the Federal land, the board, acting for the State of Florida, shall agree not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain land or permanent improvements thereon (hereinafter referred to as "State land") comprising a part of the State-owned portion of Camp Blanding Military Reservation to any party other than the United States without the consent of the Secretary of the Army. The State land is more particularly described as follows:

TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

The south half of the northeast quarter of section 10;

All of sections 13 and 14; a portion of section 15 more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the east boundary line of section 15, said point being fifty feet south of the centerline of State Road Numbered 48; run thence south eighty-eight degrees twelve minutes forty-eight seconds west along a line, said line being fifty feet south of and parallel to the centerline of State Road Numbered 48, a distance of two thousand three hundred eighty-one and sixty-five one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence south fifty-one degrees forty-five minutes twenty-seven seconds east a distance of nine hundred fifty-three and fifty one-hundredths feet to a point; run thence south thirty-eight degrees fourteen minutes thirty-three seconds west a distance of one thousand nine hundred and seventy feet, more or less, to the northeasterly shoreline of Kingsley Lake; run thence southeasterly along the northeasterly shoreline of Kingsley Lake a distance of three thousand nine hundred and ten feet more or less, to the south boundary line of section 15; run thence easterly along the south boundary line of section 15 a distance of seven hundred eighty and ten one-hundredths feet, more or less, to the southeast corner of said section 15; run thence north along the east boundary line of section 15 a distance of five thousand two hundred thirty and ninety-three one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning; and all of sections 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35, and 36;

TOWNSHIP 7 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

All of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, except the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10 and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 20; all of section 25 lying northwest of State Highway Numbered 68; all of sections 26, 27, 28, and 29; and east half of section 30; all of sections 32, 33, and 34; and

all of section 35 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68;

TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 23 EAST

All of sections 3 and 4 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68; in section 5, the following lots and blocks in Spring Lake Estates, according to plat recorded in plat book 2, page 53 of the public records of said Clay County, Fla., viz: all of blocks 1, 2, and 3; lots 1 to 10, inclusive, block 4; all of blocks 9 and 10; lots 1 to 10, inclusive, block 11; all of blocks 13 to 27, inclusive; all of blocks 31 to 44, inclusive; the north half of section 8 and all that part of the north half of section 9 lying northwesterly of State Highway Numbered 68;

all in Clay County, Fla., and containing thirty thousand two hundred thirty-four and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less.

(3) In the event of the existence of any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President or by action of the Congress, the use of the State land, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of the Army, be vested in the United States for the full period of such national emergency without cost to the United States in accordance with the usual conditions contained in the United States Standard Form of Lease. Upon the expiration of such national emergency such use of the State land shall cease in favor of the board and such land shall be restored in accordance with the usual conditions contained in the United States Standard Form of Lease.

(4) In the event that the State of Florida or board 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 the Army, all of the right, title, and interest in and to the Federal land shall revert to the United States without cost: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent the State of Florida or board from disposing of interests or rights in land by lease, license, or easement or by contract of sale of timber or timber products, each of which shall be terminable at will in the event of need of the land involved during any national emergency and, insofar as these grants or sales affect Federal lands, shall be entered into only after the State of Florida or board and the United States, by and through the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall have reached an agreement whereby revenues received by the State of Florida from any such lease, license, easement, or sale shall be expended for the management of natural resources at Camp Blanding and its maintenance and preservation as a military installation and the sharing of any residual revenue by the State of Florida or board and the United States: *Provided further,* That exploitation of minerals by strip mining or similar operations shall be confined to the following Federal lands: In township 5 south, range 23 east, sections 19, 30, and 31; in township 6 south, range 23 east, sections 6, 7, that part of section 8 lying southwest of State Highway Numbered 121; those parts of sections 17 and 20 now owned by the United States and sections 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32: *And provided further,* That exploitation of minerals by strip mining or similar operations shall be confined to the following State lands: In township 7 south, range 23 east, sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, all of section 20, except the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 29, and the east half of section 30.

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.

ADVISABILITY OF A 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 this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6455) to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a National Monument Commission. Said Commission shall be composed of four Senators from the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States, four Representatives of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker of that House, and four eminent citizens of the United States to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall be bipartisan and the terms of the first Commissioners shall be for 1, 2, 3, and 4 years and subsequently shall be 4 years. Vacancies in the Commission shall be filled by the respective designator who appointed the original member. Members shall serve until their respective successors are appointed.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of said Commission to secure plans and designs for a useful monument to the Nation symbolizing to the United States and the world, the ideals of a democracy as embodied in the five freedoms, speech, religion, press, assembly, and petition, sanctified by the Bill of Rights adopted by Congress in 1789 and later ratified by the States. Such plans shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 3. Said monuments shall be located on federally owned land within the George Washington Memorial Parkway adjoining the north boundary of Arlington National Cemetery west of Arlington Ridge Road and south of Arlington Boulevard on the heights overlooking the Potomac River, and that tract of land shall be and is hereby reserved for such purposes. The monument, upon its completion, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. Said monument shall serve as an international shrine and a continuing memorial to the principles of the five freedoms and to all peoples and nations who have contributed to the establishment, promotion, and defense of those principles in the preservation of democracy throughout the world. It may include an appropriate structure or structures to house cultural displays and exhibits or symbolic features of national and international significance designed to accomplish the objectives of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 5. (a) Said Commission may establish rules and regulations governing its actions in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Commission members appointed from the Congress shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(c) The Commission is authorized to accept and utilize services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to pay any such personnel necessary traveling and subsistence expenses when engaged in the work of the Commission.

(d) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

(e) The Commission is authorized to request and secure the advice or assistance of any Federal agency. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for this purpose, with or without reimbursement from the Commission as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the agency.

(f) The Commisssion shall report annually to the President and Congress its progress and recommendations pertaining to such a memorial. Upon the conclusion of its work, the Commission shall promptly submit a final report.

(g) Thirty days after the submission of its final report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, insert "The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as chairman."

Page 2, line 22, change the comma to a period and strike out "and that tract of land shall be and is hereby reserved for such purposes."

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.

AMEND THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT SO AS TO INCLUDE ONIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6435) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 2), is amended by inserting "onions," after the word "eggs," in the third sentence thereof, so that onions are added to the definition of the word "commodity" for purposes of said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. 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. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I present a summary of the reasons presented to the Committee on Agriculture, making appropriate the

passage of this bill, and ask that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

First. Onions are a perishable commodity.

Second. In view of the fact that onions grown in the United States do not find world markets and are limited even in the States to production areas, they are therefore susceptible to manipulation.

Third. Rules of contract market not accountable to the industry or the Secretary of Agriculture, of this perishable commodity in interstate commerce, is a dangerous practice, and must not be left unregulated.

Fourth. That the futures trading conducted on the Mercantile Exchange is affected with a national and public interest.

Fifth. That prices are generally quoted and disseminated as a basis for determining prices to producers and consumers in interstate commerce.

Sixth. Such a condition warrants careful regulation and scrutiny to prevent distortions of price and obstruction of proper distribution with resultant disastrous effects upon agriculture and the consumer.

Seventh. Inclusion of onions within the purview of the Commodity Exchange Act will place futures trading of onions under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture for the first time. Futures trading unless included in the CEA bars the Secretary of Agriculture from any regulatory jurisdiction over onions, yet producers, shippers, and receivers are under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture by virtue of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

Eighth. Such authority will obviate the patent danger of a futures contract market superseding the well established and highly acceptable provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

The unrestrained and unregulated futures contract market will either depress or unreasonably increase the price structure out of proportion to available supply and demand, as so often happened within the last 10 years. Specifically on March 23, 1953, onions sold on the Mercantile Exchange at a time when the attempted squeeze was then in operation at $4.75 per sack of 50 pounds. During this period, onions were kept out of distributive channels with almost no supplies available. All holdings were held at team track or cold storage pending delivery on futures contract. Within a period of less than 1 week, these same $4.75-per-sack onions were sold at a variable price of from 60 cents to $1 per sack. The fact is that in March of 1953 the accumulated storage holdings for delivery purposes were in the hands of a few speculators who already had started the squeeze in operations in February. I have been advised that there was also included a practice of offering to legitimate hedgers a price in excess of their hedge in order to prevent their delivery.

To indicate the speculative interest in the 1953 deal, 102,306 cars were traded, or almost 3 times the entire production. Prices ranged wildly. Often and regularly advanced the limit and created a situation so out of proportion to the law of supply and demand, and for at least a period of over 2 months prevented the proper flow at prices in accordance with the law of supply and demand to have entered into the consumer channels. This, of course, disrupted the whole onion picture, with devastating effect on growers throughout the country, with no appreciable benefit to the consuming public.

Placing onions under the CEA will remedy most of the problems that I have discussed previously herein, and will give an opportunity to the industry to effect and promulgate such rules and regulations governing the contract market, its members and traders which will assist in making that contract market a place where the commodity will be properly and fairly traded within the limitations of the ordinary speculative hazards, not increased by artificial manipulations carried on by unscrupulous interests who seek opportunity for weaknesses within the unregulated contract market, and dote on chaos instead of some form of stability.

The trade from the producers to the distributors, is in almost complete unanimity that there is a possibility of making the futures contract market an adjunct to proper distribution of an available crop, with a degree of certainty for both growers and distributors as well as the consuming public, and that this can be best accomplished under the regulation.

The administration of the CEA and the proper enforcement, in cooperation with the industry, can prevent unwarranted chaos. Under the CEA also there will be opportunities to promulgate such rules and regulations respecting short sales, elimination of certain contract months where need be, inclusion in the Board of Governors of onion people, establishment of an onion advisory committee, considering inclusion in the contract market of the other producing areas which begin harvesting in the spring, and very important is the fact that under the CEA practices which smack of manipulation will be punishable either by revocation of license, or the more severe penalties under the act. These are not available today.

The original premise anent the subject of futures trading in onions was for its complete prohibition, and while much can be said for this position, however, from a practical viewpoint of this whole subject, it has been concluded by most of the onion people that at this time the likelihood for a complete prohibition is so remote that the relief sought by including onions under the CEA is most practicable at this time.

PAY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES FOR NONWORK DAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7554) to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the Joint Resolution 127 of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1246), is amended by inserting after "Executive order" the following: "or any day on which such employees are relieved or prevented from working solely because a department or establishment of the Government, or any part thereof, is closed by administrative order,".

With the following committee amendments:

In line 3, strike out "127."

In line 5, strike out "'Executive order", the" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "'by Executive order", the."

In lines 7 and 8, strike out "solely because a department or establishment of the Government, or any part thereof, is closed."

In line 9, strike out "order'," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "order issued under such regulations as may be promulgated by the President'."

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.

REMOVE LIMITATIONS UPON LAND CONVEYED TO MILES CITY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4984) to remove certain limitations upon the purposes for which the city of Miles City, Mont., may use certain land heretofore conveyed to it by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Miles City, Mont., is authorized to utilize tract E in township 8 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian (which was conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946)) for such purposes as may be deemed by the city council of such city to be appropriate, notwithstanding any limitations upon the use of such property imposed by such act of August 8, 1946, or by the patent issued thereunder, and any such limitations shall hereafter be of no force or effect, except that all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits which may be found in such lands, and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing the same, shall be reserved to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 to 7, delete the words "utilize tract E in township 8 north, range 47 east, of the Montana principal meridian (which was conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946)) for such purposes" and insert in lieu thereof the words: "sell or convey for industrial purposes such portion of the thirty-seven and twenty-six one hundredths acres of land more particularly described in the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 946) which were conveyed to such city by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to such act to be used for industrial and recreational purposes."

Page 2, line 1, following the word "thereunder" change the comma to a colon, strike the balance of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That any such sale or conveyance shall be at fair market value as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands covered by this bill, and the net proceeds of such sale or conveyance shall be deposited in the general funds of the Treasury of the United States."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVE CLOUDS ON TITLES OF CERTAIN LANDS IN COLORADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5620) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct an incomplete and faulty survey in township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, and to issue patents describing any new areas included in lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in sections 1 through 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado.

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 correct a faulty and incomplete survey of lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 5, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado by canceling and obliterating the northern boundary of the township as established by A. M. Fahringer in 1871 and by extending the subdivisional lines of the north tier of lots of each of said sections in that township north to the southern boundary of townships 9 north, ranges 53 and 54 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado as established by George V. Boutelle in 1868 and reestablished by Benjamin H. Smith in 1875.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, to the holders of title of record, as of the date of completion of such correction, to lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, patents to any additional land included in their respective lots by reason of the correction of survey authorized by section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That a charge of $1.25 per acre shall be made for each acre or fraction thereof patented under the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the boundary line established by George V. Boutelle in 1868 and reestablished by Benjamin H. Smith in 1875 is hereby confirmed and reestablished as the southern boundary of township 9 north, ranges 53 and 54 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado, and as the northern boundary of lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in each of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, township 8 north, range 53 west, sixth principal meridian, Colorado."

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 remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE SHOSHONE CAVERN NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6251) to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shoshone Cavern National Monument, established by Executive proclamation of September 21, 1909 (36 Stat. 2501), is hereby abolished and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey, without cost, the lands embraced therein, aggregating 210 acres, to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, upon such terms and conditions as he shall find to be equitable and in the public interest.

In order that the city may provide adequate public access to such property from the Cody-Yellowstone Highway (U. S. Nos. 14 and 20), the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to convey without cost a right-of-way to the city.

In the event that the city of Cody shall fail to devote the said monument lands to the purposes of public park and recreational site within 10 years after the date of the enactment of this act or shall fail to maintain such land for such purposes for any period of 5 consecutive years subsequent to its devotion to such use or shall fail to provide adequate measures for fire control and watershed protection for the lands, or shall devote such lands or any part thereof to any other use not consistent with the purposes of this act, such lands and all improvements thereon shall revert to the United States. In such an event, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to declare a forfeiture of all grants and conveyances made pursuant to this act to administer such properties in accordance with the public land laws of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE MILITARY AND THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4231) to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the second paragraph of the act entitled "An act to establish a department or economics, government, and history at the United States Military Academy, at West Point, N. Y., and to amend chapter 174 of the act of Congress of April 19, 1910, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes'," approved June 8, 1926, as amended (34 U. S. C., sec. 1036a), as precedes the colon preceding the first proviso thereof is amended to read as follows: "That the number of midshipmen now authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy is hereby increased by one hundred from the United States at large, to be appointed by the President from among the sons of members of the land or naval forces (including male and female members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of all components thereof) of the United States, who were killed in action or who have died, or may hereafter die, of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, or preexisting injury or disease aggravated, in active service (1) during World War I or World War II as each is defined by laws providing service-connected compensation or pension benefits for veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents, or (2) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress under the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950,' approved May 11, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 745)."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of the first section of the act entitled "An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1950 (10 U. S. C., sec. 1092a), is amended in the following respects:

(1) By striking out "One hundred and seventy-two" and inserting in lieu thereof "Two hundred and thirty-two";

(2) By striking out "forty from among the sons of members" and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred from among the sons of members";

(3) By inserting "(1)" immediately before "during World War I"; and

(4) By inserting immediately before the colon preceding the first proviso of such subsection the following ", or (2) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress under the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to provide certain benefits for certain persons who shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on and after June 27, 1950,' approved May 11, 1951 (38 U. S. C., sec. 745)."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "two thousand four hundred and ninety-six" and inserting in lieu thereof "two thousand five hundred and fifty-six."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, change the word "or" to "of."

On page 2, line 6, strike the words "one hundred" and substitute therefor the word "forty."

On page 3, lines 6–10 inclusive strike without substitution.

On page 3, line 11, strike "(3)" and substitute therefor "(1)."

On page 3, line 13, strike "(4)" and substitute therefor "(2)."

On page 3, lines 22–25 inclusive, strike without substitution.

On page 3, after line 25, add a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) This section shall apply to any Air Force Academy which is established by law before or after the date of enactment of this act."

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.

UNAUTHORIZED WEARING, MANUFACTURE, OR SALE OF MEDALS AND BADGES AWARDED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 459) to amend the act entitled "An act to pro-

hibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," approved February 24, 1923, as amended by the act approved April 21, 1928 (10 U. S. C. 1425), be amended to read as follows:

"The wearing, manufacture, or sale of any decoration, medal, badge, or ribbon which has been or may hereafter be authorized by the Congress or the President for the Armed Forces of the United States or the civilian employees thereof, or for any person who may render or contribute meritorious service in connection with the work of the United States of America Typhus Commission, or any decoration, medal, badge, ribbon, or veteran's service lapel button, which has been or may hereafter be awarded by any of the Departments of the National Military Establishment, or any decoration, medal, badge, or ribbon which has been or hereafter may be awarded to United States citizens or members of the Armed Forces by foreign governments in accordance with existent statutes, or the ribbon, button, or rosette of any such decoration, medal, or badge, or any colorable imitation of any of the said devices, or the reproduction in any form or by any means of the design of any of said devices, or of any colorable imitation of said design, is prohibited, except when and as authorized under such regulations as may be prescribed by the President or by such person or persons as he may designate.

"SEC. 2. Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert "that section 704, of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 704, title 18, United States Code."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF PAID POSTAL-SAVINGS CERTIFICATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7371) to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims for payment of any postal-savings certificate, or other evidence of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, which certificate or evidence of deposit, including duplicates, are shown by the records of the Post Office Department to have been duly paid, shall be barred if not presented to the Postmaster General within 6 years from the date on which such records show that they were paid.

(b) Final determination as to whether payment properly has been made on postal-savings certificates or other evidences of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, shall be based upon the official records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 2. The Postmaster General may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, destroy, or otherwise dispose of, all postal-savings certificates, or other evidences of deposit in the postal-savings depository system, including duplicates, after the expiration of 6 years from the date payment thereon has been made as shown by the records of the Post Office Department.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month following the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)."

Page 1, line 10, after "paid", insert "except in those cases where it is established that payment in fact has been made, by reason of fraud or misrepresentation, to a person not entitled thereto."

Page 2, line 7, after "Department", insert "except in those cases where it is established that payment in fact has been made, by reason of fraud or misrepresentation, to a person not entitled thereto."

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. That completes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar eligible for consideration today.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

WAH CHANG CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5461) for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wah Chang Corp. the sum of $130,877.16, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of property and for removal expenses incurred as a result of the acquisition by the United States for military purposes of certain lands at Staten Island, New York City, N. Y., which had heretofore been leased by the said Wah Chang Corp. and upon which the said Wah Chang Corp. had erected and maintained a tungsten processing plant: *Provided*, That no part of the amount apropriated 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 a sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims, whose duty it shall be, notwithstanding the lapse of time or the bar of any statute of limitations or previous court decision, to hear, consider, and render such judgment, as equity and justice shall require, on the claim of Wah Chang Corp. against the United States for compensation for loss of property and for removal expenses incurred as a result of the acquisition in the year 1942 by the United States for military purposes of pier No. 13, New York foreign trade zone, Staten Island, N. Y., which had theretofore been leased by said Wah Chang Corp. and upon which the said Wah Chang Corp. had erected and maintained a tungsten processing plant."

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.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

Mr. ROBERTS. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

CARL A. ANNIS, WAYNE C. CRANNEY, AND LESLIE O. YARWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2678) for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl A. Annis, Osgood, Ind., the sum of $241.70; to Wayne C. Cranney, Afton, Wyo., the sum of $315.45; and to Leslie O. Yarwood, Mohler, Wash., the sum of $186.60. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of such persons against the United States for compensation for personal effects which they lost on June 9, 1947, while serving as employees of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, as a result of the sinking of a dory belonging to the Coast and Geodetic Survey at Bruin Bay, Alaska. No part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SGT. WELCH SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5158) for the relief of Sgt. Welch Sanders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Welch Sanders, sergeant, United States Army, the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Welch Sanders against the United States on account of the death of his

wife, Garnette Brewer Sanders, and his infant son, William M. Sanders, on January 27, 1948, while passengers in an Air Force plane which crashed into White Horse Mountain located 12 miles east of Digne, France: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$10,500."

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.

PERRY PERKINS AND NORAH MEREDITH PERKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5433) for the relief of Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents of Opal Perkins, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $20,000, to Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents and sole surviving next of kin of Opal Perkins, deceased, a minor, 12 years of age at time of death, of Newcomb, Tenn. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the instant death of their son, Opal Perkins, on October 25, 1935, when he was burned and instantly killed as the result of an explosion caused by the negligence and wrongful conduct of employees of the Federal Government engaged in work on the public roads of Campbell County, Tenn., said work being carried on by employees of the Works Project Administration, and in the performance of which they stored quantities of road materials in iron or steel barrels on a lot in the town of Newcomb, Tenn., where children were accustomed to congregate and play, and which said road materials thus stored in said barrels generated and emitted when they were unstopped highly inflammable and explosive gases which, when they came in contact with fire, exploded. On the date on which the said Opal Perkins was burned and instantly killed as aforesaid, he was only 12 years of age and another child about the same age threw a lighted match into one of the said steel barrels containing said highly volatile and explosive materials, thereby causing the explosion which killed the said Opal Perkins as aforesaid: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$20,000", and insert "$6,000". Same page and line, strike out "Perry Perkins and Norah Meredith Perkins, parents and sole surviving next of kin", and after the word "to" insert "the estate."

Same page, line 7, after the word "deceased" strike out "a minor, twelve years of age at the time of death," and insert "and to pay the sum of $6,000 to the estate of Kenneth Ross, deceased, all residents".

Same page, line 9, strike out "sum" and insert "sums."

Same page, line 10, strike out "their son."

Same page, line 11, after the name "Perkins," insert "and Kenneth Ross."

Same page, line 11, strike out "he was" and insert "they were."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "exploded." strike out down to and including the word "aforesaid."

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.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Opal Perkins, and Kenneth Ross, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUGUSTA SELMER-ANDERSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6642) for the relief of Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Augusta Selmer-Andersen against the United States arising when a departure bond deposited by her on behalf of her adopted daughter, Bjorg Wennberg Iverson, was forfeited even though the daughter has been granted a suspension of deportation. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN P. HOOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7460) to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Warren P. Hoover be paid the sum of $550.08 out of funds in the Treasury of the United States for 32 days of work performed for the Army of the United States as a civilian employee for which he has not been paid at the rate of time and one-half per 8-hour day upon a salary of $2,600 per annum, the services being performed at the Muskogee Army Air Field, Muskogee, Okla., from October 3, 1942, to May 15, 1943, inclusive.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "That Warren P. Hoover be paid the sum of $550.08 out of funds in the Treasury of the United States," and insert in lieu thereof: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $550.08 to Warren P. Hoover, of Eureka Springs, Ark."

At the end of the bill add: ": *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."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, and my Republican colleagues, permit me to call attention to the fact that a very prominent member of the Democratic Party, the party which now objects to the use of certain words by political orators who are Republicans, not so long ago, in fact just last fall, and the gentleman will be seeking election soon, made this statement: He said:

Ike is but the pretty bird in a gilded cage.
Whose sweet song and bright plumage are
supposed to hold your eye.

Now listen to this:

While the crows are in the kitchen gobbling
up the public's pie.

Does not that mean that the hard-working Republican Members of the Congress are, in some disreputable way taking things which belong to the people? That we in Congress are eating pie while the taxpayer is lucky to get a crust?

Then the gentleman added:

Modern day pirates have hoisted a new Jolly Roger over Washington.

Calling us pirates—think of it.

Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] please take note? I ask him—was that nice?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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. The Chair wishes to make a statement in order to clarify the rules of procedure during the calling of the Private Calendar. Inadvertently, the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the last word.

Under the rules of the House, of course, that may be done on bills on the Consent Calendar, but not on the Private Calendar. The Chair is simply stating that for the Members of the House.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the poem was so good, I ask unanimous consent that it may remain in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. What has been said will remain in the RECORD, of course, but the Chair is pointing out the rule for the guidance of Members of the House.

AUTHORIZING PATENT IN FEE TO ROBERT GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R 4816) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Robert Graham a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue to Robert Graham, Shubuta, Miss., a patent in fee to the following-described land, to wit: Lots 3 and 4, section 5, township 9 north, range 7 west, St. Stephens meridian, north of the old Choctaw boundary, Mississippi: *Provided, however*, That the issuance of such patent shall operate only as a conveyance of right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described herein, but shall not affect any valid adverse rights of third parties should any such rights exist.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "of" insert the words: "all the."

Page 2, following line 3, add a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. The tracts of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the said Robert Graham of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has notified the said Robert Graham of the appraised price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by Robert Graham or his predecessors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said Robert Graham. The patent shall expressly provide that the oil and gas lease entered into between the United States and M. J. Peterson on August 1, 1948, shall continue in effect, subject to compliance with the terms and conditions set forth in such lease, until terminated in accordance with the provisions thereof. The patent shall also provide for the assignment to the said Robert Graham of all rights of the United States under such lease, but such assignment shall not include any rentals, royalties, or other charges accruing for any period prior to the beginning of the first complete lease year commencing after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. REBECCA GODSCHALK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 68) for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

ANNI WILHELMINE SKODA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 123) for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, the fiancée of Andrew P. Hamilton, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Andrew P. Hamilton and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anni Wilhelmine Skoda as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

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

WILHELM ENGELBERT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INSUN LEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 179) for the relief of Insun Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

With the following committee amendment:

On line 7, after the words "visa fee", strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EVDOXIA J. KITSOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 205) for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

AMIR HASSAN SEPAHBAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 236) for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

CONFERRING CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON HENRY LITMANOWITZ (LITMAN)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 296) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz—Litman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, Henry Litmanowitz (Litman), the son of Mr. and Mrs. Morris Litmanowitz (Litman), of Cleveland,

Ohio, who was killed while serving with the United States Armed Forces in Korea, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

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.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND HIS WIFE, LILLY ELIZABETH SCHORR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANTONIO VOCALE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Antonio Vocale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

ISAAC D. NEHAMA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 313) for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

RELIEF OF ROSE COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 323) for the relief of Rose Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

LI MING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 353) for the relief of Li Ming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

HORST F. W. DITTMAR AND HEINZ-ERIK DITTMAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 506) for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar 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 two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

THOMAS O. ROBITSCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 550) for the relief of Thomas O. Robitscher.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration.

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

There was no objection.

LINA ANNA ADELHEID (ADAM) HOYER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 569) for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

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

HANNELORE NETZ AND HER TWO CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, in the administration of such act, Hannelore Netz, the German fiance of Staff Sgt. Hugo H. Reiss, a United States citizen now serving in the United States Air Force, and her two children shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hannelore Netz is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Staff Sgt. Hugo H. Reiss, and that, except as herein provided, she and her two children are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hannelore Netz, she and her two children shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hannelore Netz, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hannelore Netz and her two children as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fees.

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.

WINFRIED KOHLS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 730) for the relief of Winfried Kohls.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Winfried Kohls shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-

control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

EUGENIO S. ROILES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Eugenio S. Roiles 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 officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

KARIN RITA GRUBB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 825) for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

DR. JAWAD HEDAYATY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 973) for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

HELENA LEWICKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 982) for the relief of Helena Lewicka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

ZOLTAN WEINGARTEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1009) for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

GEORGE ELLIS ELLISON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1018) for the relief of George Ellis Ellison.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

STEFAN VIRGILIUS ISSARESCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1226) for the relief of Stefan Vergilius Issarescu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

EMMANUEL ARISTIDES NICOLOUDIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

LYDIA L. A. SAMRANEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lydia L. A. Samraney, wife of Corporal Joseph M. Samraney, a citizen of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

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

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas

for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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

JOSE DEANG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1443) for the relief of Jose Deang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

LIESELOTTE SOMMER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2108) for the relief of Lieselotte Sommer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Sommer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert "*Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiance, Sergeant Leroy Meininger, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ALA OLEJCAK (NEE HOLUBOWA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2151) for the relief of Mrs. Ala Olejcak, nee Holubowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Ala Olejcak (nee Holubowa) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 7, insert "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 197.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7123468, Abdo, Zaki.
A-6818125, Abdullah, Naim Ezra.
A-3214298, Adler, Peeter Wilhelm.
A-6897062, Adesnik, Klara (nee Frejdson).
A-6568285, Adamsons, Arnolds.
A-6568274, Adamsons, Frida Kvitans.
A-6738932, Al-Hindawi, Ibrahim Yousif.
A-6738933, Al-Hindawi, Lily Heskel.
T-2760702, Al-Hindawi, Amira Ibrahim.
T-2760703, Al-Hindawi, Ferial Ibrahim.
A-6903675, Aron, Renee (nee Muller).
A-7078088, Apperman, Pepi Lazarovitz (nee Herskovitz).
A-9180348, Antonenco, Nicolai.
A-7249872, Apse, Laura Margareta.
A-7249883, Apse, Ivars.
A-6432771, Awad, Mahmoud Mohammad.
A-6991752, Baginski, Kazimierz.
A-6991754, Baginski, Paula.
A-6575180, Baron, Theodore S. or Theodore Solomon Zalcberg or Ted Baron.
A-7186428, Benjamin, Sassoon Joseph.
A-6953013, Berger, Ignac.
A-6886878, Berger, Martin Adalbert.
A-6953288, Birnbaum, Salamun.
A-6755695, Bisharat, Alfred Hanna.
A-6623693, Bitker, Anna (nee Sterelny).
A-6886830, Blumstein, Morris.
A-6142352, Bytniewska, Barbara Franciska.
A-7631707, Bielic, Joseph.
A-6776589, Boury, Costandy Nicola or Qustandi Nicola Boury.
A-7073399, Barycki, Edward.
A-8117712, Bedar, Gregory Jacob.
A-6232680, Borkowski, Peter (Piotr) Stanley.
A-7828471, Brajnovich, Giuseppe or Josip Brajnovic.
A-6953006, Braun, Ignac.
A-6903771, Brauner, Zoltan.
A-6887567, Brauner, Irene (nee Rosenberg).
A-8039756, Balacich, John.
A-7975992, Bon, Ho Yee.
A-7243860, Bindemanis, Valija Alexandra.
A-6090162, Breuer, Alexander.
A-8057459, Breuer, Cecilia.
A-8057460, Breuer, Herman.
A-8057461, Breuer, Ignatz.
A-6887745, Breuer, Maximilian.
A-8082011, Breuer, Judita.
A-8082010, Breuer, Deborah.
A-7197544, Brody, Sophie Mary.
0300-411507, Bracco, Simeon.
A-6383645, Chang, Chia-Ling.
A-6849504, Chang, John Wei Kung or Wei-Kung Chang.
A-6829521, Chang, Kuo Hwa.
A-6033450, Chao, Jowett Chou or Chou Chao.
A-6356316, Chao, Cherie (nee Pin Hwa Chow).
A-6143084, Chao, Stanley Kuo-Shu or Kuo-Shu Chao.
V-13545, Chao, Lyn Chang (nee Lyn Chang).
A-7366251, Chao, Wen Ying.
A-7174561, Chao, Yung Yen (Tsao).
A-6866998, Charucki, Stanislaw.
A-8082016, Chen, Chi Hing.
A-6702179, Chen, Feng Chi (nee Feng-Chi Wu).
A-6606603, Chen, Shao Lin.
A-6620814, Chen, Sing Mei.
A-8091328, Chen, Tommy D. C.
A-8091329, Chen, Joyce (nee Liao).
A-8091330, Chen, Henry Tsu Ming.
A-8091331, Chen, Helen Tsu Wah.
A-6851574, Chen, Tsu-Chi.
A-6848435, Chen, William Tung-Yung or Tung Yung Chen.
A-6704083, Cheng, Laura Wei-Hsia or Wei-hsia Cheng.
A-8057479, Chow, Shu Liang.
A-6197751, Chow, Tsu-Ling or Charles Chow.
A-6967579, Chu, Liang-Wei.
A-6881801, Cohen, Estera Lola.
A-7975170, Cristoloveanu, Mircea.
A-5291487, Cheng, Wen Chin (Mary Chen) or Sister M. Frances Agnes.
A-7415147, Chin-Hsin, Gin.
A-6522841, Chan, Robin Mei (nee Chow or Chow Mei or Mei Chow).
A-6461143, Chang, Pei-Wen.
A-6999690, Chen, Li-Ching (nee Yen or Li-Ching Yen or Letty Li-Ching Yen).
A-6967369, Cheng, Han or Hans Jeans.
A-6699875, Chou, Hung Sheng.
A-6577556, Chu, David Lian Koon.
A-6577555, Chu, Eileen Catherine.
T-1495407, Chan, Clarence Bock Kun.
A-6967613, Chang, Bansun.
A-6848052, Chang, Betty Wu.
A-6620834, Chang, Cheng-teh.
A-6967631, Chang, Martha Guee-Fang.
A-6052404, Chao, Yu-Shai.
A-8057483, Cheng, Richard Kuo-Wei.
A-6620730, Chow, Hsiang Sheng or Johnson Chow.
A-6667193, Chu, Margaret or Mei Yu Chu.
A-6697607, Chitayat, Anwar Khadouri.
A-7096023, Chiu, Hung-Wen.
A-7133239, Carvalho, Elena Natalia or Sister Mary Jacinta.
A-7375367, Chang, Edward Al-To.
A-7276021, Chang, Angela Liu.
A-6206586, Chien, Ting or Timothy Ting Chien.
A-5998605, Chow, Sui Wu.
A-6403342, Chang, Jen Chi.
0700-18500, Chang, K. H. Ronald.
A-7355994, Chang, Y. S. Irene Hu.
A-7133272, Chang, Wen Hsiang.
A-6509104, Chien, Evelyn Peh-Sin Chien or Peh-Sin Chang.
0300-403710, Chuen, Tsang.
A-6474305, Calamaro, Raphael Joseph.
A-8021776, Carcich, Venanzio Joseph.
A-6982797, Carmona, Pierre Albert or Peter ("Pete").
A-6781203, Chammah, Ibrahim (Albert) Moise.
A-7118707, Chen, Ching Hua or Si Chan Chen or Theresa Chen or Sister M. Dominica Chen.
A-0901262, Chen, Melie Su-Tsung Cheng.
A-7193932, Chiang, Jen or John or Jen or John Chaing.
A-6857647, Dajani, Abdel Salam.
A-6837646, Dajani, Shihadeh Hashem.
A-7138290, Dieska, Jozef.
A-6919339, Dimitrijevitch, Alexander Radovan.
A-7073996, David, Salim Isaac.
A-7073997, David, Marcelle Salim Isaac.
A-7415665, David, David Salim.
A-7415667, David, Sammi Salim.
0300-307098, Dobritch, Alexander Alexandrov.
A-7955257, Dobritch, Jr., Alexander Alexandrov.

A-7200393, Dabora, Eliahou Khedhoory.
A-6613816, Dziadek, Abram.
A-7463593, Dimini, Casimiro.
A-6399898, Dogic, Nikola or Nikola Dogic.
A-6956241, Eross, Janos.
A-6818103, Ellenbogen, Jeno.
A-7983360, Faldic, John or Ivan Faldic.
A-8021389, Faldic, Romano.
A-6026524, Fang, Chen Shang or James Chen Fang.
A-6745034, Ferescz, Miklos.
A-6952324, Fogel, Jeno.
A-6967583, Fong, Lucy Shu-Yu.
A-8057476, Foo, Sze Ah.
A-6868674, Fried, Ilona.
A-7362418, Frisch, Mozes.
A-7362416, Frisch, Ilona.
A-7362417, Frisch, Imre.
A-7097844, Friedman, Ernest.
A-6887746, Friedman, Sarah.
A-6851361, Fu, Wen Tou.
A-6887738, Fuchs, Arnold.
A-7955271, Fucich, Joseph or Josip Fucich or Giuseppe Fucich.
A-8082066, Fong, Lam.
A-7457864, Fu, An Ling.
A-7975404, Fah, Ching Kai.
A-8082041, Fable, Frederik.
0300-398084, Fat, Joe Mok.
A-8091056, Fook, Wong Pooh.
A-6444628, Geintze, Helen Andgela (nee Valente).
A-6971665, Glaser, Jacob or Jakob Glaser.
A-6903708, Grunberger, Hilda or Hilda Landau Grunberger.
A-6543892, Gruszka, Gerszon.
A-7052441, Gruszka, Stella (nee Matalon).
A-7052442, Gruszka, Tamara.
A-6868682, Gutter, Roza Klein.
A-7243365, Gottwald, Antonin.
A-6916048, Grossman, Alexander.
A-6891802, Grossman, Eva Kohn.
A-7073950, Grimm, Bela Stephen.
A-6886831, Goldenberg, Isidor Zoltan.
A-6923158, Gaspar, Ella (nee Feig).
A-7244304, Grigutis, Juozas.
A-7056024, Gold, Joseph.
A-7790705, Hagman, Louise.
A-6576640, Hamoui, Ibrahim or Albert Joseph Hamoui.
A-6401323, Harari, Maurice.
A-6405110, Harari, Joseph.
A-6937851, Hasal, Antonin Bohumil or Nizborsky.
0500-35379, Hasal-Ova, Josefa Antonie (nee Skorepova).
0500-40091, Hasal, Milan Jiri.
0500-35580, Hasal-Ova, Milica Jelizaveta.
A-6922085, Hawa, Joseph Salim.
A-7264280, Heckler, Barbara or Martin.
A-7863797, Horowitz, Edmund or Edmund Horski.
A-7863855, Horska, Maria (nee Maria Hahn or Maria Horowitz).
A-7886512, Horski, Andrew.
A-7863826, Horski, Allan.
A-6403566, Hsu, Elizabeth Kwang-Hsin or Kwang-Hsin Hsu or Elizabeth Hsu.
0300-391428, Hu, Tin An.
0700-16565, Hui, Po Ching Margaret.
A-6861991, Hwa, Su Wellington Chee.
A-6887025, Hwang, Tsaisia Sen.
V-221923, Hanikat, Erkki Fridolf.
1300-86586, Him, Chung Burk.
A-6569530, Horvath, Jozef.
A-7184281, Hardoon, Daphne Elizabeth.
A-6427756, Haron, Albert Sasson.
A-6444675, Hsia, John I-Sheng.
A-7118747, Hsiao, Chen-Hwa or William Hwa Shaw.
A-6027102, Huang, Hsiao-Tsung.
A-6843411, Hwang, Shih-Tzen or Hotspur Hwangin.
A-6173173, Hsie, Jen-Yah or Hsie Jen Dan.
A-7450577, Hoch, Elizabeth.
A-6749987, Hochberger, Jakub.
A-6744362, Hochberger, Hinda.
0300-396629, Harabaglia, Nicola Santo.
A-6771819, Hlass, Ibrahim Jiryes.
A-8021327, Hallika, Ulo.
A-7415176, Hwang, Chueh-Fei or Chester F. Hwang.
A-8057477, Hsun, Mu Hong.
A-7117922, Igla, Abram.
A-9778151, Ikmelt, Peeter.
A-7890662, Issak, Armiin Giuseppe.
A-7244300, Iesalnieks, Janis.
A-7915147, Jablonski, Jan.
A-6903673, Jakubovich, Markus.
A-6848583, Jin, Korda Kee-Dah.
A-7052343, Jacobowitz, Margit.
A-6862649, Jakubovic, Evzen.
A-7886278, Juriacco, Rocco.
A-6993772, Jaruzelski, Janusz Jan.
A-6887558, Karmel, Baila or Ilona Karmel.
A-6949989, Karp, Towie.
0300-286838, Kazda, Milada.
A-6830434, Khoursheed, Fareed Subhi or Farid Subhi Khurshid.
A-6771764, Khoury, Habib George.
A-6282161, Kiibus, Richard.
A-7097847, Kinel, Jacob.
A-6848649, Kingman, Eleanor Priscilla.
A-6936485, Klagsbrunn, Abraham Chaim.
A-7210289, Klagsbrunn, Hadasa.
A-6891825, Klein, Joseph.
A-6922681, Klein, Markus.
A-6936499, Klimas, Antanas.
A-6426400, Kazimi, Mahmoud Ishaq El.
A-6903763, Kcgel, Sandor.
A-6886892, Kohn, Flora Schwarcz.
A-9061054, Kong, Foo Sui.
A-6712031, Koo, Thomas Cheng-Pang.
A-7116371, Kornreich, Sarah Sulamita Frankel.
A-7802998, Kornreich, Hirsch Meiloch.
A-7450145, Kuo, Nancy Huang.
T-1495413, Kwong, Mrs. Su Shang Chi.
0300-408001, Kow, Lay.
A-7078191, Kwan, Tsun-Ying or Lawrence Tsun-Ying Kwan.
A-8091335, Kaszer, Stanislaw.
A-7297270, Klein, Lajos.
A-7858082, Kucich, Gerolamo.
A-6862648, Katz, Josef.
A-6934997, Klapper, Mendel.
A-6860163, Klimesova, Vlasta Marie or Vlasta Klimes.
A-6707345, Krawczyk, Thaddeus Mathias or Tadeusz Krawczyk.
A-6933874, Kalisch, Judith.
A-9684346, Kan, Chan.
A-6847999, Kao, Lillian Chih-jen.
A-6732399, Kalme, Elmar.
A-6732400, Kalme, Akulina.
A-6771738, Khalil, Ahmad Zohair.
A-7073400, Kellman, Jacob.
A-6772578, Kruza, Zanis Alberts.
A-7821513, Ladon, Harald Eduard or Harold Edward Ladon.
A-7491271, Laktionoff, Vladimir Ivanovich.
A-6897066, Landau, Salamon or Salomon Landau.
A-7439753, Lang, Imre (Emery) Tibor.
A-6851689, Lee, Beatrice Dzun.
A-6847805, Lee, Mavis Shao-Ling.
A-6866943, Li, Hua-Wei or Howard H. Lee.
A-7594866, Li, Richard I-Hua.
A-6396666, Ling, David.
A-6980354, Loh, Chao Chi.
A-6763045, Loh, Chao, Fah or Ellen Chao Fah Loh.
A-6751952, Loo, Ti Li.
A-6441722, Lu, Milton Ming-Deh or Ming-Deh Lu.
V-890155, Lu, Sung Nien.
A-7283021, Lutyk, Andrew Nicolas.
A-6877780, Lee, Yih-Hung.
A-7056897, Levai, George or Gyorgy or Gyorgy Czeisler.
A-7056896, Levai, Margit (nee Varga).
A-6980347, Li, Hua.
A-6737878, Lieblich, Tibor.
A-7873182, Lovric, Hermenegild.
A-6686067, Lin, Ku Yin.
A-7248060, Loh, An-Veng.
A-7120703, Lam, Yat-Yin.
A-6958556, Li, Hsui Tung or Mayanne Lee.
A-6840804, Liang, Maria Mu-Lian or Maria Fok.
A-6958627, Ling, Timothy C.
A-6958626, Ling, Irene.
A-6847981, Liu, Shia-Ling.
A-7135773, Liu, Yei Fang or Liu Yei-Fang or Y. F. Liu.
A-6532537, Loh, Shirley Shao.
A-6851380, Loh, Wei-Ping.
A-7054429, Loh, Hwei-Ya Chang.
A-7118711, Lee, William Wah-Ying.
A-6986562, Lee, Francis Fan.
A-6916031, Leichtag, Margit Polatsek.
A-6709305, Li, Min Chiu or Min Ch'iu Li.
A-6552715, Lin, David Yao-Pei.
A-6403556, Lis, Eli Mojsze.
A-7134583, Lysakowski, Ryszard Stanislaw.
A-6712034, Lee, Ai-Shen Miles or Ai-Shen Miles.
A-6894840, Lee, Liu Man.
A-7450588, Ling, Dr. Ji-Toong.
A-7417097, Lewkowicz, Jozef.
A-7118668, Liu, Chin Lan or Mary Rosa Liu or Sister M. Rosa Liu.
A-9765740, Lysakowski, Marian.
A-7886319, Majewski, Felix.
A-7297272, Margittai, Jozsef.
A-7297273, Margittai, Olga.
V-738365, Maripuu, Hilda (nee Koobakene).
A-7828126, Mattesich, Beniamino.
A-6703205, McGregor, Donald Hudson.
A-6511892, Meizlik, Icik.
A-6917593, Miczynski, Zygmunt.
A-6719390, Mermelstein, Edith.
A-7125360, Monseu, Stanislaw Ludwik.
A-7125361, Monseu, Maria Stefania Okanska.
A-7283495, Monseu, Jerzy (George) Alfred.
A-7283496, Monseu, Renata Maria.
A-6953259, Mozes, Szmul.
A-7424935, Mulczet, Gabriella or Ella.
A-7197630, Maged, Aron.
A-7197629, Maged, Erna.
A-6887702, Milstein, Henry or Chaim Milstejn.
A-7868087, Miklos, Andor.
A-7095991, Miklos, Sophie Weiss.
A-9825098, Marek, Bronislaw.
A-6771743, Morcos, Elias Farah.
A-9765576, Matteoni, Anthony or Antonio Matcovich.
A-6142245, Na, Chung Sheng.
A-7095966, Nemes, Elemer or Elemer Nemes Lehocz.
A-6949985, Neuhauser, Alekander.
A-7873132, Neuhauser, Estera.
A-7873133, Neuhauser, Tibor.
A-6923771, Niederman, Armin.
A-7073627, Niederman, Lenca.
A-7145199, Niederman, Susana.
0300-287494, Nozicka, Jiri Josef Antonin.
A-6886893, Noskowicz, Naftali.
A-6955625, Nagy, Bartalan Istvan or Bartholomew Stephen Nagy.
A-7967085, Ni, Mary.
A-9500016, Noritis, Janis.
A-6772248, Obeid, Ali Abder Razzag Ali.
A-7125353, Orensztejn, Naftula Hirsz.
A-7125354, Orensztejn, Szyfra.
A-7366399, Orensztejn, Natan.
A-9729111, Osting, Erich.
A-6721803, Ovadiah, Eliyahu Joseph or Elijah Ovadiah.
A-7841091, Pai, Sin Yu.
A-7419932, Pao, Jenia.
A-8091325, Perissa, Anthony or Anton Perissa or Antonio Perissa.
A-7802996, Percutka, Maria.
A-8065360, Pezzulich, Enrico or Enrich Peculic.
A-9776546, Pokutynski, Feliks.
A-7251984, Peng, Jean You-Chen.
A-6967655, Pan, Coda Hoong-Tao.
A-9798727, Perts, August.
A-7096146, Pere, Sinaida.
A-6610630, Polonski, Fania.
A-7243253, Polonski, Joseph.
A-6989702, Palu, Theodor.
A-6026520, Pan, Paul Mei.
A-6920454, Paulmann, Louis Phillip.
A-7184141, Pu, Yun Hsin.
A-7249072, Paipals, Fred.
A-7249071, Paipals, Zenta.
A-6848197, Paneth, Juda.
A-7052479, Paneth, Gabriella.
A-7049964, Paunovic, Trifun.
A-6452003, Royang, Thomas Tsao.
A-7054205, Ranky, William Octavius (Vilmos Octavius Ranki).

A–7197512, Rottenberg, Jenta (nee Bernzweig).
A–6887711, Rottenberg, Zygmunt.
A–6753464, Rajulaid, Toivo Eino.
A–6953530, Roosenbaum, Mooritz.
A–6987948, Rozycki, Stanislaw Roman Jozef.
A–6938798, Rozenbergs, Janis Voldemars.
A–6938799, Rozenbergs, Mirdza Eleonora.
A–7457577, Saltoun, Haron Heskell.
A–6953465, Saltoun, Vivian Haron.
A–6953464, Saltoun, Ida Haron.
A–6953466, Saltoun, Haskell Haron.
A–6903747, Schreiber, Herman.
A–6891803, Schwarcz, Tibor.
A–9691837, Seng, Chee.
A–6614251, Sheena, Albert Haron.
A–7209347, Shen, Pao, G.
A–7209348, Shen, Wayfun.
A–7209349, Shen, Shirley Jo.
A–6847903, Sheng, David Shuan-En or Shuan-En Sheng.
A–6848519, Sheng, Lydia Ling-Chen Chang or Lydia Sheng or Ling-Chen Chang.
A–7081611, Shieh, Jwo Jye.
A–6411899, Silva, Cecilia Maria Basto Da.
A–6923164, Simsowitz, Sari (nee Simsowitz).
0300–286835, Smetacek, Zdenek.
0300–286836, Smetacek, Milada.
0300–286839, Smetacek, Eva Marie Anna Zdenka.
A–7830616, Sokal, Julie Chen-Chu (nee Yang, Chen Chu).
A–6954751, Spigler, Seli.
0300–287058, Stanczak, Ryszard.
A–8091344, Stepancic, Jakov or Giacomo or Jack.
A–6719269, Stern, Olga Mermelstein.
A–6877474, Strauss, Lino Leon.
A–7053578, Sugho, Louis Larry.
A–7053577, Sugho, Emilia.
A–9694065, Sulislawski, Kazimierz or Stanley Sules.
A–6620609, Sun, Keh-Ming.
A–7967086, Sun, Mey-En (nee Chen).
A–6848620, Sung, Chien-Bor or C. B. Sung.
A–6142921, Sung, Ya Bing or Robin Sung.
A–6855583, Sze, Clarence Saio-Ju.
A–4040525, Sze, Kenneth Chiache.
A–7110840, Szenczy, Sophie.
0300–288648, Stein, Bluma Szpigelman.
A–8057543, Szpigielman, Yakob.
A–6696204, Sung, I. Chung or Sung I. Chung.
0300–277030, Sandel, Adolf.
A–7078091, Sandel, Etela.
A–7210107, Shatohin, Victor George.
A–7210108, Shatohin, Olga V.
A–7399968, Shen, Chung-Yu.
A–8001360, Shohet, Isaac Haron or Ishaq Haroon Shohet or I. Shohet.
A–6958130, Szamek, Anna Marie.
A–6985373, Szumska, Jadwiga.
A–6848189, Shih, Chen Chong.
A–8065355, Stocovaz, Ruggero.
A–6516726, Strochlic, Zelman.
A–6515725, Strochlic, Ohaja (nee Zelenka).
A–6897057, Szapiro, Dora.
A–7244152, Saulesleja, Augusts.
A–6621140, Schwarc, Maxmilian or Max or Schwartz.
A–6582842, Schwarc, Alzbeta or Elizabeth or Schwartz (nee Tauber).
A–6582843, Schwarc, Gizela or Schwartz.
A–6681211, Shahabeddin, Jamal Zaki.
A–6967370, Shao, Stephen Pinyee or Shao Pinyee.
A–6848509, Shieh, Francis Shis-Hao.
A–6938813, Strelis, Arvid.
A–6704111, Sun, Pao Chang or Paul Sun.
A–6971794, Spuul, Lembit Indarlin.
A–6033425, Shen, Tso-Mei or Thomas Shen.
A–6798995, Stepe, Janis.
A–6887747, Stern, Eugen.
A–7198354, Stern, Terezia.
V–229916, Stern, Margita.
A–7197375, Stern, Szerena or Sarah Elizabeth (nee Wettenstein).
A–6805602, Schonfeld, Ludvik or Sarosy Laszlo or Larry Sade.
A–7125125, Schuller, Lore Margarete.
A–6903927, Shangh, Huang Ming.
A–7243861, Sumskis, Antons.
A–8082094, Sgaliardich, Antonio.
A–8082044, Shen, Sien-Wha Nyeu.
A–6881800, Simpser, Sloime or Sam.
A–6708744, Soong, Hsin-Chen or Seai Pau Soong or Agatha Soong or Sister Mary Gabriel Soong.
A–7142265, Tambaur, Vaino.
A–6847839, Tang, Yuet An.
A–6702203, Tao, Chien Ching or James Tao.
A–7078195, Tao, Yugn Tsing or Norman Tao.
A–6849413, Teng, Lin-Cheun Lincoln or Lin-Chcun Teng or Cheunley Teng.
A–8065352, Terdoslavich, Mariano Agostino.
A–7886280, Tojagic, Rade Luka.
A–7415659, Tomkov, Oleg.
A–6884235, Torbeczko, Maurycy.
A–6975576, Tsang, Hsi Ling (Schillings Tsang).
A–6488544, Tsao, Linda Wen-Mei.
A–6027105, Tseng, Paul Pao-Mong.
A–6904323, Tsien, Hong Yuan or Hong Yuan-Tsien.
A–6967544, Tsien, Wen-Hui (nee Kao).
A–8091332, Tsu, Lucille Liang-Ching.
A–6975611, Tversky, Roza or Rosa Lipkis.
A–6975612, Tversky, Feiga.
A–7868142, Tai, Shou Nan.
A–9914572, Tak, Ho Ming.
A–7200781, Tobolik, Peter.
A–7200779, Tobolik, Koenelia.
A–7863002, Turauskis, Vilma Kristina (nee Greizis).
A–6014816, Tsai, Wen-Cheh.
A–6938817, Tisins, Janis.
A–6938818, Tisins, Olga.
0300–410645, Tai, Chung.
0300–403715, Tong, Lim Ah.
A–6848502, Tsao, Ching Hua.
A–7463589, Ugricich, Matteo.
A–6794923, Urshan, Ruth.
A–7118781, Valvur, Heino Oskar.
A–8091373, Veske, Linda Kristine (nee Kiider).
A–6463149, Voong, Edith Tse-Lieu.
A–7915649, Vaidre, Alexander or Aleksander Vaidre.
A–9825345, Vlacich, Antonio.
A–6646835, Viest, Ivan Miroslav.
A–7097886, Wald, Eguenia Poss.
A–6922687, Weingarten, David.
A–7125447, Weinreb, Jindrich or Henry.
A–7125417, Weinreb, Relli.
A–8091309, Weinreb, Robert.
A–8091310, Weinreb, Tibor.
A–6931484, Weisz, David.
A–7427290, Weisz, Rosa Dora.
A–6878042, Weisz, Ignac.
A–6819608, Wieder, Solomon.
A–6843404, Woo, Robert Kwoh-Tao.
A–7363104, Woo, Tao Fu or Robert Tao Fu Woo.
A–6283296, Wu, Chang Sheng.
A–6965803, Wojciechowski, Andrew (Andrzej).
A–6083627, Wang, An.
A–6849826, Wang, Lorraine Chiu.
A–9746779, Wojciechowski, Witold Wladyslaw.
A–9705251, Wah, George Cheung.
A–6851364, Way, May.
A–6923193, Weiss, Zitta Stern.
A–7290221, Weinberger, Elias.
A–7297285, Weinberger, Iloma (Elie).
A–8031863, Weinberger, Hedvig.
A–8031864, Weinberger, Hedvig.
T–1510164, Woloszyn, Bronislaw or Bronislaw Wolosyn or Wolzszyn.
0606–66138, Wang, David I-Jaw.
A–6877738, Yee, Chi Yu or Stephen Chi-Yu Yee.
A–6238161, Yang, Chen-Ya.
A–7363107, Yao, Florence Hui-En.
A–6660956, Yih, Wei Hong.
A–6849392, Yin, Yuan-Shi.
A–6851351, Yu, Alexander Shih Han.
A–6953055, Yu, Teh Chu.
A–6095748, Yui, Regina Shiao-Lien.
A–6975569, Yang, Yun-Wen or John Yun-Wen Yang.
A–9771052, Young, Wan.
A–7133252, Yu, Colleen Nai Huan.
A–8001251, Yung, Cheng Chin.
A–9693033, Yung, Wong Sung.
A–6620573, Yu, Ping Chang.
A–7249624, Yu, Ven Wei.
A–7262206, Yu, Jimmy Shi Kiang.
A–6847780, Yang, Chang-Lee.
A–6703458, Yen, Hsin-Kai or David Hsin Kai Yen.
A–6545333, Yen, Mei-Huei or Mei Huei Kuo.
A–8039700, You, Chien Shun.
A–6904363, Zaharia, Florin Constantin.
A–6862628, Zelig, Jack.
A–7863132, Ziemelis, Martins.
A–6707032, Zindulka, Marie Charvat.
A–6855662, Zoberman, Chaim.
A–7125136, Zafir, Arthur.
A–7125147, Zafir, Anna (nee Gestetner).
A–7863212, Zandbergs, Ernests.
A–7863213, Zandbergs, Milda.
A–6830537, Zloof, Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir or Ezra Meir Ezra.
A–8065359, Zlatarevic, Milan Goldschmidt or Milan Goldschmidt or Edward J. Meyers.

The House concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON F. PARRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7251) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States in foreign countries in and to a certain invention.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may transfer to Vernon F. Parry, an employee of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, by means of an appropriate legal instrument, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention made by the said Vernon F. Parry, consisting of a continuous process for devolatilization of carbonaceous materials and apparatus therefor, as described and claimed in United States Application for Letters Patent filed in the United States Patent Office, on August 22, 1949, designated as serial No. 111,752: *Provided, however*, That such legal instrument shall reserve to the Government of the United States, in all departments, independent establishments, and corporate and other agencies thereof, the right to a nonexclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free license in the invention for all governmental purposes, and an exclusive right to grant sublicenses, consistent with the law of any foreign country in which the invention may be patented, for the use of such invention in connection with any production undertaken for defense purposes by the government of such country or by any person or company pursuant to any procurement contract with the government of such country or any of its instrumentalities.

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 authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Vernon F. Parry, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to a certain invention."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIELLE STAUB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Gabrielle Staub.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabrielle Staub shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States on January 26, 1941, the date on which she was recorded as permanently admitted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Gabrielle Staub" and insert "Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub)."

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 for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUSNU ATAULLAH BERKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGHERITA DI MEO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of Margherita Di Meo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Margherita Di Meo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Di Meo, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIEL HITTRICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4738) for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE TCHEREPNIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE BELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1705) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell.

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 issue to Jesse Bell a patent in fee to the following-described lands located in Adams County, Miss.: The northeast quarter and the east half of the southwest quarter and the west half of the southeast quarter of section 2, township 3 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss.; and the east half of the northwest quarter of section 5, township 3 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss.; and lots 3, 4, and 5 of section 1, township 4 north, range 5 west, Adams County, Miss. The said Jesse Bell, having complied with all the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 14, 1832 (6 Stat. 523), was entitled to be issued a patent for such land in 1833; but no such patent was ever issued due to the fact that the documents required by such act were lost or misplaced after they had been duly filed by him.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 7 insert:

"SEC. 2. The tracts of land described by the first section of this act shall be conveyed upon the payment by the successors of Jesse Bell of the appraised value of the lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, if payment is made within 1 year after the Secretary has given suitable notification of the price of the lands. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by Jesse Bell or his successors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the said successors.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall issue patent for said lands without any reservation of minerals."

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.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAND

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 369 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be amended by striking out "1 hour," page 1, line 8, and to insert in lieu thereof "one hour and a half."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and at this time yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 369, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands.

House Resolution 369, Mr. Speaker, provides for an open rule with one hour and a half of general debate on the bill itself. All points of order against H. R. 4646 are waived and the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the

bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4646 was given a rule by the Rules Committee on last July 29, 1953, but at that time there was a certain amount of criticism of the bill in its present form, which led the author of the bill and other interested parties to decide to defer presentation on the floor until valid criticisms of the bill could be worked out in the form of suggested amendments to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment various Members of Congress and officials of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service worked together on perfecting this bill, and have now eliminated most of the points of dispute in the bill.

On February 4 the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs filed a supplemental report on H. R. 4646, in which is set forth the amendment they propose to offer to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will see fit to adopt the rule, House Resolution 369, which will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646.

I might explain that last summer when the objections to this bill first appeared, those objections became known to the author of the bill and to the Committee on Rules, and, in fact, to the entire House only at the time of the hearings held on the bill by the Committee on Rules. Prior to that time and prior to the time the bill was reported to the House, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held 2 full days of hearings on this bill. They were held about 2 weeks apart. Thus, any persons interested had ample notice and ample opportunity to appear and be heard.

At that time there was very little opposition voiced against the bill; none by interests outside of the Government. I believe that during those hearings Forest Service representatives appeared and did offer some objections to the bill in its original form. Some of those objections were removed by the amendment which became the committee substitute. But, when the Committee on Rules was holding its hearing on the bill, deciding whether or not it should grant a rule and send it to the floor, several Members appeared before that committee and raised a number of objections and criticisms to the bill as reported. As the author of the bill, I listened to those objections carefully and, realizing that since there appeared to be no objections to the principle of the bill, it seemed to me quite possible that all of the objections to that bill could be cleaned up with some very simple words in the way of an amendment.

One objection to the bill was that lands included in national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, and so forth, should not be eligible for exchange. Such lands were never intended to be made eligible for exchange under the provisions of this bill. In the original draft of the bill that proviso limiting such areas was included. Later a few other suggestions as to areas which should not be included were made, so as the author of the bill I finally determined that it would be better not to attempt to name by name specifically those areas which would be excluded for fear that in naming only a few some other area might inadvertently be omitted. So, it was thought that that particular situation could be met by merely including in the bill that no exchange could be made unless it was in the public interest and, of course, it would not be in the public interest to exchange lands from the national parks, national monuments, and wilderness areas.

However, in the amendments which the committee will offer this proviso is included:

Provided, That federally owned timberlands so transferred shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges, administrative sites, wild or wilderness areas, forest experimental areas, and developed recreation areas.

I might point out that some of those areas were put in at the very last minute. They are all protected by the words "in the public interest."

This is another criticism:

The department or agency responsible for the administration of the federally owned land to be transferred would have no part in the selection of such lands.

The committee in discussing the matter in the hearing did not consider that that was really a valid criticism, but in order to remove any possible doubt one word was changed, the word "cooperate." We provided originally that the Federal agency shall cooperate. In the amendment the word "participate" is used which, of course, makes the agency having jurisdiction over the lands involved a partner in the whole transaction.

This objection is further met by the third proviso which provides for advisory public hearings to be held by the Department or agency having jurisdiction over lands which might be transferred.

Another objection which was raised:

Other processing operations in the same general area which depend on sustained production of the national forest would be injured if lands on which such operation depend for timber were transferred in an exchange as provided for in the bill.

That is really a matter which the public interest clause will take care of; so in connection with that subject the third proviso will read:

That transfers will be in the public interest.

Another objection:

One member declared that there should be some method of inspection to determine whether or not the landowner who seeks the benefit of the act is practicing sustained-yield management and will guarantee that he will maintain such practices in any Federal lands transferred to him.

The suggested amendment which will be offered provides for those matters to be settled by an advisory public hearing before any transfer is made.

This objection is answered in several ways, not only in the bill as written but in the proposed amendment. However, the point is assumed to be strengthened by (a) in the third proviso, which requires that one purpose of a public hearing is to determine whether "the private timberlands are being operated as a part of a forest area to provide a sustained yield of timber for processing purposes." So far as the additional guaranty is concerned, that would more properly be taken care of administratively by merely including a reservation in the deed of transfer.

Then there was the further objection that the agency taking the land should be required to reimburse the agency from which the land was transferred by transfer of funds.

The second proviso in the amendment to be offered will cover that.

The second proviso in the suggested amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That any such transfer shall be made with reimbursement or transfer of funds for the value of timberland transferred as determined by the transferring agency.

It is pertinent to note that in connection with this proviso that such reimbursement to the Forest Service, which would be the agency from which practically all lands would be transferred, would be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt as provided in United States Code, title 16, section 499. This section reads as follows:

All money received by or on account of the Forest Service for timber, or from any other source of national-forest revenue, including moneys received from sale of products from or for the use of lands in national forests created under section 471 (b) of this title, and moneys received on account of permits for hunting, fishing, or camping on lands acquired under authority of sections 513–517 and 521 of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

May I point out to the House that all of these objections, which are valid and reasonable criticisms of the text of the bill, have received the careful and earnest consideration of the committee. It has been the endeavor of the author of the bill to meet these objections. We think the objections will be adequately taken care of by the amendment which will be offered, and the principle in the bill is not injured one whit; as a matter of fact, the bill is actually changed very little, and this additional language is merely considered to be further safeguard against the transfer of land under improper circumstances.

The purpose of this bill is very simple and very clear. When an operator by the practice of good forestry and by the exercise of good business judgment has placed his business in such shape that his employees and the little community around his industry and he have reason to believe that that industry can operate perpetually, in other words, that his timber operation is on a sustained-yield basis, then when such an operator happens to find that his property is located where the United States Government is about to build a reservoir or for some other reason needs his land, and his land which will supply his permanent timber supply is to be taken by the Government

under condemnation proceedings, this bill would allow him to accept in exchange for the land which the Government is going to take away from him by condemnation similar suitable land instead of cash.

This bill has been criticized on the ground that it is a bill to bail out the big interests. I submit to the Members of the House that it is no such thing. It is quite the contrary. The owner of such a property, a mill with a balanced timber supply operating on a sustained-yield basis, obviously is a man of means and considerable wealth or he would not own that kind of property. Such an owner could be perfectly content, I think, to accept cash for his property because he could take the money and go elsewhere, and would be harmed very little by doing so. No; the people who are harmed and oftentimes ruined under such circumstances are the innocent third parties, the employees of that mill, who have bought or built homes in the community which has been built up around that industry, the people who have jobs there. I have known of mills where the jobs are held by the second generation. If their jobs are wiped out by the liquidation of that mill because of the Government's taking away its timber, they are the people who are hurt. The private owner of the timber is not damaged.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COON. The eliminating of all or a major part of a sustained-yield timber operation would throw many men out of work and would curtail or eliminate the income in an affected community. Would not this legislation protect workingmen and small-business men?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; that is one of the purposes of the legislation, I may say to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COON. Did not the Secretary of Agriculture in a letter discussing this bill on July 24, 1953, say, "We are convinced that an inequity with respect to private owners exists"?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; the Secretary did make that statement. I am sure he well recognizes that this condition I have described is an inequity.

Mr. COON. So it would be true, then, that this bill would work for the benefit of the worker, by insuring employment, and for the small-business men and a stable economy in the community.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes. I may say to the gentleman that as the author of the bill it was that point in particular that impelled me to introduce it.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call to the attention of the gentleman that where a condition exists such as was referred to by the gentleman, where a corporation or a company would jeopardize their sustained yield, I believe under Public Law 273 which was passed in 1944, the Leasing Act would permit the Federal Government to lease them certain acreage. The law is in effect now which would permit the Federal Government to lease them certain acreage that they would need to continue that sustained yield to keep up their activity and whatever industry might be involved, or wherever any employment may be affected.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. It happens that I am author of the bill which became Public Law 273. I regret to say that it could not apply under the conditions which I have pointed out, which comprise the reasons behind this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The gentlemand said that the operation of the law, which was passed in 1944, would not apply in this situation and that the gentleman is the author of the bill and is familiar with it. At the present time, I want to point out under the existing law there is presently pending an application by 1 corporation, and I would like to read just 3 or 4 lines which are as follows:

> And it is proposed in this application (which has been forwarded to me) that the sustained yield unit consists of national forest land in either Sam Houston or David Crockett National Forest or both, such as will yield—
>
> And this is very important—
>
> 10 million feet of timber annually and (2) the sale of this timber to this organization be made to the new corporation without competitive bidding.

This is the type of guaranteed, sustained yield of 10 million board-feet which apparently is now lawful under the law. Does not the gentleman think that is the type of activity which gives them a guaranty of operating their mills?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that the 1944 act was very, very emphatically approved by the Forest Service. The principle involved in that act is very pertinent to the principle involved in this bill presently before us. The purpose of the 1944 act was to encourage sustained-yield management of timber held in private hands. There is just one really big thing wrong with forestry in this country today. There is one real big threat to the future wood supply of the people of this country, and that is that there is not enough timber now held in private hands operated on a sustained-yield basis. The legislation which is now before us I introduced with that thought uppermost in mind for the protection of the little communities, that is, if we can give an incentive to large owners or any owners of private timber to go ahead with their operation on a sustained-yield basis instead of on a cut-out-and-get-out basis, as has been the practice in lumbering operations for so many years, we will be making a contribution to the long-range forestry supply and program of this country. That is what this bill is for and that is why it has the approval of the American Forestry Association.

If the gentleman will bear with me, I would like to relinquish the floor, and Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HESS. 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. 12]

Adair	Durham	Merrow
Addonzio	Fine	Miller, Kans.
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Green	Morgan
Battle	Gubser	Morrison
Bowler	Hagen, Calif.	Moulder
Brownson	Haley	Oakman
Buchanan	Harrison, Wyo.	Passman
Carnahan	Hart	Powell
Cederberg	Jackson	Prouty
Celler	James	Reece, Tenn.
Chelf	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Chiperfield	Kearns	Regan
Clardy	Kee	Rodino
Corbett	Klein	Taylor
Cotton	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Coudert	Lesinski	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Velde
Dawson, Ill.	McCarthy	Weichel
Deane	McConnell	Willis
Dingell	Mailliard	
Dollinger	Mason	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CORBETT (at the request of Mr. FULTON) was granted leave of absence for 1 week on account of illness.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAND

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention was first called to this legislation about 3 days before we adjourned last summer. This bill was very suddenly called up before the Rules Committee at the 11th hour, and there was considerable insistence that the Congress act on this legislation in the 2 or 3 days remaining before adjournment.

I think this is a very dangerous piece of legislation. From the knowledge I have of this bill, it will jeopardize and gradually create an avenue of encroachment upon our national forests and our national park reserves. I think every Member should give this bill very serious study before he makes up his mind to vote for it.

It was only shortly after the turn of the century when a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, together with Gifford Pinchot, made a terrific battle against the lumber barons and succeeded in enacting legislation that has preserved up to this day our great national forest reserves. This bill will give the

lumber interests of this country an opening wedge to take over large sections of our national parks and our national forests and gradually usurp and take over some of the virgin timberlands of our national forest reserves.

I was startled at the time this legislation came before the Rules Committee to learn that certain organizations of this country, including the Izaak Walton League, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, and about 12 to 15 other conservation organizations, that represent millions upon millions of American citizens were not given notice or did not have an opportunity to testify before the committee when this legislation was originally heard and considered by the committee.

I attended a meeting here about 2 weeks ago of heads of various national wildlife and conservation societies. All they are interested in is to have this legislation recommitted so that these organizations representing millions of American citizens who have the welfare of our national parks public resources at heart may have an opportunity to testify in order to bring out the true facts as to the purposes underlying the passing of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, whenever our Federal Government wants land for an atomic-energy plant, a dam site, or for any military or civilian purpose whatsoever, this will give the large lumber companies permission to come in before the Federal department that wants to take this land over for this Federal purpose and exchange off, acre for acre, virgin timberland in our national forests. This bill is aimed to cripple our national forest department because it will take transfer control to whatever Government department wants to use this land for Government purposes. Once the gates are opened it will take but a short time to cripple our timber reserves in our national preserves. It is a piece of legislation which every Member on this floor should give some very serious consideration before voting on the bill. It has all the earmarks of another well-concealed giveaway. This is an extension of the policy created by the tidelands oil legislation and public power curtailment which passed in the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just addressed the House saw fit to criticize the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It seems to me that I should set the record straight. This bill was introduced on April 16, 1953. Public and open hearings were held on June 25 and July 14 and again before the full committee on July 15. Every Member and everyone who requested to be heard was heard during those hearings.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

I yield the gentleman 6 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great national forest in Pennsylvania that was created by President Calvin Coolidge in a proclamation of September 24, 1923—the Allegheny National Forest of some 750,000 acres, a great part of which is in my congressional district.

Over the years I have watched this forest grow from a conglomeration of worn-out, run-down, cut-over forest land that nobody wanted then—into a productive area of real worth to my State and to the local counties in which it is located. Under careful and prudent management the Allegheny National Forest has become a source of many benefits to the 15 million people living within 300 miles of its boundaries. Through multiple use for timber, water, recreation, and wildlife a great many people benefit each year and the resources of my State are strengthened.

My colleagues in Congress are aware of the 151 other national forests in our Nation. They are found in 39 States from the coast of California to the Florida pinelands and from Maine to the vast forest areas in Washington State. Alaska and Puerto Rico also have national forests.

These forests have been a vital bulwark in America's efforts to protect and wisely use our God-given resources. Not only do they provide recurrent crops of valuable timber but also they are the source of clear streams, ample flows of fresh water, needed forage for livestock, abundant supplies of game and fish for the sportsman and a place of recreation and relaxation for millions of our citizens.

In the fiscal year just past our national forests returned receipts totaling over $76 million. In addition, it is estimated that the capital assets of the national forests increased in value more than $70 million. Last year's expenditure from regular appropriations for running these forests was $64½ million. Cash receipts alone thus exceeded expenditures by over $12 million. Over 33 million citizens visited the recreational areas in the forests and hundreds of thousands of sportsmen hunted and fished in the forests. These forests benefit many and are under the control of no individual or groups.

We in the Congress are responsible to the American people for the welfare of these Federal forests. It is our duty to see that no legislation is enacted to weaken or impair them. Their importance becomes doubly significant when we realize that less than 10 percent of the land area in the Nation is in national forests. This is a small margin of safety for the years that lie ahead.

Fortunately over the years the Members of Congress have been vigilant. No legislation has been passed that would jeopardize the present or future welfare of the national forests. We cannot afford to grow indifferent now.

It is my sincere hope that this Congress will not pass any legislation that will establish precedents which may later rise up to harm our great public forests. It is my opinion that we are charged with the responsibility to reject any legislation of which we are doubtful and that would establish precedents whereby our national forests or, in fact, any of our essential public lands might be encroached upon.

Last year, at the close of Congress, H. R. 4646 was reported favorably by the Rules Committee. Under the legislation as then proposed, a Government agency building a dam for irrigation or power purposes would be permitted to trade or exchange lands in national forests, national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, and recreational areas for private forest lands under sustained yield that were to be flooded by the Government project. The Federal agency administering the lands would have had little or no say in the ultimate transaction. The furor raised at the time caused my very good friend, the sponsor of this legislation, Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, to withdraw the bill for restudy with those interested in an effort to develop a bill that would be satisfactory to those concerned.

You now have the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs' report on the amendments that will be submitted today. They are certainly a considerable improvement over the bill as originally reported. However, I am now convinced that, notwithstanding the sincere efforts of the committee to provide satisfactory substitute language and to remove objectionable features, the legislation is still aimed at the national forests and will establish a precedent so dangerous in my opinion as to eventually jeopardize the future of our great public forests. It can go much further and set a precedent whereby not only national forest lands but other public lands could be used as trading stock in the development of a power, irrigation, or some other Federal project.

It is my firm conviction that our national forests should be left alone and no legislation enacted that would in any way open up avenues by which parts of these forest areas might be traded or exchanged.

This legislation introduces a completely new concept in the method of payment for private property when the Government exercises its right of eminent domain, namely, payment in kind instead of in cash for private timberlands needed for public projects. It can have far-reaching effects, cause much confusion and misunderstanding among our people, and eventually leave every national forest or other federally owned property open to inroads which could eventually impair their usefulness.

And if this bill is passed, I understand the local courts, not the agencies which we hold accountable for the management of our public lands, will have the final authority in requiring the exchange or transfer of federally owned lands.

Through the years I have served notice that I will be watchful for any move that might now or ultimately cause harm to our national forests. My colleagues in Congress have been just as alert. As I said, our national forests should be left alone. Again we must exercise our cau-

tion and not pass legislation which we will regret later. I feel certain we are supported in such a stand by millions of citizens represented by State and national conservation associations, fish and game clubs, recreation groups, wilderness areas supporters and independent timber operators and others. The host of people who benefit from the use of our public forests, parks and wildlife areas are the ones who are depending on us not to open the door even a little to any action that could ultimately, in my opinion, imperil our national forest program over the years ahead. If over the next 75 or 100 years we had enough exchanges, that would be permitted under this legislation, we might end up by having no national forests whatsoever.

Let me point out to the Members that others are not quite satisfied with this legislation. In fact, the report to accompany H. R. 4646, as originally reported by the committee, contains this letter, and I quote:

Hon. A. L. MILLER
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEAR DR. MILLER: Since sending you on July 10 the Department's adverse reports on the original and revised versions of H. R. 4646, further consideration has been given to the problem which this bill seeks to correct, and we wish that the report be withdrawn. We are convinced that an inequity with respect to private owners exists, but question that the full solution is contained in this proposed legislation. In the event no action is taken at this time, the Department would be glad, during the recess or adjournment, to work with the author of the bill, Members of Congress, or the Committee staff in an effort to develop an equitable solution which this Department could support.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Did the gentleman review the original report?

Mr. GAVIN. No; I have never seen this adverse report that they referred to.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. What reason did they give for changing their mind and reversing their position and being opposed to the bill?

Mr. GAVIN. I do not know. The gentleman will have to ask Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, about that.

It is evident from this letter that Mr. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, considers that the full solution is not contained in the legislation as originally reported.

On January 27, 1954, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture to ascertain what their thinking was on this legislation at this time, and I am in receipt of a letter from J. Earl Coke, Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Reference is made to your telephone request of January 27 for the views of this Department on H. R. 4646.

By letter of July 24, the Department advised Dr. A. L. Miller, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it questions whether the full solution to the problem which the bill seeks to correct is contained in the proposed legislation. The Department offered its facilities in working with the author of the bill or other Members of the Congress in an effort to develop an equitable solution.

In accordance with this offer, the Department has assisted Mr. ELLSWORTH in his efforts to find an equitable solution, and as a legislative service has developed certain amendments to the bill.

However, the Department feels that the bill raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of money, for necessary Government acquisitions of private property. Such a question would affect several departments in addition to the Department of Agriculture and is, we believe, a matter for congressional decision. Since we have not discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments, we feel it would be inappropriate to express an opinion as to whether H. R. 4646 should be enacted.

J. EARL COKE.

In this letter Mr. Coke states that they have not discussed the matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments as to the possible reaction in event this legislation should be passed.

Therefore, I think the Congress should proceed with caution before taking action on any legislation that would appear to be as controversial as this legislation appears to be.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came up before the Committee on Rules, I was one of those who appeared in opposition to it. I was one who entered into an agreement with the gentleman from Oregon on the floor of the House just before the close of the last session of the Congress in which we agreed that we would try to work out a compromise, and in good faith we had a meeting with the gentleman from Oregon.

Shortly after this session of the Congress reconvened, the Nash people had a banquet here at which they gave conservation awards to many of the sportsmen and conservationists and the wildlife associations throughout the United States. At that banquet more than 20 national organizations, conservationists, and national park associations, and so forth, were represented. During that time several of the Congressmen who had opposed the bill met and tried to work out a compromise bill with the gentleman from Oregon. As he says, we did file our objections with him. Some of those objections have been met in a supplemental report, but I disagree with the gentleman from Oregon when he says that there were no objections to the principle of the bill.

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

Mr. METCALF. Gladly.

Mr ELLSWORTH. At the time we discussed the matter in the summer it did not seem to me that there was any objection to the principle. However, I discovered in our conference that there was this very distinctive difference of opinion on principle, and that is that you folks who oppose this bill are opposed to deeding any Government land to anybody, under any circumstances.

If the gentleman will yield further—and I will give him time to make up for this interruption—I would like to point out that during the 10-year period from 1943 to 1952, inclusive, the Forest Service has deeded a total of 549,822 acres of good standing timber out in the national forests to private individuals, and in order to understand how much that acreage amounts to, that is an area about one and one half times the State of Connecticut. So, actually your Forest Service has over the years been making trades of its timber land to private individuals and are taking in return cut-over land. I think the House should know that.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman. Iwill hold the gentleman to his commitment to give me a little additional time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. METCALF. I am not, and I do not think any of the other Members who are in opposition to this bill are opposed to the relinquishment of public land to private ownership when there is good and sufficient justification for it, but we are opposed to the principle of making in-lieu-payments of land when land is acquired for a public purpose. We are opposed to it when you acquire land for a post office. We do not feel that the man who had a small store or a home, whose land is taken for the building of a public building, should go to the Government and say, "You have to set me up in another store on another corner" or "You have to give me another home up the street somewhere." We are opposed to the exchange of land for any purpose. We feel that the historic, age-old method of settling these condemnation disputes by monetary consideration, inadequate as it is, is the best method that has been evolved, and we feel there should be no departure for the special interests or special privilege of forestry operation.

Now I want to say to my friend and colleague from Montana that I do not feel that any of us were criticizing the Interior Committee for not giving a full and complete hearing. I will grant that these organizations, these associations that I have enumerated, perhaps were negligent in failing to appear at the hearing. But, let me remind the gentleman that the bill as it came out of the committee was an entirely different bill than the bill that went into the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the proviso in the bill that was taken out would have protected the national parks and the national monuments, and so forth. That was what alerted these associations to the danger in the bill. Whether they were negligent or not, they should have an opportunity to be heard. They represent millions of Americans. They asked to be heard, and they should have an opportunity to present their case in opposition to this bill. That is the only point. It was not that we objected to the fact that they were not heard, it

is that now that they have asked to be heard we feel this bill should be recommitted, and they should have an opportunity to present their case to the committee.

I have introduced a bill that came out of this conference of conservationists and Congressmen interested in this proposition. That bill is H. R. 7683. Later I am going to submit some amendments taken out of that bill. I have introduced this bill simply for the purpose of showing that there was a good-faith attempt made to meet the objections the gentleman from Oregon had to our bill and the objections we had to his bill, and to get together. I feel that my bill, if it were passed in this Congress, would take care of the very proposition the gentleman from Oregon is complaining about and at the same time would protect the vital interests the people have in the national forests.

As I say, later I am going to present some amendments and describe to you what my bill would do. My bill provides that ownership shall not be transferred.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement made before the committee by a representative of the Department of Agriculture at the first hearing.

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

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

I am Howard Hopkins, the assistant chief of the Forest Service. I am authorized to speak for the Department of Agriculture but we have not gotten a statement from the Bureau of Budget as to its views on this legislation, Mr. Chairman. The amended H. R. 4646 provides that in any case and for any use where the Federal Government takes over forest land that is operated under a sustained-yield management to the extent that it will decrease the annual cut of the private owner and thence decrease his processing operations, the private owner will have the choice of either cash reimbursement or taking federally owned land with timber and growing capacity equal to reimburse him so that the annual cut will remain the same and the processing operations will be equal to what they were before the original take of the Government. Of the 461 million acres of commercial forest land the Federal Government has less than 20 percent. It has 89 million acres. But of those 89 million acres of commercial forest land of the Government, the Forest Service in the national forests has over 80 percent. The bulk of the land we are talking about which would be taken by this bill would come from our national forests.

The Department of Agriculture feels that this bill is undesirable from the public standpoint. To summarize those reasons I would like to state that first of all most of the land in the national forests which would be involved, to which this bill would apply, are also under sustained yield, with dependent processing operations and dependent payrolls, et cetera. So, it would just be a switch from one payroll, you might say, to another, without really any net benefit of the operating process which the bill is supposed to improve. In addition to that, the national forests have always tried to keep a certain number of small sales going each year with small, independent operators who would be very largely crowded out under this bill under the land that would be affected by it. Second, as you know, the national forest land is managed primarily from the standpoint of multiple use management. That is, with watershed values, recreational values, timber values, grazing values, et cetera. So in this case, land transferred from the national forests would be transferred from multiple single-use management. That is, primarily for timber production. Third, the bill provides no protection whatsoever for the land after it is transferred. That is, the ownership of the company or the corporation could change and they could destroy it completely or change the management or sell it or dispose of it. So you would change land that is dedicated in public ownership to continued good management to land under an ownership which might change in management on any day. Fourth, are the watershed management values of national forest lands which are often paramount even to the timber production. In this case the watershed values would probably not have much commercial value recognized as such and would not mean much to the individual owners receiving the lands. So they might easily be depleted very seriously. I think those watershed values might be of the greatest possible importance to the life of either nearby communities or even distant cities.

Next are the recreational values on the national forests in the way of public hunting, public fishing, camping, and picnicking which are involved. While they would probably have no commercial value recognized as such, if transferred under this law, nevertheless, they are of great value to local communities and to the public. They would probably be closed when they are transferred to private ownership and removed from public use. Also, there is little or no authority for the administrative officer in charge of the Federal land concerned, in this case the national forests, which would be the Secretary of Agriculture to either designate the area concerned or to indicate the extent of the public values which might justify and prove the desirability of keeping the land in public ownership. I know you want me to be brief. I will try to do so. I would like to give one other item. Down at the very end of this amended bill there appear the words "that such transfer is consistent with the public interest." That gives the impression that transfers which are not consistent with the public interest would not be consumated. In actual practice, as I see this bill, this section would not be used in most cases and therefore that provision is dead. That is, if it is not used. This second section where this public interest is brought in refers only to cases of condemnation. The Forest Service will not be using this bill to acquire land. It will be primarily the armed services, the Reclamation Service, the Atomic Energy Commission, or some of those outfits. According to the bill they would be the ones to negotiate with the private owner whose lands they are taking away. Let us assume, for instance, that they agree that the land they take away would cut down the production or the processing operations of the private land owner by 10 million feet per year. That might represent 100,000 acres of good timberland growing 100 board feet per acre per year. The Atomic Energy Commission or the armed services would say, "that is all right. We agree. That is fair enough." It might be fair enough from the standpoint of your bill. Then they would turn to the Forest Service and say, "Here is a plot of land of 100,000 acres which we have agreed you can transfer and should transfer over to the private owner." The bill does not leave any choice to the Department of Agriculture. It says it shall be transferred so this item of being consistent with the public interest would not come into the picture at all unless there was a condemnation and the private owner would be smart enough to realize the desirability from his standpoint of not getting into a condemnation case. So I think that section is not going to be used and therefore we should discount a great deal that last phrase which is perhaps a little sugar coating to a pill which I think is very undesirable from a public standpoint.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. 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 thirty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. D'EWART. 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. 13]

Adair	Ford	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Green	Merrow
Barden	Gubser	Miller, Kans.
Battle	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, N. Y.
Bowler	Haley	Morgan
Buckley	Harrison, Wyo.	Morrison
Carnahan	Hart	Moulder
Cederberg	Hoffman, Ill.	Multer
Celler	Holt	Neal
Chelf	Jackson	Passman
Chiperfield	Kearney	Powell
Clardy	Kearns	Reams
Corbett	Kee	Reece, Tenn.
Cotton	Keogh	Reed, Ill.
Coudert	Klein	Regan
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Rodino
Deane	Lovre	Taylor
Dingell	McConnell	Tollefson
Dollinger	McGregor	Velde
Durham	Mailliard	Weichel
Fine	Mason	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LANDS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to all the debate that has been had on this bill because I am trying to find out what the shooting is all about and I cannot, for the life of me, understand what the opposition is to this bill, and I cannot, for the life of me, understand why the Forest Service should have turned its lobby loose on the Members of Congress to try and defeat this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that probably I am as disinterested in this bill as anybody in the House, because if there is any such project as a sustained operation of timber in my district, I do not know where it is and nobody has ever spoken to me about it. But, I do know that in southern Virginia and in North Carolina and in other States the lumber industry is a great industry. Our people have studied it and have come to learn something about it in recent years, and they are operating their properties on what is known as sustained yield operation; that is, a man acquires enough timberland so that he may grow timber as he cuts timber and thus keep his operation as a permanent industry in that community. There are many small

communities in the South—and I have no doubt in all of the other parts of the country—that have as their sustaining economic factor in that community a sustained production mill which produces not only timber, but produces employment, and often the only employment for the people in that vicinity. When the Government steps in, and a man has 30,000 acres of timberland under sustained production, and takes away 10,000 acres of it, it not only takes away that man's 10,000 acres—and it compensates him for it; he is not hurt, but he is put out of business, and a lot of folks are put out of business these days—but the people that are hurt are the poor workingmen who lose their jobs, because when that mill loses its sustained production those people lose their employment.

I have listened to this debate. It was indicated that this was a hurried thing, that it was brought out suddenly. It was not. The bill lay in committee for 3 months. In due course it was reported. It came to the Rules Committee. That was the first I ever knew about it. It was considered there for 2 days. It was brought here, and there were objections. It was agreed by the author of the bill that this matter could lay over the recess of Congress and the departments and the author of the bill would try to get it straightened out. They have done that.

I am sure Members want to be informed about this thing. I know most of the Members in this body, like myself, have no particular knowledge or no particular interest in this bill, yet want to do what is fair about it. That is all I am asking you to do, is to see that you do know and do what is fair about it. In order to do that, just take this little one-page bill and this little one-page supplmental report, and you will see what has happened.

The bill has been amended, and redrafted. It was approved by the Agriculture Department provided certain changes were made. Then the supplemental report was filed and an agreement was made by which certain committee amendments will be offered, probably half a dozen.

After studying this thing, I cannot for the life of me see how any reasonable person can offer any objection to this bill, and I do not think I have heard any reasonable objections to it by the gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate because I think perhaps almost without exception they have not had the opportunity to read the reports that are here on the bill and to understand exactly what this is all about.

It has been indicated here, for instance, that the lumber owners want something from the Government. Understand this: The private owners of timberlands are only asking one thing from the Government, and that is, "Leave us alone. Let us make our living and let us give employment to the people in our vicinity." That is all they ask. But if the Government has to have that property they say to the Government, "All right, take it if you have to take it, but don't put us out of business. Give us some similar land, not acre for acre but value for value. Give us similar land that the Government owns in our vicinity." What could be fairer than that?

I hope you gentlemen will consider this matter seriously before you just turn this bill down on the theory that somebody is asking something from the Government. Nobody is asking anything from the Government but to be left alone to attend to their business.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman know of any other interest where public property can be condemned for private purposes? That is the part that concerns me. Under this legislation, when private property is condemned for a public purpose the Government does not have the choice but the owner of the private property has a choice of requiring condemnation of public property for private purposes. I wonder if there is any example the gentleman can think of.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension about it. In the first place, the owner does not even have the right to ask this because the bill itself in these amendments that will be offered says it shall be done only when it is in the public interest.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio, is it not a fact that under the present law the Army engineers are authorized to transfer any lands it may have when it condemns certain lands for the purposes included in this bill?

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call to the attention of my distinguished friend that what this bill is trying to do is already incorporated in a law. Let me read it to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well if it is in the law, then the gentleman should not have any complaint about the bill, and it will not do any harm. These people who own this property are being put out of business. I think business is so bad in this country, and my friends on the right as well as my friends on the left have all been crying so much about helping business. I think we should help business, but let us not put them out of business.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has had so much time but I yield nevertheless.

Mr. GAVIN. Public Law 294 which was enacted in 1944 states, "An act to promote sustained yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment and taxable forest wealth." Or, in other words, if there was a spot where there was a corporation or company that needed timber for a sustained yield to continue to operate, there is not any question but what the Forest Service could lease certain land necessary to continue the sustained yield. Here is your law. Now you want an exchange—you want the land.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. The gentleman is going on the assumption that we can get along with the Forest Service. I have had a great deal of trouble in getting along with them.

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

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are 1 or 2 things that should be said regarding this bill before the matter comes to a vote. I believe the House should understand when we speak of the Forest Service of the United States we are talking of a tremendous institution. Do you realize that the United States Forest Service has jurisdiction over 10 percent of the entire land mass of the continental United States?

To give you an idea of the extent of this rather enormous bureaucracy, the land under the control of the United States Forest Service is equal in area to some 3 times the size of the United Kingdom which includes England, Scotland, Wales and the 6 counties of Ireland. That is a great deal of land. My friends it is not going to be ruined or disturbed if a few communities, after they have complied with the very rigorous restrictions contained in this bill to protect the public interests, come under this legislation. If these provisions are complied with, I do not think anything but public good and great good at that can come from the protection of these industries who qualify under this bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Under the amendments which the committee, will offer, and which I understand the committee has approved, does not the first amendment on page 2, as pointed out in the supplemental report, by excluding from the bill the national parks and other areas meet the objection which is being made to the original legislation by these various conservation groups?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I point out to the gentleman from New York that in the beginning I thought that that amendment would meet any and all objections because most objections came from the National Parks Association people, the Wilderness Society and some of these other societies. Now, apparently, the objection is to the idea of transferring any land at all controlled by the Forest Service, where you cannot build a fire unless you have a permit. The objection seems to be to the transfer of any land at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri) there were—ayes 117, noes 52.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4646, with Mr. O'KONSKI in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] is recognized for 45 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4646 has as its general purpose preventing Federal land acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations. During the last session, on July 27, 1953, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported H. R. 4646, with certain amendments recommended.

At the hearing on this legislation before the Rules Committee last session, several Members appeared to voice objections to the wording of the bill as reported.

In view of the fact that several objectors felt time should be given them for the consideration and preparation of amendments to the bill which would remove their objections, it seemed advisable to delay final consideration of the bill until this session. Accordingly, with the approval of the leadership and the Rules Committee, the rule was not called up before adjournment; this was done with the understanding of both the sponsor and the objectors that amending legislation would be mutually developed during the interim.

At a hearing before the House Public Lands Subcommittee on February 1, 1954, the sponsor of the bill [Mr. ELLSWORTH] advised subcommittee members that, first, he had conferred during the recess with several objecting Members, with officials of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, and had then prepared an amendment to the bill initially reported to the House.

EXPLANATION OF THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL

With the understanding that amendments to the bill as originally reported will be offered, I shall only outline the general purpose and proposed operation of this legislation.

H. R. 4646, with its proposed amendments, would make it possible, under certain circumstances spelled out in the bill, for an owner of timberlands being managed and operated on a sustained-yield basis to be reimbursed in kind by the transfer of federally owned timberlands to him when the United States takes over his land for public use.

For many years—at least 50—it has been the policy of Congress to encourage development of our vast timber resources, and to insist upon good forestry practices; it has been the policy to discourage some of the earlier cut-out-and-get-out practices that prevailed in the past.

Toward this end the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, through the Forest Service, and Forestry Division of the Bureau of Land Management, have programed carefully development of timber areas on a sustained-yield unit basis; this system provides for replacement of cut timber with seedlings in such a manner as to establish a cycle permitting continuous operation accompanied by continuous replacement.

Close working partners of this Federal program for many years have been our hundreds and thousands of private timber operators, and other non-Federal owners of timberlands.

The problem, as presented to our committee, can be reduced to this:

To efficiently produce wood requires carefully planned and executed long-range forestry programs—silvaculture is the word, I believe, the professional foresters' use.

We have encouraged, over the years, private capital to interest itself in utilizing our vast forest resources on sustained-yield unit operation.

With billions of dollars invested, these hundreds of private and non-Federal timber operations and their employees are today pretty much anchored to fixed localities. Sustained yield timber operation demands that.

You build a plant, attract people to work in it; logging camps, logging towns, spring up; towns cluster around the manufacturing areas, the tree farm areas, and the logging areas.

Now, the departments of the Federal Government have the right—by acts of this Congress—to condemn land for various purposes: for military bases, for critical industries, for dam sites, roads, schools, highways, powerlines, various experimental tracts—for a multitude of purposes.

In the past 10- or 12-year period, approximately 35 million acres of land have been acquired by condemnation; perhaps more, since it takes the departments a long time—we have found in our committee—to total up those things.

A lot of those acres were in forests; that part of the forest land condemned was not considered as forest as such; it was taken for some other purpose.

When those lands go, that part of the economy which depends on sustained-yield timber operation to employ its people, to pay its taxes, to keep going—suffers proportionately.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent Federal lands acquisition from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; if enacted into law, H. R. 4646 would allow these industries to continue operations by permitting the exchange of federally owned lands in the same community area for the private lands taken by the Federal Government.

Its enactment would not require any additional expenditure by the United States.

The Departments of Interior and Agriculture worked with the committee and the sponsor in developing this bill. The reports of those agencies are included in our report and supplemental report to the Speaker. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of the Interior report to our committee; Budget was unable to advise as to the relationship of this legislation to the program of the President.

We do not have many of those kind of operations in Montana, we do not have them very often in the Northern States or in the Eastern States. This bill is particularly concerned with the Southern States, especially where the pulp industry and similar industries are set up with a community around them, to carry on an operation that would be continuous over the years and not have a hit-and-go proposition, leaving the community stranded.

Here is a bill that has been written with the intent and the purpose of sustaining the economic life of small communities. It will not harm any of the national parks, monuments, or similar areas. Here is an opportunity, I think, to do a service for those communities in the South where they have established themselves around a timber operation on a long time sustained yield basis.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand it, the bill would only apply where there where like lands in that neighborhood; is that correct?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. "Neighborhood" is not the technical word used. It is "community." What would the gentleman construe the word "community" as meaning? In other words, put it in the matter of miles.

Mr. D'EWART. It would be hard to put it in miles. It is more a question of transportation. If you set up a pulp mill or sawmill operation it is a question of how far you can transport the timber economically to that community to process. It is not a question of miles; it is a question of transportation.

Mr. COLMER. Then it is conceivable that this could apply in a radius of 100 miles?

Mr. D'EWART. I do not know of any place where they are transporting logs that far.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I believe the language speaks for itself. The language in the bill is "in the same community area" which I believe is pretty clear in referring to the immediate vicinity of the processing operation, which would preclude any operation of a thousand miles.

Mr. COLMER. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, the author of the bill, what his definition would be then of how far they could go? That is still pretty general. You are talking about a community area. Would it be considered feasible or practical to go 100 miles?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It might in some communities or in some regions, but it would have to be determined by the agency having jurisdiction over the lands concerned. It would be easy for the Forest Service to say, "No, the lands that are suggested to be exchanged are not considered by us to be in the community area where there might be the request for the transfer."

Mr. COLMER. Then I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to this fact: I recall on one occasion when it was considered feasible and economical for the lumber people in the State of Mississippi, my State, to transport redwood timber from the gentleman's State of Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That, I might say, was the very reason why the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when this bill was under consideration in committee, added the words "in the community area," because that very point was raised that the gentleman is now making. That language was inserted in the bill in the committee amendment for that purpose, putting it in the same community area, which would preclude any such operation as described by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. If I may say one other thing, the thing that really concerns me about this matter—and, of course, I am a private enterpriser—but the thing that concerns me about it is the possible abuse in the administration of it. I do not want to see anything opened up here whereby we might get the wrong kind of administrator in there that will go a long way toward destroying our national forests.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to say in answer to that, before any of this trading can be done, there must be a public hearing, and it must be found to be in the public interest, and it must be approved by the Secretary.

Mr. COLMER. Who is going to determine what is in the public interest?

Mr. D'EWART. The Secretary.

Mr. COLMER. The Secretary?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Well, I get back to my point: It is conceivable that you might have some bad administration there.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I might say, in further discussion of that point, and it is an important point, I am one who believes we must pass laws that are, as Jefferson would say, binding the individuals with chains. I do not think we should pass a law because of the presence in office of some particular individual as administrator, so I am entirely in accord with the gentleman's point of view.

I believe, however, that the language of this bill so safeguards the public property that even a bad administrator would have difficulty in doing something contrary to the public interest, because anybody who seeks to have the right conferred by this bill must clearly demonstrate that he is operating a sustained-yield unit; he must clearly demonstrate that the land proposed to be taken by the Government seriously damages his business. He must show all those things before he is even eligible and even then the administrative agency can fall back and say, "No; we do not consider this is in the public interest." Of course, then the man has the right to appeal to the courts. In my opinion, whatever it is worth, I think that the bill has ample safeguards.

Mr. COLMER. If my friend will bear with me for this final observation, and I will desist, if you confine this to the area, I do not think you are going to get very far with your bill. If you confine it to that area and it is honestly administered, of course, we have a reason to believe it will be. It is not going to be very effective in very many fields.

Mr. D'EWART. When there are public hearings before action is taken, then good will and intent could be determined.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. In the gentleman's district and in my district you are familiar with the pulpwood operation where the pulpwood is cut and shipped to Wisconsin pulp mills. Now, suppose land is taken in that immediate area where the wood is being shipped to Wisconsin?

Mr. D'EWART. I would say to the gentleman, and I think he knows very well, that there is no privately owned sustained-yield unit in Montana.

Mr. METCALF. There is no sustained-yield unit under Public Law 273 in the whole United States, but according to the Forest Service there are 5 to 10 privately owned sustained-yield units on the branch of the Columbia River in Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Not on privately owned land.

Mr. METCALF. On privately owned land; yes. I am talking about that pulpwood operation which is on privately and publicly owned land. Suppose some of the private land is taken and it is deemed to be a sustained-yield unit. Because it is shipped to Wisconsin it would be under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. D'EWART. I know of no such instance in Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I am talking about the operation up there near White Sulphur Springs where the pulp is shipped to Wisconsin.

Mr. D'EWART. There is not a sustained-yield unit in that area.

Mr. METCALF. Suppose there were one?

Mr. D'EWART. There is none. Certainly that does not involve a community, a sustained unit such as is proposed in this bill.

Mr. METCALF. The community is not hurt from it either way under the bill. I will say to the gentleman there are sustained-yield units in Montana that would come under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. D'EWART. We have one in the Libby area. It is largely Federal property. There is another large sustained-yield unit in northern California. We have a few of those in the Northern States. I know of none in my district, not a single one, and two-thirds of the State of Montana happens to be in my district.

Mr. METCALF. Most of the forest happens to be in my district.

Mr. D'EWART. We have large forests in eastern Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I concede that.

I want to bring up another point: The committee amendment says there shall be an advisory public hearing. What is the gentleman's construction of that? That seems to me to be not binding on the Department.

Mr. D'EWART. I think so. I think the final decision is left to the Secretary as to whether it is in the public interest. He can call a public hearing, and the proponents and opponents of the exchange can appear and advise the Secretary at that hearing, but the decision is left to the Secretary as to whether or not it is in the public interest. I think that is where it should be.

Mr. METCALF. I concede that. Does the gentleman think the Secretary could transfer this land without a public hearing, or does he construe the language of the amendment to mean that this advisory public hearing has to be held?

Mr. D'EWART. I would say that the public hearing should be held. There is interest on both sides and the question should be thoroughly aired before such an exchange is made.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If I may interject at that point, there would be many instances where application would be made by an owner of land to take advantage of the provisions of this bill, which application would on the face of it be turned down. The language of that amendment was made to read "may without a public hearing" to relieve the necessity and cost of holding public hearings in those cases which were obviously not going to be granted. The Forest Service or any other agency will of course hold public hearings on any application that is apparently eligible. It was merely to save time, trouble, and expense that that provision was made permissive instead of mandatory.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The word "may" is in there instead of "shall." All you would have to do would be to say that "there shall be a public hearing before any transfer takes place." Therefore, if the transfer were turned down you would not have to have a public hearing.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That could be, but my judgment is that the language as it now reads will cause public hearings to be held in all cases where there is consideration of a transfer.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would be hesitant to speak on this matter which directly affects the people in my district, particularly the large timber landowners who stand to benefit greatly by this legislation, were I not moved by a sincere compulsion to outline the facts and figures pertaining to this proposed legislation, called by

some as the first step toward the spoliation of our great national forests, a timber reserve for this Nation.

Concisely, the problem is this: Shall we institute a Government policy of trading or swapping land needed for public use, highways, rights of way, damsites, atomic-energy centers, jet-airplane fields, military camps, and so forth, for our well developed and carefully guarded national forest lands, often many times more valuable per acre than the land to be gained by the United States. The Government now is ready and willing to pay fair prices for this land.

The big timber owners of this country are for this legislation. They say it is only fair and that they only want land for land, that it will close their sawmills unless they are given an opportunity to maintain their extensive timber holdings, but the fact is that private loggers and sawmills now cut every board foot of national forest timber.

A. Cite 34 big sales in Texas of over $5,000 each.

B. Cite 10-year contract for 273,000 cords of pulpwood.

C. Cite new contract application for 10 million board feet annual yield, at noncompetive aid.

Private millowners now cut all the timber. This bill will not grow any new trees, it will not create one board foot of timber and will but transfer the title of national forest lands to private owners.

Bill says "sustained yield"—if seriously interferes—this calls for substantial cuts every year. A small timber man does not have a sustained cut, he does not have enough trees maturing every year to cut. Sustained yield may mean stumps or cleared land in the first stages ready for planting, or it may mean 10-year-old pines, ready for thinning and pulpwood taking, or it may mean 20-year-old trees, beginning to mature. Almost any land in a big holding can fit into some stage of a sustained-yield program.

But neither small farmers nor big farmers—no farmers can qualify. No cotton farmers, no corn farmers, no vegetable growers, not a single homesteader who might have lived there 100 years can qualify. Not one small timber owner can qualify. This bill excludes everyone except large timberland owners. I cannot and be honest, fail to point this out to you as conscientious Americans, Democrat and Republican alike.

This will ruin and eliminate in every district in which it takes place the scores of small sawmills, independent loggers, and their employees of an opportunity to earn a living. They now can bid for national-forest timber under sealed bids. They got 360 in 1953 in Texas. Small loggers, some with good equipment and scores of men; some old nesters who cut pulpwood alone and hauled it out by mule. When transferred to the private owners they will be eliminated because these small operators cannot buy large tracts of land.

This bill fails to bring up a rather important point: Fabulous oil potentials. They are developing oil farther and farther up into and around these national forests and on this forest land the mineral rights are worth many millions. No protections lie in this bill for the United States. The land purchases in 1934 and 1935 provided for 25-, 30-, 40-, and 50-year reservations, at the conclusion of which times the minerals revert to the owners of the surface. It would be a splendid business program to buy land at its timber value and in addition get the oil potential forever. I do not chide these timber folks, but I do apologize for not originally appearing before the committee and bringing these facts to light. After the hearings I read the testimony and none of these facts were mentioned. This bill gives away precious rights of the American people—rights which I think American Congressmen believe should be safeguarded and preserved.

This bill transfers national forest land now operated for multiple use—maximum use of our natural resources—such as watershed protection, recreation—fishing and hunting, picnicking—grazing and timber growing to a single use, timber production. Private owners fence and post their land as they are certainly entitled to do, but with major holders owning hundreds of thousands of acres of land in my district the people will have no place to hunt, fish, camp, picnic.

There is no requirement in the bill relative to future protection, management, or production from the federally owned forest land once it is transferred to private ownership. Land dedicated to permanent good management would be transferred to land whose future management is dependent on the whim of the immediate owner.

The 658,000 acres represents four-tenths of 1 percent of the land area of Texas or 6 percent of east Texas forest lands. Ninety percent of this land was purchased from 11 large land owners in about 1934 at an average cost of $4.63 per acre after most of it had been clear-cut—no seed trees, just stumps. It was not worth any more than that then, but now it has been developed into valuable timber stands.

Taxes—a sore subject at best, but essential to our National Government and essential to the wonderful east Texas counties I represent—is another factor. The national forests pay 25 percent of their gross sales to the counties in which the land is located. Half goes to roads and half to schools. It virtually supports many an east Texas county. The forest also spends another 10 percent of the gross sales on access roads which also benefit the communities in which they are located. Taxwise the facts are:

The present average tax per acre in the 11 counties in which there is national forest land is approximately 20 cents per acre. The rate of return from the Texas national forests 25 percent refund to these same counties is more than 4 times the tax, or 88 cents per acre. September 25, 1953, the United States mailed a check to the State treasurer of Texas for pro rata payment to these counties for $575,317.89. They need it badly for schools and roads.

SUMMATION

There is no protection of the American public in this bill. It provides for "similar and suitable federally owned lands" to be exchanged. If the land is growing trees and one tract has 4-inch saplings and the other 12-inch saw logs—they are similar—both grow trees—pine trees. Any valuation should be determined by the national forest which inventory every tree and tract; the values under this bill can be fixed by negotiation or condemnation proceedings. The national forest "shall participate." I participated in a fight once with a left-handed boxer who knocked me down five times—sure I participated. The sugar coating is "An advisory public hearing may be held" to determine, first, a sustained yield; second, interference with existing processing, substantial or serious—not whether it will interfere with national forest sustained yield, research, watershed protection, recreational uses, grazing uses, special uses, fire protection, roads; third, in public interest.

Gentlemen, despite heavy political pressure to support this legislation, I cannot vote for this first step toward the destruction of our national forests and little independent sawmill operators and will recommend it be recommitted for further study and consideration.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Atlanta, Ga., February 2, 1954.

HON. JACK B. BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is to advise you that I have received, through Supervisor Rasor, an application for the establishment of a sustained yield unit under the provisions of section 3 of the Sustained Yield Act of March 29, 1944. The application was signed by O. T. Dinkins, Stinson Huston, and B. H. Cauthon, Jr., as representatives of the subscribers and organizers of a new corporation for the purpose of buying and continuing the operation of the Trinity mill of Southland Paper Mills, Inc. It is proposed (1) that the sustained yield unit consist of national forest land in either the Sam Houston or Davy Crockett National Forest, or both, such as will yield 10 million feet of timber annually; (2) that the sale of this timber be made to the new corporation without competitive bidding.

The application has been received during the absence of Mr. Chas. A. Connaughton, regional forester, from this office. No immediate action on the application will be taken until Mr. Connaughton has had the opportunity to study it.

Very sincerely yours,

CHAS. A. CONNAUGHTON,
Regional Forester.
By REZIN E. PIDGEON, *Acting.*

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

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Even if they did bring about this exchange of land, what guaranty have you from any operator that he is going to continue to operate this particular acreage on a consistent yield basis over the next 75 or 100 years?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. None whatsoever. I thank the gentleman very much, and I will cover that in my statement.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. The present law provides that in any transfer from the Federal Government the mineral rights must be reserved. That is existing law.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. That is a splendid law. Does it also provide that the Federal Government will have the right of ingress and egress; will not have to pay damages for a right-of-way, and the slush pits and roads and other necessities for the development of oil?

Mr. D'EWART. Is the gentleman speaking of private land or public land?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. If they take the national forest and give it to somebody else, you reserve the mineral rights. Would they reserve the full rights to exploit those minerals without paying excessive damages?

Mr. D'EWART. This bill provides that the trade must be made in the public interest. The Secretary of the Interior would protect the public interest.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. This bill does not seem to provide that. It provides that an advisory group may be called together. They will discuss these three categories, whether there is a sustained yield, whether it will be materially affected, whether it is in the public interest or not. It does not point out that it may be dangerous to our national forests.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In the event there is any controversy involved, then the final decision is left to the local courts; to the local courts. They determine what shall or shall not be done.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. It is also true that the negotiations to be made are to be made by the agency which desires control of this land. If the Corps of Engineers want to take some land, they will make the negotiations. If I am going to deal with your property, I am pretty easy to deal with; but you might, on the other hand, complain bitterly.

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

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute so that the gentleman from Oregon may reply to a question.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I just wanted to clear up a statement made by the gentleman. It is true that the language of the bill as now written does not in the first paragraph contain the term "in the public interest." But in an amendment which will be offered and undoubtedly approved, that is made one of the conditions of qualification for the transfer; that is, that the public interest shall be protected. So that that term will be in the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, because it strikes at the heart of the program for the preservation of our great natural resources. I am not satisfied that the time has come when we can turn those resources loose. Laws to do this must receive the greatest scrutiny and are not justified unless there is substantial and good reasons for their passage. I do not believe that this bill has been given a proper hearing. Sportsmen, conservation organizations, and others have protested to me that they did not have an opportunity to be heard on it, and I think they have a right to be heard.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I have not time to yield.

Mr. Chairman, remember that once standing timber is dissipated it takes many human lifetime generations before it can replace itself. Our forests have been ruthlessly cut over. The theory of the sustained yield is comparatively new, and it takes a long time when measured in the life of trees.

The forests, remember, are not valuable for the trees only; the forest houses our wildlife and makes possible our watersheds. The forests are not the exclusive right of timber operators, cattle grazers, and other people who use them for profit; they are part of the great natural heritage of this country; they are the property of the city dweller who seeks recreation in them. They are indispensable to the people of this country. Their value cannot be measured in today's values.

All of us have seen lands ruined for quick profits. I could show you mining lands in California ruined for all time and could show you overgrazed lands throughout the country that have been destroyed and cannot be replaced; and I caution that we go slow on legislation of this type. It must be thoroughly analyzed and all people concerned have had a chance to be heard on it. This has not been the case.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to correct the gentleman from California. He said the bill did not have a thorough hearing. I want him to listen to this.

The bill was introduced on April 13 last year. It had a hearing on June 25, July 14 and July 15. These were open public hearings, well advertised and no one was denied the opportunity of being heard. So as chairman of the full committee I resent very much the gentleman's implication that opportunity was not given, that this was sort of a secret operation that was carried out, because the record does not bear the gentleman out.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] an additional 8 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about the history of the acquisition of forestry lands during the depression. I supported the measure under which the Government acquired approximately 35 million acres of land. I know the reason for that acquisition.

In the first place, we had a very severe depression and a number of the timber companies were in dire straits. In the second place, we wanted to provide work under the CCC program of that time and reforest cut over lands. The Government bought this land in East Texas for approximately $3.75 an acre. It has reforested the land, and it has done a good job of reforesting. It owns large acreage in the section of the State in which I live.

In the town of Lufkin we are dependent almost wholly upon the manufacture of wood products. We have a paper mill, which employs directly and indirectly 1,500 people. We have some sawmills which employ a thousand or more people. We have very little farming. So that directly and indirectly the great majority of the people in the area in which I live depend upon the industries that are engaged in the manufacture of wood products.

In that area we have a project which has been approved by the Congress known as the McGee Bend project and the Rockland Dam project which contemplate the acquisition of several hundred thousand acres of land. At present the Government of the United States owns a sizable portion of East Texas. Under these projects which the Congress has already approved it will enlarge greatly its holdings.

It is essential to the industries in my area that they have an adequate reserve of pulp wood and of timber. It is vital to their operation. They have a reserve at present which is certainly not in excess of their needs, and in the event they expand, which we hope they will, they will need an additional reserve. It seems to me that if the Government is going to acquire additional land there is not anything unfair in permitting those industries which are dependent upon these reserves to receive in exchange for this additional land which we propose to take from them a part of that land which the Government has acquired in East Texas. These industries have a record of sustained yield and they have for many years conserved their timber.

What is wrong with that? The Federal Government already owns 24 percent of the land area of the United States. We acquired 35 million acres from 1938 to 1953 for our forestry program and 3 or 4 million additional acres for our atomic energy program.

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

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

Mr. ENGLE. It is just a proposition, is it not, of giving a man land for land instead of cash for land?

Mr. DIES. What is wrong with the idea that private people ought to own land? Have we come to the time that we subscribe to the theory that the Government ought to own the land of this Nation. We already own 24 percent. How far do you propose to go? Both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party subscribe to the principle of private enterprise. There never has been a platform adopted by either party in which we have not reaffirmed our faith in the private enterprise system.

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

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not also true that both parties take the attitude that the natural resources of this country basically belong to the people of our country?

Mr. DIES. No one is seeking to acquire natural resources. The Government need not lose one acre of this land if it quits acquiring land for all conceivable purposes. I grant you that sometimes those purposes are wise, but the gentleman knows that we have acquired land all over this country for sites, land that we no longer use, and they are actually giving away some of that land.

How much does this mean? Let us use a little common sense about it.

In the area where I live, in Lufkin, all of these companies have approximately 50,000 or 75,000 acres that will be taken from them by this huge reservoir of water. It will not be a drop in the bucket so far as the national forestry domain is concerned. All over the United States there will be a very small percentage of land to exchange unless you intend to move in the direction of acquiring the rest of the land of this country.

Now I will tell you this: I am not ashamed to believe in the virtue of private enterprise. I would rather have the citizens and the industries of this country own the land than to have the Government of the United States own the land. I recognize, of course, that the Government must acquire and own land for necessary and legitimate purposes. There was a time, I grant you, when the companies disregarded sound forestry practices. I remember when I was a boy and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. LONG] remembers the time, when the sawmills literally destroyed our timber reserves. It was a ruthless age. But, I can tell you that for the past 20 to 25 years, to my knowledge, the industries in my area have been practicing sound forestry principles. And, they have to do it. It is in their interest to do it. Unless they do, they cannot maintain their great industries, and when I say "great" I do not mean compared with the kind of industries that you have in the East because actually they are very small in comparison to what we see in New York and other areas. But, in our area they are vital to our economy and the majority of our people who must make a living. Everybody profits from it. This is not just for the benefit of a few sawmills or papermills. How much of the money that comes from timber do you suppose goes to the laboring people and the business people in my area? A sizable portion of it. They are as interested as are the industries because if the industries have an adequate reserve of timber and pulpwood it means that they are employed, and that they get a large share of the earnings.

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

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to my very distinguished friend tell about how the Government went into Texas and developed these various areas that were complementary to the production of enterprise and employment of people.

Mr. DIES. Now, what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GAVIN. And creating prosperity. The facts are, you do not have to take this project down there. It is a new flood control reservoir project. If it is going to jeopardize those areas and industries, it is not necessary for you to accept it. You want dams, you want reservoirs, you want to develop hydroelectric power; you want everything.

Mr. DIES. In that respect are we any different from the district that the gentleman represents?

Mr. GAVIN. So you want to take more Government land to rehabilitate and protect that which you have already developed. I just wonder where we are going to end up.

Mr. DIES. That is not the point. The point is that this Federal Government now owns 455,147,000 acres of land in the United States. You own 24 percent of the land of this country. Are we going to continue until finally we get 100 percent? If we do, then we become a socialistic economy.

Mr. GAVIN. Oh, no.

Mr. DIES. No one wants to wreck the national forestry program. The truth is this involves but a small fraction of the total acreage of our Government, and there is certainly every safeguard imaginable in this bill.

When you go into Federal court, and I have been in Federal courts representing people on the condemnation of land, I can assure you that you do not get any big bonus when you get through. You are lucky if you can get a reasonable value for your land. You have your courts to safeguard the interests of the United States. You have the Secretary of the Interior. The owners of private land condemned will not get any land in exchange unless they show that the acquisition by the Government will cripple the operation of their industries. So that here is every possible safeguard. There are some of us who pay lip service to private enterprise, but when it comes to the showdown we find every conceivable objection to any program which is designed to encourage and sustain private enterprise but not to destroy the public domain, not to diminish it, because the Government is getting land for land—the land they are going to acquire is valuable land. The owners do not want to exchange that land or to sell it. They would be happy to keep their present reserves. But to represent this as an effort by the sawmills or industry to grab public land is simply a misrepresentation. That is not true. They are trying to preserve what they now have so as to insure future operation. The people who are equally interested in this operation in my area are the working people, the merchants, the farmers, and everybody else and not alone the sawmills and paper mills. We have individuals who practice sustained yield, and I am advised that they will be eligible to relief under this bill.

Suppose I have 200 acres in the vicinity and the Government takes it, and I have been selling timber and pulp on a sustained-yield basis to the paper mills under this program, if they take my land from me, I can say, "All right, give me land of equal value in place of it." You cannot buy any more land in our country unless you pay considerably more than the courts will award you in a condemnation proceeding.

This not only protects the sawmills and the paper mills but it protects individuals who have land in the area and who have been selling their timber on a sustained-yield-unit basis.

So I would think that there is nothing vicious in this proposal or nothing unfair in it. It simply recognizes that if you are going to continue to acquire private land in the future the owner who loses his land can acquire public land under some circumstances if it is in the public interest. The man whose land is taken from him for a reservoir, which may not benefit him at all, may receive land of equal value where it is essential to the operation of an industry.

For instance, the reservoir we are going to build at McGee Bend, while it will help to some extent various sections of east Texas, will help chiefly the great industries in Jefferson County. That is fine, they need water. But the man whose land is taken may get no benefit whatever from it. All you are saying under this bill is that if you take an acre of my land you will give me back an acre if it is of equal value if I can comply with this act, and if the Secretary of the Interior finds it is in the public interest and if the court and the jury selected from among my fellow citizens find that the transaction is fair and in the interests of the country. What is wrong about that?

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

THE GOVERNMENT OWNS TOO MUCH LAND

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I favor this bill. I favor it because, like my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], I believe in private enterprise.

I favor this bill, also, because I believe that Congress sometime must take action to halt this month after month and year after year, grabbing of more and more land from private owners to place it under Government ownership and control.

Of the entire land area of the 48 States 23.89 percent is owned, controlled, managed, and administered by the Federal Government.

The total land area of these 48 States is 2,977,138 square miles. Of this, the Federal Government owns 711,166 square miles, or 455,146,725 acres. These Federal landholdings are the equivalent of more than 3 acres for every man, woman, and child in the United States. And these figures, mind you, do not include the additional enormous landholdings of the Federal Government in Alaska, Hawaii, and elsewhere outside continental United States.

Yet, despite the almost incalculable size of the present enormous landholdings of the Federal Government, the bureaucrats of the various agencies, like

Alexander the Great, constantly scheme to acquire new and additional territory.

They come before Congress with pleas that they need money to purchase additional property to "square up" the lands they now control in order to make these holdings simpler of administration. These bureaucrats always, somehow, profess they can simplify their management problems if they only can get more land under their control. They never can see that their problems would be lessened and simplified if they disgorged themselves of part of the vast empires over which they now hold dominion.

THE FEDERAL EMPIRE

The enormous size of the 711,000 square miles or more than 455 million acres of landed areas now under Federal ownership is so vast as to be beyond the capacity of the human mind to visualize or to comprehend.

The 711,000 square miles of lands now owned by the Federal Government and controlled by its bureaucrats is a domain that is 2½ times the size of Texas, or the equivalent to 10 States of Washington.

The land our Federal Government now owns in the 48 States and which our bureaucrats manage is equal to the combined total area of 11 of our Eastern States—is equal to the combined area of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland, with the District of Columbia thrown in to boot.

MANY AGENCIES INVOLVED

More than 40 agencies are involved in the management of these enormous landholdings of the Federal Government.

For example, we have, according to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], 16 different agencies engaged in managing our federally owned timberlands.

Some may dispute the old saying that too many cooks spoil the broth, but none can deny that 16 cooks doing the job that 1 or 2 should do makes the dinner more expensive. We ought not to have 16 sets of bureaucrats from 16 different agencies when 1, 2, or 3 agencies could do the job much better, more efficiently, and at less cost.

WESTERN STATES HARD HIT

This great ownership of lands by the Federal Government works a great hardship on the Western States.

Of all the landed area of the 10 Western States more than 54 percent is in Federal ownership. In Washington State, 34.90 percent of all the land of that State is federally owned. In Oregon, 52.72 percent is owned by the Federal Government; in California, 45.74; in Arizona, 69.43; in New Mexico, 45.62; in Nevada, 84.71; in Idaho, 64.69; in Montana, 36.54; in Utah, 71.33, and Colorado, 37.35 percent is federally owned.

The opposition to this bill is making a mountain out of a molehill. There are few, very few, privately owned sustained timber units. Not any great amount of land will be affected.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I call to the attention of the gentleman that even though there are these big holdings, as the gentleman says, of Government land in Washington and Oregon, and these other States in the great northwest, during the last 20 years you have made most remarkable strides, more so than any of the other States in the Union have made. So it certainly has not been a detriment to you people in the Northwest that the Government has had any of this property. You refer to it as though it were a detriment and that it was holding back the development and expansion of the great Northwest. I cannot see where it has done any particular damage to any of the States in the Northwest.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Maintenance of the sustained-yield principle of logging is essential to perpetuating our timber supply. Loggers and timber owners ought to be encouraged to practice sustained-yield logging in order that we may have a perpetual timber supply. They should not be discouraged from practicing sustained yield.

This bill will encourage loggers and timber owners to practice sustained yield on their private holdings. If this bill is not enacted they will be discouraged from sustained-yield operations.

Sustained yield should be encouraged because it tends to assure a long range, perpetual supply of timber. We need great amounts of timber now and, due to our growing population, will require even more timber in the future than we now possess.

If the Federal Government takes a tract of timber away from a private logger for some public purpose it should give him other equally good nearby timber, as this bill proposes, to compensate him for the timber, the Federal Government took away from him; that is if the private owner is operating on the sustained-yield principle. If the Federal Government takes away logged land from the owner for Federal purposes then the Government should give him an equal amount of nearby logged land so that the owner may employ it for growing more timber, provided the logger has a sustained-yield operation.

This, in my opinion, is a good bill. It serves the interest of the public by assuring a long-range supply of timber. I hope the House will pass it.

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

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned over the contents of this proposed legislation. In the State of West Virginia we have two huge national forests, the Monongahela forest stretching from the Pennsylvania border almost to the borders of Ohio and Kentucky; and the George Washington National Forest, partly in Virginia and partly in the State of West Virginia.

We have been nurturing these national forests along for better than 50 years. Over those years the sportsmen of West Virginia have advanced money to the Government to buy up small tracts of individually owned land within the forest area so as to remove fire hazards and other such acivities within the national forests.

Now along comes this proposition, and I should like to say to you that West Virginia and the Appalachian area contain the greatest potential power sites of eastern United States. There are going to be flood control dams and power dams built. This issue is going to come up, when you are going to replace property you take from those power dams in the national forests. You are going to give them not only the right to cut the timber, but you are going to give them the right to the land. The first thing they will do will be to dispose of it to somebody to build a lake, and they will open up the national forests to recreation. Then you will treble and quadruple your fire hazards by letting them get into your national forests.

I sincerely hope that we will not be misled by this kind of legislation purely and simply in the interests of private capital and against public welfare.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, it has been implied here that there is not much at stake in the legislation under consideration and that it was a simple matter of fair play involved. But let me say to the House that there is a principle involved that will take more than a few hours this afternoon to resolve.

The Department of Agriculture stated it when it pointed out the bill "raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of money, for necessary Government acquisition of private property."

How can we expect to meet this question now when the House has had so little time to consider in greater detail the issue and principle involved?

Mr. Chairman, I think those of us who are opposing H. R. 4646 are sympathetic with the situation in which the large lumber organizations, which would benefit from the provisions of the legislation, find themselves. Most certainly any group suffering damage from Government work projects are entitled to redress, and I know that it is on this premise that this bill was submitted for consideration.

But it poses a considerable problem. It offers a solution only for a special group. It raises an important question of policy and precedent in a matter of Government compensation to private owners for necessary Government acquisition of private property. Few segments of our society are free from such possible Government acquisition, but in this bill consideration is given to only one group.

This is not merely my analysis of the bill; the Department of Agriculture itself, although it does not officially now express an opinion as to whether H. R. 4646 should be enacted, as late as February 10, 1954, in a communication to the Wilderness Society, stated:

The Department feels that the bill raises an important question of policy and precedent as to whether the Government should compensate private owners in kind, in lieu of

money, for necessary Government acquisition of private property. Such a question would affect several departments in addition to the Department of Agriculture, and is, we believe, a matter for congressional decision.

In considering such an important matter, the Congress should not limit its attention to a special group. What about the home owners, the filling station owners, the livestock raisers, the farmers, the businessmen, and any number of different groups who might in the future be forced to relocate because of some Government public work projects—would they not also be entitled to the same consideration as these few lumbermen? Last year, when it appeared an effort would be made to secure enactment of H. R. 4646, I pointed out its many faults in a statement which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 11, 1953. There were so many that it would take much more time than I have here today to enumerate them. Yet at that time the inference was made to the Congress that this was an unimportant bill and did not require too much of the time of the House.

I might point out that the bill since has been amended, but with all its amendments, the basic principle on which it was founded still makes it unwise legislation. After my statement appeared in the RECORD last year, I received a communication from the Honorable Lyle F. Watts, of Portland, Oreg., who from 1943 to June 30, 1952, was the chief of the United States Forest Service. Mr. Watts informed me that he had studied H. R. 4646 and prepared his own analysis, a copy of which he sent to me. Pertinent in this analysis was his contention that the bill is definitely special-privilege legislation on several counts. He outlined these counts as follows:

First. It applies only to those timber companies which are following sustained yield and operate their own manufacturing plants. Thus, the private owner who elects to sell his logs in the open market instead of operating a manufacturing plant is left out.

Second. It is a big-industry bill. Regardless of how good forestry a small owner practices, few if any of them can be said to be on sustained yield. Sustained yield requires substantially equal cuts each year. It is not feasible for a small owner to follow this practice. Thus it is a big man's bill.

Third. It gives special consideration to timberland owners. If such consideration is justified for well-managed timberland it is equally desirable for well-managed rangeland. I see no reason why it should not be as logical to apply the principle to well-managed rangeland in Wyoming, Colorado, or Arizona as to well-managed timberland in Texas, Oregon, or Montana. Certainly, if such a law passes as applied to timberland one might expect that in a few years it would be broadened to apply to rangeland. You see, well-managed rangeland, in large or small ownership, is really on sustained yield.

Fourth. If such consideration is given to owners of well-managed timber and rangeland, it should apply to such uses as dude ranches, resorts, and hunting lodges. These lands are on sustained yield.

Fifth. Thus, it seems clear that H. R. 4646 is truly a special-privilege bill. It will be made worse by broadening the present wording to include all types of land.

Mr. Watts further pointed out that H. R. 4646 gives no protection to the public as regards character and location of the lands to be selected in lieu of the private land taken by the Government. He pointed out:

First. The land-management agency whose land is taken has no voice in regard to the land selected.

Second. The area selected might well destroy a national forest management plan for a unit aimed to support a community or several small mills.

Third. There is no protection against a company so selecting land as to practically get control of a much larger area of Government timber.

Fourth. There is no protection against the selection of the entire shore line of a new, or old, reservoir and thus block higher public use such as public recreation.

Fifth. There is no protection against selection of areas critically needed as spring or winter range for big game.

Sixth. Thus, the removal of land from public ownership may well do more harm to the interest of all the people than it benefits the few.

Mr. Watts, former Chief of the United States Forest Service, definitely states that this is bad legislation, and I feel that the United States Forest Service shares his personal view. It is true that H. R. 4646 has been amended since last year, and while these amendments would seem to indicate protection for the public interests of the national forest, let me warn the Congress that they leave a big loophole, and through this loophole a few big corporations that own and operate vast acreages of timberland in the West and South can get what they have wanted all the time.

The major fault of this bill is still there. It is special-interest legislation. It has set a dangerous precedent in the management of public land under the jurisdiction of Federal Government.

The history of H. R. 4646 is a peculiar one. The bill cannot possibly benefit more than a handful of big timber operators. These are the few big operators who own lands in the way of authorized flood control, power, and irrigation reservoirs. Perhaps because they are big and can exercise influence far out of proportion to their numbers, they seek to be treated as a privileged class.

When a reservoir or other Federal project comes to a community, the little fellows who do not own enough timber to operate on what is considered a sustained-yield basis will have to sell out at a fairly appraised value. So will the farmers, the merchants, the hotel operators, the service station operators, and those whose homes are in the valley to be flooded.

But under this bill a handful of big operators, big wood-using corporations, would have a special privilege. They would be given in exchange for their lands a portion of the national forest which had been reserved to the people for a variety of important public uses.

Both the power of this little group of operators and the methods they have used in pushing this bill are alarming, Mr. Chairman.

Their persuasiveness even influenced the Department of Agriculture which yielded to their special brand of pressure and withdrew an unfavorable report on this bill, a report which honestly pointed out the faults of the bill. They effectively gagged the United States Forest Service which drafted the original unfavorable report.

The Forest Service is fully aware of the dangers inherent in this legislation. They recognize a special interest purpose, but they cannot speak up. They have their orders from the top echelon in the Department of Agriculture, which in this particular matter acts on the advice of the National Association of Lumber Manufacturers.

They were powerful enough, also, to get a favorable report on the bill from the Department of Interior. But that is not so surprising. The Department of Interior, whose policies are supposed to reflect conservation principles, is becoming noted for its tendency to look the other way when raids are mounted on national resources of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the loophole which keeps this bill a special interest device is found in the proviso for advance public hearings. In the case of a transfer of national-forest land under this administration, the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service may hold a public hearing on the validity of the claim of sustained-yield operation, on the economic effects of the Federal acquisition, and on the question of whether or not the transfer of national-forest land to private ownership would be in the public interest. This sounds good, to be sure, but who finally decides whether or not the transfer would be in the public interest? Not the Forest Service. No; it can exercise absolutely no veto power under the provisions of this bill as amended. The final decision would be made by the land-taking agency; usually this would be the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

There is the loophole, Mr. Chairman. It is wide enough to drive a sawmill through crossways. And the word "participate" which the committee substituted for the word "cooperate" earlier in the amendment does not explain it away. That word gives the Forest Service no real authority, no veto power, not even a major voice in selecting public lands to be exchanged.

We have heard the charge made that the present national administration is inclined to cooperate with these special interest raids on our national resources. We hoped it was not true, the tidelands oil case to the contrary.

But, my colleagues, there is growing evidence that this is an administration bent on distributing our national resources to private interests. Most of the blessings are based on actions which do not come directly to the attention of Congress. They come around through

changes in policy here and there in the executive departments, in new interpretations of law, in new rulings for regulatory agencies such as the Federal Power Commission.

But, perhaps unfortunately for their causes, this little group of powerful timber operators had to come to Congress to get what they want. Mr. Chairman, if we had been awaiting evidence that special interests regard the present climate in Washington as favorable to giveaways, this is it.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, in my opinion, have yielded to a very persuasive group in this matter, but the Congress of the United States does not have to follow suit.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the dangers of this special privilege bill.

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

Mr. PRICE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman agree that where the Government can do it as a practical matter, there is no sound objection to compensating a man in kind when property is taken?

Mr. PRICE. I would say that we cannot resolve that question here this afternoon. I say I do not think we can definitely resolve that question in giving consideration to only one segment of the society. I cannot cover the full scope of that question in the few minutes allotted to me, and I do not think anybody in the House this afternoon can do so.

But I want to say that those who have opposed this bill on the floor this afternoon do not represent merely a few individual Members of Congress. There is a lot of opposition to this throughout the country.

I would like to read for the RECORD a list of organizations that are definitely opposed to this proposed legislation, and I would like to point out that these organizations are still opposed to this bill even though they are aware of the amendments which will be offered this afternoon.

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

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wish also to call attention to the fact that representatives of the Department of Agriculture stated that they have not discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget or other departments of the Government and, therefore, they thought it was appropriate to express an opinion on H. R. 4646, and as to whether it should be enacted.

Mr. PRICE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. I do not think the Department of Agriculture is actually for this bill; and I am certain in my own mind that the people who know most about this problem in the Forestry Service are not for it.

May I point out a list of the national organizations that are opposed to it:

Wildlife Management Institute.
National Parks Association.
Izaak Walton League.
The Wilderness Society.
Emergency Commission on Natural Resources.
National Wildlife Federation.
Independent Forest Farmers Association of America.
The National Audubon Society.
The Sierra Club.
The Nature Conservancy.
The Forest Conservation Society.
The Outdoor Writers Association of America.
Numerous State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues.

There has been an attempt to leave the impression here that there was no interest in this legislation, that there was no real opposition to it. I want to say that throughout the State of Illinois most sportsman's leagues I know of, every wildlife federation group in the State have been in contact with me in opposition to this legislation.

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

Mr. PRICE. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is it not true—at least it is my impression and I would like to have the gentleman speak to the point—that practically all that opposition arose as a result of its being the belief that this legislation would affect the national parks and national monuments?

Mr. PRICE. I would say to the gentleman that that first probably attracted more attention to the legislation; but as I pointed out in my remarks, these organizations are aware of the amendments that will be offered here this afternoon and are still insistent in their opposition to this legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this bill, H. R. 4646.

Previous speakers have pointed out very ably the defects in this proposed legislation. I wish only to summarize briefly the principal reasons why I feel that I must oppose it.

At the outset let me say that I believe it has been demonstrated by the previous debate that this proposed legislation by its very nature can benefit directly only a relatively small number of business concerns—that handful of large operators with large enough holdings to conduct sustained-yield operations.

I hold no prejudice against the large operator, nor against the small one. Both play an important part in our Nation's economy and in the orderly harvesting of our annual timber crop. I recognize the necessity and the importance of the sustained-yield programs by private companies; and I recognize that a successful sustained yield processing operation requires vast timber holdings. In my State, our principle timber crop is the Douglas-fir, which requires an 80-year cycle. You have to own a lot of land to sustain operation of a mill by logging only one-eightieth of that land each year. But when a bill is presented for my consideration which directly benefits only a small number of the largest concerns in the business, and which does so by turning over to them a preferential right to acquire valuable national forest holdings, I must ask myself, and ask myself again, is this legislation really "in the public interest." I feel that I was elected by the voters of my State not to stand at the door and hand out our valuable forest lands to every special group that comes along and makes out a case for preferential treatment, but rather to regard our Federal timberlands as a public trust, and to keep the door tightly closed unless it is conclusively in the public interest to open it. I do not wish to see this bill or any bill become the drum major at the head of a preference parade.

Where does the public interest really lie? First, it is well-known that our national forests—and I think it is admitted on all sides that practically all of the land that will be affected by this bill will come from our national forests—our national forests are presently devoted to many uses besides timber: watershed, grazing, recreation, and so forth. There is not a line in this bill which says that the large operator who acquires valuable timber land from the national forests shall grant grazing rights, shall allow recreational use, shall conduct subsequent logging operations with due regard to water run-off and soil conservation programs. The bill transfers to the large operator the valuable mineral rights below the ground as well as the timber above it. This bill takes land which is an integral part of a multiple-use program and confines it to one use, that of timber, to the exclusion of all the others. I question whether this meets the test of "the public interest."

Not only is there no protection of the other uses of this valuable natural resource, but there is no guarantee, once the land is given to the sustained yield operator, that it will continue to be utilized as part of a sustained yield operation. We all know the vagaries of any business enterprise, especially over an eighty-year span. Once acquired, this land might be denuded of its valuable timber, or it might be sold to another for the same purpose. Bankruptcy or reorganization might ensue, and the land forever lost to careful management policies. The committee in supporting its amendments rather weakly argues that this problem might properly be taken care of administratively by merely including a reservation in the deed of transfer. I am no lawyer, but as a matter of common sense I question whether the administrative agency would have this power unless the bill specifically creates it. Furthermore, as a matter of common sense, I think this question of future control over the land is important enough that Congress should spell it out in the act, and not leave it to the uncertainties of administrative discretion.

What protection does the bill afford to the sustained-yield operation now conducted by the Forest Service? Very little, that I can see. I do not see that adding the requirement that the transfer "shall be consistent with the public interests" means very much. In one sense, no transfer would be in the public interest, for in one sense it is in the public interest to keep all of this timberland under Federal jurisdiction. I do not feel that this is what the committee

means by the inclusion of that magical phrase. But if not, then where do you draw the line as to what the words mean in terms of protecting the existing sustained-yield operations by the Forest Service? Neither the committee nor the proposed bill tells us.

Much has been said about protecting the community which depends on the existing sustained-yield processing operation. But what of the small operator, the "gyppo" logger, who depends for his livelihood on the timberland which is given away? Again, the magic words give us no satisfactory guide.

One further fact about this legislation concerns me. Traditionally, under the constitutional mandate of due compensation, the Government has always paid cash when it takes private property for public use. I recognize that in many instances, if not all, property values exist which are not adequately compensated by money alone. But in the long run our time-honored system for compensating private property owners in money has proven to be the only workable one. This system is difficult enough to administer, but our difficulties would be compounded many times over if we started a system of compensation in kind. If we pass this bill today, we can expect that tomorrow the farmers will be at the door asking for farmland, the rancher for ranchland, the miner for similar and suitable mining rights—all from Federal holdings. If today we grant this special privilege to the sustained yield timber operator, can we tomorrow say "no" to the grazing operator who demands compensation in the form of grazing land from our public holdings? Or to the duckblind owner who wants to shoot his bird on a Federal pond? We must legislate for everybody, not for the few. It seems to me that once we start on a program of compensation in kind, it would not be long before our comprehensive public holdings would be emasculated by piecemeal grants—ostensibly in the public interest.

I think this bill sacrifices the multiple uses of our national forests at the altar of a single use—timber; and I come from an area where timber is king. I believe there are inadequate safeguards for the existing sustained-yield programs of our national forests and for the interests of the small logger. I am seriously concerned that by adopting the principle of compensation in kind we will establish a cumbersome, expensive, and even dangerous precedent. I do not want to start a preference parade. I urge, therefore, that this bill be defeated. I am not satisfied that this proposed legislation truly would serve the public—and not the private—interest.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In listening to the gentleman's remarks one might assume that everything done by the Government is good but probably everything done by private investors or private individuals is bad. I think it is pertinent to point out to the gentleman that the national forests are not being managed on a sustained yield basis. Only about two-thirds of the national forest area is actually under what might be called the sustained yield principle. I think it is unfair to assume that just because the land is in the ownership of the Federal Government it is being better managed than land in private hands, because the facts will not bear out that assumption.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to ask the question of any member of the committee who may choose to answer it for me. That is in relation to severance damages which is often part of the taking of land by the Government and the settlement therefor. What is the interpretation in this bill in relation to allowing severance damage on properties which are to be a part of the transaction under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. D'EWART. In answer to the question, the committee consulted with attorneys for the Department of Agriculture and attorneys for the Department of the Interior and we were informed that by using the phrase pro tanto, as shown on page 3, line 6, that would preclude severance damage.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I make further answer and say that the trading of land as set forth in the bill, under the protection as given in the bill, actually saves the Government money, because if industry in a community is ruined by the fact that the Government must of necessity take the bulk of the acreage of timber land from the industry, of course, severance damages which the gentleman refers to must be paid for in cash by the Government. That is a direct cost, a direct loss to the taxpayers of the country, whereas a simple exchange costs the Government nothing in the way of severance damages. I think that is a further excellent argument in favor of this legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill and I do so because of one fact. I believe that the gentleman who sponsored this legislation has done so with a very proper motive and in what he considers the best interests of the people whom he represents. However, I must disagree with him because I can find nowhere in our history where there has been such an exception made to the general condemnation rule. As you know, if the Federal Government condemns property, the general rule is that an amount of money is paid in damages.

I am afraid that the bill is making an exception not just for the timber industry, but only for a small group. And, I wish you would all note that everyone who has spoken in support of this bill has been very strong in specifying to the Members of the House that there are only a few people in this country or a few businesses that would be benefited by this bill, and therefore I do not believe that an exception to the rule, which would allow not just people engaged in the timber business, but that small group engaged in the timber business who are on a sustained-yield basis, who have a special privilege of being allowed to take from the national forests the acreage to replace the land taken by condemnation, is good.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. In answer to the point the gentleman just made, one public good to rise from this legislation is an incentive for more sustained-yield operation on private land. As I said earlier in the debate today, the greatest defect, the greatest danger to the wood supply of our Nation in the long run is the cut-and-run practice of private enterprise. If we can bring a few more people in so that they can qualify under this bill, the practice under sustained-yield will make progress.

I would like to give a citation about this being the first instance of giving something in kind, trading land in kind, and condemnation. I refer the gentleman to the act of June 20, 1938—52d United States Statutes at Large, page 804; title 33, United States Code Annotated, section 558b—and the act of August 11, 1939—53d United States Statutes at Large, page 1414; United States Code, section 558–1:

> These measures empower the Department of the Army, whenever appropriate in connection with any civil-works projects, to exchange Government-owned lands for privately owned lands. Furthermore, it has been long standing practice for the Federal forestry agencies to exchange Federal for private lands (or timber) and millions of acres have to date been involved in these transactions.

In the last 10 years the Forest Service has deeded over 500,000 acres.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will concede that the gentleman is correct. There has been a practice of exchanging public land for private lands, but in those cases, I believe without exception, you will find out they were trying to do what has been referred to of straightening out the various leases of the national forests. It has not been the general practice to exchange lands indiscriminately such as this bill proposes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. There has been the further theory, with which I do not quarrel too much, that they bring in cut-over land and put it under forest management in such areas. In some cases it is a benign practice, but it is a destructive practice in the long run, I think.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Does not the gentleman believe it is true that it is simply for consolidation at the request of the National Forest Service and in agreement with the particular owners that they have made these exchanges of land, to straighten out lines and consolidate the holdings, and with the full agreement from the inception of the National Forest Service, not by agreement with some other agency of the Government which disposes of their land but by discussing it with them?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. ENGLE. I think the record ought to be straight on this swapping business. The Forest Service has followed a policy for years of swapping cutting rights on national forests for the fee title on private lands, which has shoved out the boundaries of the national forests in the West, and in my State has been one of those factors which has added almost 7 percent of the total ownership of our State to the Federal Government in the last few years. It went from 40 percent to something like 47 percent in the last few years.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. In further comment, may I say that I happen to be a member of a Senate-House joint committee appointed for the purpose of approving trades between the Forest Service and private owners. We do it continuously when we find it in the public interest. It is also for acquiring lands in and outside the forests in order not to lock up these areas.

I call the gentleman's attention to the bill we reported out of our committee, and which he supported, that had as its objective the trading of timberlands in Glacier National Park for other lands outside of Glacier National Park. I think it was good legislation. I think the gentleman believes it was good legislation. I think the State of Montana and the National Park Service both benefited by that trade. It was done with the approval of Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There was a specific trade specified in that act. I still think that was a good piece of legislation.

May I ask the author of the bill just one question, since it has been specified that if this bill is not enacted there might be some companies that might go out of business. I have not heard yet any one business specified.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I will be glad to give the gentleman the names of several companies that I happen to have here in my file. I am doubtful whether I should reveal the business secrets of these people. I will be glad to furnish their names privately to the gentleman, but I think as a matter of public record it would not be a fair thing to do.

Mr. SAYLOR. There is one other thing I should like to ask the author of the bill. Since he knows these, and the word "locality" has been used and has not been defined, would he be willing to have an amendment offered which would define "locality" in this bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I cannot see any objection, depending of course on the wording the gentleman has in mind. The intent of the bill very clearly is to confine the application to the community area as stated in the language, so anything that would clarify that certainly would meet no objection on my part.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, let us not forget we are dealing with multiple-purpose forest land, land that is not only useful and valuable for timber production, but land which is valuable for watershed protection, recreation, mining, grazing and other services. Now we are going to exchange the ownership of the land and give the timber operators control over recreation, we are going to give them the mineral rights under the land, and we are going to adversely affect the grazing interests involved. Let us not forget also that we are dealing with a very small portion of the people—5 to 10 in Montana. According to the Forest Service, we have 47 working units in that same area, 47 forestry sustained-yield programs that are operating which, according to the testimony of the representative of the Department of Agriculture that I put in the RECORD earlier today, the supervisor of national forests is keeping a certain number of small sales going each year to small, independent operators who would be largely crowded out under this bill under the land that would be affected by it. So the proposition boils down to this. We are going to let the big operators, 5 or 10 of them in my district, take over the land to the detriment of the 47 working units, consisting of 8 to 12 small independent operators—maybe 400 or 500 small, independents who will be adversely affected. We are not going to have a single additional board-foot of timber. If the gentleman's bill could add any timber, it would be all right. But we are going to flood this land which is going to be taken—we are going to build airfields on it or radar stations or what not. We are not adding a single thing to that community's timber supply. The only thing is that we are taking the timber from the small, independent operators and giving it to the big sustained-yield operators. Do not forget that.

I have in my hand two of the programs for the working units that are in operation in the northwestern part of my State. There are 55 pages here. They contain a program for the development of recreation and a program for the development of watershed control. They contain a couple of pages telling how water will be protected. I ask the gentleman from Oregon or anyone else, tomorrow when I submit an amendment on ownership, to explain to me where any of these private owners have such a program for recreation and for grazing and for any of these other multiple uses. Where do they have a 55-page plan for the development of other uses outside of the purely timber uses of the national forest?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have given very careful study to this legislation. I cannot find anything in it that justifies the apprehension which has been stated here on the floor. I certainly would not want to be party to any bill which would turn over a vast area of the public domain of this country for the private benefit and use of any particular lumber operators. I am sure that is not what is occurring in this instance.

Let us take a specific case and examine it and see how this legislation would operate. Let us assume that you have a timber operation which permits you to cut a million board-feet a year in perpetuity on a sustained-yield basis. It may take as much as 100 or 200 acres of forest in order to do that. You have set up your operation with your mill. You have employed your men. You have built your little community dependent upon the operation of that lumbering enterprise.

Now along comes the Federal Government and builds a great water project and floods out one-third of your timber area. They will give you cash for it. Under the rules of condemnation they will condemn it if necessary, if a price cannot be agreed upon, and they will give you cash for it.

Some people may say, "Well, why do you not take that cash and go and buy yourself other timber in order to keep your mill operating, in order not to tear up this little community and throw all of those people out of employment?"

It just happens that you cannot always get hold of timber that is located to suit your needs, and so you are faced with this proposition that you are going to have to cut out and get out. You are going to have to run your mill, clean up your timber, and move out of the area; wipe out that little community and wipe out the employment. If some way is not found under these circumstances to continue a sustained yield operation of that mill, we defeat one of the policies which has constantly, over the years, had the endorsement of this Congress.

So what do we say in this legislation? We say, under those circumstances where it is practical, where it is in the public interest, that the agencies involved will endeavor to trade you timber to take the place of the timber that is being taken over by the Federal Government. In other words, instead of reaching into the Treasury and taking out cash and giving you cash for your timber, the Federal Government says, "We have a great backlog of timber, and because of the community interest and because of the interest generally in maintaining these sustained-yield units, we are prepared to try to find some other timber so that your sustained-yield unit can continue to operate, so that employment can continue for that little community which has been based upon that lumber enterprise." That is all it means.

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

Mr. ENGLE. In just a minute. This bill is not mandatory. It does not require any Federal agency to hand any lumber operator a piece of property simply because he is flooded out. What this bill says is that where it is practical and where it is in the public interest they shall do it. This bill is a policy direction to administrators and it is a permissive piece of legislation, which would permit this to occur where it is practical and where it is in the public interest.

I just cannot see how my friends, especially on my side of the aisle, have gotten themselves so concerned over this

piece of legislation. We have fought for sustained yield in the West for years. In the country which I represent, 700 miles of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, we have ghost towns because lumber operators moved in, cut out, and got out. We do not like that kind of operation. We like operations that cut on a sustaining-yield basis, so that the community economy is protected. This bill moves in that direction, and it only moves in that direction in the public interest. So I see none of the dangers which my friends have referred to, and I have great respect for their opinions. Nevertheless, I am supporting this legislation because it supports a basic premise of good forestry practice; namely, sustained yield. It does that only on a practical basis, and only in the public interest. This is permissive legislation, not directive legislation; and it will be administered, I am sure, in the public interest.

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

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

Mr. METCALF. What is to prevent a man from whom private land is taken from going in and bidding competitively against other operators for the land that is left?

Mr. ENGLE. There is nothing to prevent it except the other bidders, and except for the fact that the timber is not always put up in just such a way that an operator can get hold of it. You must remember this: If you are sitting there with a mill and if you have your sustained-mill operation practically cut in two by a reservoir, the fellow who comes in and makes a bid against you knows that you are in the field of desperation bidding. What is there unfair about saying to a man, "Yes, we are taking one-third of your land, but we will give you timber for your timber"? What is wrong with that?

Mr. METCALF. Someone is going to be damaged. What is wrong in asking whether we are going to protect the little fellow as well as the big fellow in trying to pay monetary compensation for the damage when we take property from private individuals?

Mr. ENGLE. I would remind the gentleman, though, that there is plenty of timber to take care of the small operators anyway. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] pointed that out.

Mr. METCALF. If there is plenty of timber, then there is not anything to complain about, because the big operator and the little operator can come in and bid competitively, and the Government will benefit thereby.

Mr. ENGLE. There is plenty of timber in the national forests when you can get your hands on it, yes; that is what I am talking about. But why make these fellows scramble for it? And at a disadvantage?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I referred some time ago to these exchanges which occurred between operators and the Department of Agriculture. Could the needs of this bill be accomplished now by contract between the operators and the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ENGLE. I cannot tell whether it be on an equal basis; in other words they might have to appropriate and also give cutting rights in the national forests.

Mr. SAYLOR. If they can do that can they not accomplish the same thing without this legislation?

Mr. ENGLE. They probably could; yes. But what's wrong with this legislation? There would be objection to turning over cutting rights in the national forests, too. This legislation simply involves swapping land for land, where it is practical and in the national interest. Why not make a clean deal of it as this legislation proposes?

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, because of the high personal regard I hold for the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], I wish to make this statement concerning H. R. 4646.

Early last fall I spoke at the Rotary Club in my own city, Toledo, Ohio. During the question period which followed the talk, Mr. George Shepard, a member of the club, asked me to state whether or not this bill would endanger the national parks. I told him that I uderstood there was a provision which excluded national parks, national monuments, wildlife areas, and wildlife refuges from the exchange provision provided for in this bill. It was my understanding then that H. R. 4646 included these provisions, as the bill did in its original form. This was before it had been amended to make it possible to take away from the people of this country part of their national parks and national forests.

The bill that is before the House now strikes out, among other things, the following words on page 2 of the bill, lines 1, 2, and 3:

Provided, That such exchange shall not include lands within the boundaries of national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, or wildlife refuges.

Mr. Chairman, although this provision has been put back into the bill under pressure of opposition, I still see a definite danger in the bill. Every citizen of every State has an inalienable right and a definite interest in the national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas and wildlife refuges of our country.

I do not know what the reasons were that motivated the proponents of this bill in amending the original bill in order to take out this protective proviso or the causes which put it back in a modified form. But if this bill should become law in its present form it would be an opening wedge, or perhaps more realistically, the first blow or the axe and cut of the saw into the national parks and other preserves of the country. I think I can almost hear the voices of President Theodore Roosevelt and of his friend, the great conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, as they would cry out against the beginning of what they would term it, as I do, a desecration and spoliation of the forests in our national parks.

May I also quote from President Eisenhower's message to Congress, July 31, 1953, when he said:

In the utilization of these lands, the people are entitled to expect that their timber, minerals, streams and water supply, wildlife and recreational values should be safeguarded.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'KONSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4646) to provide for the exchange of certain public and private lands, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONSIDERATION OF TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday next for the House to consider the bill H. R. 7893, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, under the general rules of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, when this request was previously submitted objection was made; but the gentleman who made the objection has told me since that it was perfectly satisfactory to him to have the bill come up on Thursday. I have no objection.

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

There was no objection.

ELEVEN O'CLOCK MEETING ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PAGE BOY ACADEMY

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a con-

current resolution which I trust will have the careful and serious consideration of every Member of this great deliberative body. It is long past due in this age of rising child delinquency which has become so prevalent all over these United States.

My bill would create a Page Boy Academy for the housing of our 50 page boys, the 20 boys in the United States Senate and also the 4 boys acting in that capacity in the United States Supreme Court.

The naming of page boys comes under the patronage system—hence they may come from the 48 States—far and near. The maximum age limit of a page boy is 18 years and the minimum age is 14. The average age is between 15 and 16 years. Do you think that a boy between those ages—15 and 16—has reached years of discretion?

These boys, regardless of the age bracket they are in, have a take-home pay check of $240 per month. Do you think a boy, away from home, and on his own, is capable of handling this amount of money without any supervision?

I am told that about 25 percent of our boys live with their parents, relatives, or friends. Seventy-five percent of them are on their own. As a parent living in any one of the 48 States, would you want your boy—or girl maybe—at such a tender age, living down here alone, and with absolutely no supervision? Every Member of this House must know that the Nation's Capital has a reputation for lawlessness and which just now is being seriously attacked as it affects juveniles.

Because I have worked with youth over the greater part of my life, I have been particularly mindful of our page boys. I am sure they all come from fine families, and I am also sure that every Member of Congress has an obligation to see that they are just as fine when they leave our employ.

I have made it my business to talk with these boys and to observe their habits. One needs only to go to the cloakroom to find them eating snacks—usually ice cream, candy, and pastry, which, of course, dulls the appetite for regular and well-balanced substantial meals and does not make for good physical development. Over a period of months they have developed sallow complexions and probably a feeling of listlessness.

During the time I have been a Member of Congress I have lived in close proximity to the Capitol, and have observed many of the boys living in this neighborhood—not likely in those homes which are being restored—but in those old dilapidated houses which do not attract people of culture and discretion.

I am also aware that our boys have to walk less than a block from their work where they are free and able to purchase all kinds of filthy, obscene, and indecent literature. Can you not imagine what this could do to a boy who reads it alone in his room or, even still worse, with a group of boys?

Boys of 14 or 15 are neither mentally nor physically matured, and, in my opinion, every Member of this House is, to some extent, responsible for their well-being.

My bill would provide adequate quarters for these page boys, with a superintendent in charge, and a complete housekeeping staff, which would be responsible for their supervision as regards proper food, adequate hours of sleep, supervised recreation, and sufficient application to their school work. They are financially able, and should be required, to pay all living costs, and they should not be permitted to live elsewhere unless such home is fully approved by the superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many boys of 15, without any supervision, would give thought to attending church services or attending Sunday school once a week. The boys of 15 today will be the men of tomorrow. Are we here today helping them to meet that responsibility? I am sure many of our page boys are dreaming dreams to take our places. Please give them a break by helping to prepare them for the great responsibility which lies ahead in this great country. "Let us put first things first."

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

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

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Americans of Lithuanian descent, all firm believers in the freedom and human dignity of man, pay tribute to their relatives and friends who have suffered so much in the cause of freedom.

The Lithuanian people have little cause to rejoice while their proud nation lies prostrate under the feet of the Communist dictators in the Kremlin. Nevertheless, more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent will unite today in sympathetic observance of their independence day.

Prior to February 16, 1918, Russia ruled Lithuania with an iron fist for 133 years. Notwithstanding this ruthless oppression, the burning desire for freedom was never extinguished in the hearts and minds of the Lithuanian people.

During Russia's rule from 1795 to 1918, Lithuania's culture, industry, and economy deteriorated. Their people were exploited for the benefit of the Russian nobility. Farmers were recognized as the property of the landowners. The schools, the courts, and military were completely Russified.

The rule of Russian tyranny finally terminated on February 16, 1918. On July 12, 1920, Russia entered into a solemn agreement with Lithuania renouncing forever all claims to Lithuanian territory. In addition to this solemn treaty, pacts of nonaggression and mutual assistance were entered into between Lithuania and Russia. Despite all these solemn documents the future of Lithuania was again rudely shattered by the 1939 nonaggression pact between Russia and Germany. Once again Lithuania's hopes and prayers for peace, security, and independence were sold down the river by Stalin and Hitler.

As a member of the Select Committee of the House To Investigate the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R., I heard exiled witnesses from these nations testify to the Soviet terror of 1940 and subsequent years. These hearings brought out these salient facts.

The first attack against Lithuanian independence was made in Pravda, the official mouthpiece of the Communist Party, in Moscow, on May 28, 1940. The following day, Lithuania was presented with a menacing note from the Kremlin charging that the Lithuanian Government conspired with foreign agents to kidnap and torture two Red army soldiers in order to force them to disclose Russian military secrets. The Soviet Government refused to accept Lithuania's explanations of this incident. On June 14, 1940, an ultimatum was presented to Lithuania by the Soviet demanding the immediate formation of a new government acceptable to the Communist dictators and the admission of more troops who would occupy all strategic points of the nation. Already having had placed large numbers of Red soldiers in Lithuania, in pursuance of the mutual assistance pact, the Lithuanian Government had no alternative but submit to these demands, which it did on June 15. On this same day, the occupation of all Lithuanian territory began. On July 16, 1940, the Soviet news agency Tass announced to the world that Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia had concluded a military alliance against the Soviet Union. These announcements were absolute lies but the Soviet required such announcement to hide its forced occupation of the three Baltic nations. On June 16, Soviet ultimatums were handed to Estonia and Latvia charging them with the same offense. The following day Soviet troops entered these two countries. Soviet officials also entered these small nations to take over their internal affairs. Disturbances were created, prisoners released from jails, men and women were arrested by the NKVD. New government officials, acceptable to the Soviet, were appointed. The so-called new government at once demanded the dissolution of the independent government and a decree was issued announcing new elections for the sovietized government. These elections were illegally organized to cover up all the deceit and hypocrisy of the Soviet Government. Only candidates selected by the new dictators could stand for election. Candidates of the old political parties were branded enemies of the people and were disqualified. On July 14 and 15 the fake elections took place. The results of these elections were announced in Moscow before the polling places closed. Under these circumstances, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia became subjects of the U. S. S. R.

The diplomatic representatives of Lithuania reported these facts to the governments to which they were accredited. The free nations of the world were not misled by Soviet activities, and, consequently, the United States has refused

to this day to give international recognition to the Communists' acts of aggression and violence in Lithuania.

During the first occupation of Lithuania in 1940 by the Soviet authorities, they proceeded to destroy the political, economic, and cultural life of the nation. The leaders of independent Lithuania were deported to concentration camps in Siberia. Thousands upon thousands of Lithuanian citizens were murdered by the Red troops. Women and children were arrested and deported. The industrial and agricultural life of Lithuania was nationalized without compensation to the rightful owners. The religious and cultural life of the country was ruthlessly attacked by the Soviet overlords.

We learned that during the second occupation of Lithuania—September 1944 to date—the Soviets began a systematic liquidation of all western order and culture. The agricultural system was collectivized, industry reformed, to serve the needs of the Soviet, the standard of living reduced to that of the Soviet slave. The free farmer became a slave of the State on a huge collectivized farm. The Soviet bosses turned back the pages of history 150 years. People who were reluctant to accept the new order were deported to the salt mines. The indoctrination of communism began in earnest in the schools, universities, farms, and factories, and the persecution of the Christian Church continues at a ruthless pace.

"Religion is opium for the people," the phrase coined by Karl Marx, is the doctrine of the Soviet education authorities. Belief in God is the archenemy of Communist thought. Religious faith is condemned as a relic of class society, deeply rooted in the peoples' minds, weakening the workers and encouraging in them an attitude of abject humility. The Soviets have a strict antireligious attitude, based on militant atheism. In Lithuania, religion is prohibited in the schools and may not be taught in the privacy of the home.

According to the Soviet code of moral conduct, everything that contributes to the victory of communism, irrespective of methods used, must be considered moral. Thus, there is no harm in lies, deceit, robbery, chicanery, or even murder so long as they serve the interests of communism. Socialist vigilance, regardless of ties of blood or friendship, is taught in all schools.

This summary is but a small part of the suffering and agony of the Baltic nations. I am happy that the Congress of the United States saw fit to expose the criminality of the Soviet dictators. The magazine America in its February 6, 1954, issue carried the following article:

During last December the select committee of the House to investigate the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R., of which Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN is chairman, heard exiles from the Baltic nations in Washington, Detroit, New York and Chicago. The sworn testimony of 41 eyewitnesses of the Soviet terror of 1940 adds up to the most damning indictment of Soviet chicanery we have read to date. The Moscow New Times for August 12, 1953 had scoffed at the Kersten inquiry as a waste of money, since everyone knows that the Baltic States voluntarily asked to join the Soviet Union. The impressive procession of eyewitnesses disclosed a different picture. So do the valuable and revealing exhibits of treaties, military, death and deportation orders entered into the record. The record contains the testimony of a Catholic bishop, a prime minister, a defense minister, a commander in chief, a minister of education, Catholic and Lutheran clergymen, and teaching nuns. The brother of Antonas Snieckus, top Lithuanian Communist, testified. So did two survivors of the Cervene Forest Massacre. Besides Congressman KERSTEN, the rest of the committee (Representatives BENTLEY, BUSBEY, BONIN, MADDEN, MACHROWICZ, and DODD) have opened the way to a new method of historical research from which Americans may get an authentic understanding of the mentality and methods of Red conspirators. We hope that the select committee continues its hearings. Meanwhile, the testimony at hand, as engrossing as it is gruesome, should be edited for early publication.

I am pleased to have a small part in this 36th annual celebration of Lithuanian independence. The Lithuanian people have the sympathy and prayers of the American people. Eventually all the people behind the Iron Curtain will regain their freedom and independence. The process may be slow and painful but so long as there is faith in God, Lithuania will again take its rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. SADLAK. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN], deserves much commendation and praise for having reserved an hour today to emphasize and observe in the House, Lithuania's remarkable history and present plight. His complete devotion to this subject is evident throughout the fine address Mr. BONIN has just made.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of the signing of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at Vilna on February 16, 1918. For years the anniversary of this event was an occasion for annual celebration not only in Lithuania but throughout the world. On this 36th anniversary, however, there is little cause for rejoicing.

Lithuania is no longer an independent state but a victim of Russia's aggression, and I note with profound sadness the unhappy events that have led up to Lithuania's deprivation by force of its sovereign rights in self-government and incorporation into the Soviet Union. The plight of the Lithuanians today and their fellow sufferers under the Soviet Communist heel is tragic. Compassion for their suffering is felt not only by our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent but by all Americans.

In our efforts to sustain the hope for freedom in the minds of the people of Lithuania and her good neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, the Kersten committee, composed of Members of the House, is conducting an investigation of the full circumstances and events attending the seizure and incorporation of the three Baltic States by the U. S. S. R. It is hoped that this documentation will not only expose the pattern of human and economic enslavement by the Kremlin, but will also lead the way in restoring to Lithuania and the Baltic States the liberty, freedom, and prosperity which they deserve.

The Lithuanians have every reason to look to the United States for support and encouragement, and our Government should exhaust every means at its disposal in demanding not only the release of all imprisoned Lithuanians, but also that all peoples being held as prisoners as the result of wars and aggression be freed. It is estimated that at least 200,000 of the people of Lithuania have been put to death, were deported, imprisoned, or are today existing as enforced laborers under the cruel domination of the U. S. S. R.

Despite the record of infamous crimes committed by Soviet communism on the once peaceful shores of the Baltic Sea, Lithuania has continued to assert itself through nationalist peasant uprisings and extensive underground resistance. Even under most oppressive conditions, Lithuania has, since the 12th century, nurtured her distinct history, language, national culture, and traditions.

On the occasion of the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I join with her sons and daughters in fervent prayer and hope that with the help of Almighty God the steadfast spirit of an unhappy people will remain unbroken, and that the day of emancipation will, one day not too distant, become a reality. When the day of deliverance is at hand, then Lithuania's independence day will be one of true rejoicing.

Mr. CARIGG. 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. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, on this day, as we pause to join the Lithuanian people all over the world in celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we salute a proud people, who despite diabolical persecution down through the years, has never bowed its head to the power of evil.

Over the years America has been enriched by the culture, the industry and the fervor of those brave men and women who have been able to escape from their homeland and bring their talents to this their adopted country. Today we join them in the prayer that a brighter day will soon dawn for the friends and relatives who have suffered so grievously in the name of freedom and liberty, and that Almighty God in answer to their prayers will grant them the opportunity of seeing in their lifetime the deliverance of Lithuania.

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 join with my friends of Lithuanian descent in the United States and in the free world in commemorating the 36th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, a celebration which, so far as the homeland is concerned, can only be observed secretly in the hearts and souls of its citizens.

Everywhere in the free world, free people will continue to hope and to pray for the liberation of this great nation, and in so doing give expression of our concern and friendship for a brave and good people shackled temporarily by a godless tyrant.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 36th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and the free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant democratic republic

Despite oppression and torture at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the once-free Lithuania continues to live and burn brightly in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad. Occupied by totalitarian power, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual, political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of Lithuania long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my hope that in this trying period of their history, the people of Lithuania will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country has held for them. American sympathy with the Lithuanian people has been manifest in our press and in Congress, as well as in the official policy of our Government, first declared on July 23, 1940, which has refused to recognize Soviet Russia's absorption of Lithuania and has persisted in recognition of the established democratic republic.

Mr. Speaker, on this 36th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I want to extend my congratulations to the people of that brave country, and to all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry. I join in their prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. PRICE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, last year in advocating the favorable consideration of the Baltic resolution I foresaw the valuable effect the operations of the committee the resolution created would have in giving to the world the true story of Communist treachery which led to the enslavement of millions of people in eastern Europe. Among these are the people of Lithuania, who today would be joyously observing the 36th anniversary as an independent nation if they could free themselves of the oppressive yoke of their Russian captors.

It is but natural that Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and the thousands of Lithuanians who came from their homeland to become the fine type of American citizens should be concerned over the fate of relatives and friends who remain in their saddened country. It is, therefore, fitting that we in Congress today join with these Lithuanian Americans in solemn observance of this anniversary and offer with them sincere and devout prayer for liberation of Lithuania and all enslaved nations.

Lithuania enjoyed its independence for only a brief span of 20 years, since the founding of a Republic on February 16, 1918, but for centuries before the Lithuanian people held to their own language, their own culture, and their own traditions. They are steeped in proud history which fortifies them in their determination never to be subjugated to the domination of the ruthless Communist aggressor, with whom they hold nothing in common.

The Lithuanian people have not and will not accept Soviet rule nor will they be bound by the Soviet system, imposed on them by force of Russian treachery and armed might on June 15, 1940, when in flagrant violation of existing treaties, the Soviet Union occupied their country.

Although occupied and ruled by the Communist aggressor Lithuania maintains its independence through the fighting heart of its people who stubbornly resist their enemy by means of an underground and often by open resistance.

The United States and the other great democracies of the West have never recognized the illegal act of Soviet aggression and the Lithuanian people and the Lithuanian legation in Washington has never recognized the puppet regime installed by the Soviet Union.

So Lithuania still lives today as an independent nation, confident that one day the oppressors will be driven from her soil and that this new Republic will take up where its progress was stopped by Communist force in 1940 and again become an exemplary nation, holding a high and honored position in the family of free nations.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE "MAINE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered into, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have spoken on the anniversary occasion of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor on February 15, 1898. I do not recall a year in the last four decades or more when on February 15 I have not joined my comrades of the Spanish-American War in observance of the day.

Last night it was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies at the Department of Commerce Auditorium under the auspices of the United Spanish War Veterans of the District of Columbia. Department Commander George F. Cook was the able master of ceremonies.

As usual Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, Ambassador of Cuba, was present. He was accompanied by his full staff, a gesture of graciousness which I with others appreciated. The distinguished Ambassador spoke with eloquence and sincerity. His remarks were a contribution to the long record of affectionate relationship of Cuba and the United States.

The United States Marine Band Orchestra, Master Sgt. Paul Gogel conducting, and Miss Gretta W. Ludwig, national auxiliary soloist, furnished a fitting musical background. The Marines, the Army, and the Navy all were represented by details of their picked men.

Two hundred and sixty-six lives were lost in the destruction of the *Maine*. Spanish War veterans every year meet to pay the tribute of love to the memory of the 266 who went down with the Maine. Every year that I have been a member of the Congress on February 15, or the next legislative day if on February 15 there has been no session, I have asked and graciously have been granted 1 hour for services on the floor of the House.

Today I have a special purpose in mind. I want to bring a little sense of shame to the membership of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

This body constitutes one of the greatest bodies of patriots in America. Tonight when we attend the dinner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and look around we will see almost the entire membership of this House in attendance, veterans of one or more of the wars of our country.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in such a body it would be an easy matter to get favorable consideration for a bill to place naval veterans of the Spanish-American War on the same basis as Army veterans. Such has not proved to be the case.

I introduced a bill, H. R. 4490, in the first session of the 83d Congress. No one paid any attention to the bill. The subcommittee threw it in the wastebasket or whatever subcommittees do with bills that come along on their own merits and without benefit of high-pressuring. I did not have an opportunity to speak in behalf of the bill, so I wrote a letter to the members of the subcommittee. One member responded. He thought it was a good bill. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has been tops in my book ever since. As far as I know he was the only member of the subcommittee who was interested.

Mr. Speaker, February 15 is set aside to pay homage to the memory of the 266 men who died with the *Maine*. They belonged to the Navy. I can conceive of no more appropriate place and time than this and now to urge a complete change-about in the attitude toward a bill, the sole purpose of which is to place individuals who served in the Navy in the war with Spain on the same footing as those who served in the Army.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, unless the gentleman desires to proceed a little further? I

would interrupt at a later stage if he so desires.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I would like to put in one more remark here, then I trust that the gentleman from Connecticut will come down here and read in full the remarkable article on the Spanish-American War which he showed me earlier in the day.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate my dear friend from Illinois who is now addressing the House. He is not only one of the most able but one of the sweetest and most lovable Members of this body. I know that the Spanish-American War veterans, their relatives, and their families throughout the country will deeply appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] this afternoon. Well has he said that the Spanish-American War was one of the most important events in the history of our country and that the sinking of the *Maine* which precipitated the Spanish-American War was of great importance in connection with the events that flowed therefrom, not only in the history of our country but in the history of the world.

In my opinion, the Spanish-American War was the turning point in the history of America because to me that has always been the turning point away from world isolation and into America taking its position in the world that the greatness of our country justified and warranted. It has taken many years, but that was the turning point and the events that have flowed from the sinking of the *Maine* and the Spanish-American War are of major importance not only to our country but to the world.

So I join with my dear friend from Illinois in the expressions he has given us and also congratulate him, as I said before, on remembering this great event. I know that the Spanish War veterans and all their families will deeply appreciate it. In connection with the bill that the gentleman has referred to and which the gentleman introduced, it seems to me to contain great merit. I shall be glad to cooperate with my friend from Illinois in trying to have the committee conduct hearings and to do everything I can to try and have the committee report the bill favorably.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I very deeply appreciate the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts. As to H. R. 4490, I am sure the gentleman will be interested in knowing that it was on the *Yale* that men of the 9th Massachusetts and men from the 33d Michigan went down to Cuba. We arrived there in the early days of the siege of Santiago. The sailors on the *Yale* and her sister ship, the *Harvard*, are among those who through a technicality have been denied equal rights with the soldiers they carried to Cuba.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, I think, will be interested in this, too. Looking over the newspaper files of the period I found the following editorial comment in the London Spectator on July 3, 1898:

Are the American people aware that their country stands at the parting of the ways; that she is engaged in a war which may so develop that it may occupy years, create a national debt, and leave the United States with a powerful army and the first fleet in the world?

Those surely were words of prophecy.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for annually giving us a stirring address in bringing to us many of his personal experiences in connection with the Spanish-American War in which he was a participant. Earlier today, knowing that our colleague had again requested an hour to commemorate primarily the "remembering of the *Maine*," as he likes to put it, I showed him an address which was delivered by Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, who also is a constituent of mine, living at present at Madison Conn., who made a very stirring address before the Naval Order of the United States on Friday, May 1, 1953. In his address he reveals to us much of his personal experience, particularly surrounding the event of the sinking of the *Maine*, and also tells about its refloating some 14 years later. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has always sought on occasions of this kind historical data and material which otherwise has not been known. In my opinion this fine address by this noble and inspiring naval man brings, I believe, for the gentleman from Illinois and for all of us and the country at large much data and information which would otherwise not have been recorded.

It is with that purpose in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire speech of Admiral Belknap included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. The address is as follows:

Following are remarks by Charles Hann, commander general of the Naval Order of the United States, when he introduced Admiral Belknap on the 55th anniversary of the great victory of Adm. George Dewey at Manila Bay. Admiral Dewey was commander general of the Naval Order of the United States from 1907 to 1917:

"To surpass the age of 80 with such distinction and affection as has marked the devoted and useful life of Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap is a noteworthy achievement. There were some who might have expected that career to come to a virtual end when Admiral Belknap retired from active duty in the United States Navy in 1927. But in the many years since, he has been active in the Massachusetts Bay tercentenary, the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church, the vestry of Trinity Church in New York, the Naval Academy Association, the Loyal Legion of the United States, the Military Order of the World Wars, the Naval Order of the United States, of all of which patriotic organizations he has been the national head; the Seamen's Church Institute, Laymen's National Committee, Chelsea Citizens Committee, and many other religious, educational, and charitable enterprises, and throughout the Nation he is respected as a man whose naval and civic career has consistently reflected high principles and sincere beliefs.

"A son of Rear Adm. George Eugene Belknap, Reginald Belknap was graduated with distinction from the United States Naval Academy in 1891; during the China-Japanese War he served with Marines in the Monocacy at Tientsin in the winter of 1894–1895, and in command of Marine Guard at the American Legation in Seoul, Korea, in 1896. He participated in the War with Spain; in the Chinese Boxer campaign; the Philippine Insurrection; and was in charge of building nearly 3,000 cottages and public buildings for about 18,000 persons made homeless by the Italian (Messina) earthquake in 1908.

"He was made a division commander in the Atlantic Fleet in 1915 to develop minelaying and minesweeping, and in 1917–18 he organized and commanded the United States Mine Squadron of 10 minelayers and 4,200 personnel, which planted four-fifths of the mine-barrage in the North Sea, from the Orkney Islands, stretching 235 miles across to Norway, 25 miles wide—56,571 mines, endangering passage even to a depth of 240 feet.

"Admiral Belknap served in the sailing frigate *Constellation*, cruisers *Chicago, Baltimore, Yorktown, Newport, Lancaster, Badger, Ranger, Brooklyn;* battleships *Indiana, Maine, Kearsage, North Dakota*, and commanded the *San Francisco* and battleship *Delaware* and *Colorado*.

"His wide experience in and knowledge of international affairs was enriched by naval duty in China, Japan, Korea, Samoa, the Philippines, Australia, Germany, Italy, and England. He was aide to Theodore Roosevelt at the funeral of King Edward VII, served in the Bureau of Navigation, as Director of Strategy Department in the Naval War College and as commandant of the Naval Training Station, Hampton Roads, Va.

"I am happy to present to you a wise, humorous, noble, and inspiring leader, Rear Adm. Reginald R. Belknap, DSM, past commander general of the Naval Order of the United States."

REMEMBER THE "MAINE"

(Address by Rear Adm. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, DSM, commander general, Naval Order of the United States, 1931–37, commander in chief, the Military Order of the World Wars, 1936–38, commander in chief, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, 1947–51, before the Naval Order of the United States at the New York Yacht Club, New York City, on Friday, May 1, 1953)

The slogan of 55 years ago, "Remember the *Maine*," is kept alive by the United Spanish War Veterans by memorial services on the anniversaries of that fateful 15th of February 1898, when the United States battleship *Maine* was destroyed in the harbor of Habana, Cuba, with the loss of two-thirds of her crew. Shocking in itself, the calamity was magnified by the *Maine's* being on a welcomed visit of good will. Indignant outburst in America was soon controlled, but our intervention to end the intolerable situation in Cuba became almost a certainty. Nine weeks later Congress declared war, a blockade of Cuba was established on April 22 and in the Far East Commodore George Dewey won the battle of Manila Bay on May 1, which we are celebrating as Dewey Day. The consequences of these actions, a hemisphere apart, were of worldwide effect and are still evolving.

Cuba, a colony of Spain, Pearl of the Antilles, rich in various resources and possibilities, had long been coveted by England and France, but to the United States the island's geographical position made the continuation of Spain's sovereignty there essential. Only 90 miles from our shores and bordering on Florida Strait on the east and Yucatan Channel on the west, Cuba in unfriendly hands could control intercourse in the Gulf of Mexico and with the Mississippi Valley. As long as Spain held possession, other European powers and Britain would keep hands off, while from Spain alone the United States need have no serious apprehension. Our Government had been foremost in recognizing the independence of Spain's other colonies in America and had backed them further by the Monroe Doctrine, which they in turn would buttress; as to Cuba, our policy was repeatedly declared unequivocally for Spain's sovereignty, with assurance to her of our support at all hazards. Any desire to annex the island or intervene in its affairs was almost as often disavowed. Such was our attitude for a century.

After the Mexican War, soldiers and adventurers on the loose began filibustering toward Cuba. Easy expeditions had no success and informed observers found the Cuban people not ready for revolt, nor ready for independence. The attempts at invasion, however, intensified the harsh tyranny of the Spanish rulers. The home government vested the Governor-General of Cuba with absolute power, subject only in extreme contingencies even to the supreme government in Spain. In language of today, the Governors-General went to town. In contempt of treaties, international law, humanity, and common decencies of civilization, on mere suspicion ships on the high seas or wherever found were seized and condemned, their crews and innocent passengers shot or cruelly maltreated. All down the line, subordinate officials conformed to their chief's example with zeal. Most of them were not Cubans but Spaniards, born in Spain. For them Cuba was not for Cubans but for Spain, and they ruled with a merciless hand. The status of the Cuban born was so inferior socially and politically that some husbands who could afford it would send their wives when pregnant to Spain for their confinement, for the advantage to their offspring of birth in the peninsula.

Following our Civil War, increasing intercourse with Cuba generated more and more interest among our people in the internal conditions of Cuba and the treatment of her people. All through his administration President Grant had to deal with Spain for ending the ravages of insurrection in Cuba. Harshness and violence by both the official and insurgent forces spread desolation and misery; outrages on the high seas and against American citizens in Cuba multiplied the grounds for official as well as popular protests. In 1875 war with Spain came very near. Spain herself was racked internally by disorder, distress, and revolution. Our Minister there wrote "Many of the most thoughtful men in Spain really long for a foreign war as the only efficient remedy for the domestic dissensions which now distract the country * * * it is the received opinion in Spain that for the commencing period of the war, Spain has a more efficient navy than ours." Fortunately, our Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, and our Minister in Spain, Caleb Cushing, were men of the highest character and distinguished ability; still more fortunate was it that Mr. Cushing had been much in Spain, spoke the language with facility and was on terms of intimacy and friendship with many notable Spaniards, and he was everywhere recognized as strongly opposed to filibustering in all its various forms. Our diplomacy keeping control in the hands of the Executive, intervention was averted, the Spanish Governments decreed improvements in the island administration, insurrection was exhausted by 1878 and Cuba began again to prosper, its commerce rapidly growing, especially with the United States.

Ten years of barbarous misgovernment and ruthless cruelty, however, had changed Cuban loyalty to Spain into determination for independence. A group of Cubans was formed in the United States to work towards that end. This Cuban Junta promoted filibustering, to keep the cause vigorously alive, thus to convince both governments, of the United States and of Spain, that only independence would bring lasting peace in Cuba. Despite being outlawed by our Government, hindered and penalized by all such restraints as could be reasonably expected by any other government, the Cuban junta with increasing financial support and dodging here and there, kept up its activities. When revolt in Cuba came again it had the support of 200 clubs in the United States, Mexico, and Central and South America, every member contributing a tenth or more of his earnings. They were said to have started with a million dollars, a considerable sum in the nineties.

This insurrection, declared in February 1895, had been preparing as promised reforms failed of realization. The actual rulers in Cuba were still the peninsulares, Spaniards. When filibustering began, years back, they had organized, in political clubs and groups of volunteers who were armed but did not take the field. About 70,000 strong and politically powerful, they could frustrate any attempt at substantial improvement; reforms decreed in Spain were ignored or nullified in Cuba; more than one governor-general of liberal tendency had been unable to make headway, had to retire and was replaced by one of the reactionary type. Such was General Weyler who came to Habana after a year of insurrection. The hardened attitude in Spain towards Cuba was shown when the former governor General Campos arrived; the newspapers in Spain were indignant with him for suggesting autonomy for Cuba—"an insult to the nation." Our Minister in Spain under President Cleveland wrote later that "Spain could not give to her colonies what she did not herself enjoy, popular government as it is understood throughout the world."

Coupled with the disappointment in promised reforms was the severe blow given to the principal industry, sugar production, by the high tariff protecting our growers of beet sugar. Thousands of Cuban laborers were made idle and ripe for joining an insurgent army. The seriousness and the strong support of this insurrection, more than ever before, was recognized in Spain. Mildness prevailed in government measures for a year, with the purpose to protect persons, property and industry. The insurgents' policy was the opposite; as stated in the appeal by their commander-in-chief, Maximo Gomez, addressed "to honest men, victims of the torch:" (Gomez, be it noted, was not a Cuban. He was a Dominican, and not a soldier but a guerrilla leader.) "To place Cuba in the shortest time in possession of her dearest ideal * * * it matters not what means are employed" the insurgents were "determined to unfurl triumphantly, even over ruin and ashes, the flag of the Republic of Cuba." There were no pitched battles, it was guerrilla warfare. More and more troops from Spain, up to 100,000 by 1898, did not bring the answer. Being mostly infantry they could not cope with bodies of mounted insurgents familiar with the country and usually the mere presence of a guard would be the signal to set a sugar-cane field afire. Attempts to confine the insurgents to the eastern parts of the island failed. By the time General Weyler took charge, the insurgents were in the immediate vicinity of Havana. Nearly all labor having been suspended, Gomez prohibited the burning of cane fields in the western provinces but the boiling houses and machinery were to be destroyed if the managers attempted to resume work.

In the ruin and resulting distress and destitution, General Weyler now ordered that all persons in three eastern districts be concentrated in towns that were military headquarters, no travel without a pass, and the vacating of all commercial establishments in the districts. The consequent increase of clamor in this country and of talk in Congress for intervention did not deter Weyler from further drastic measures, of summary action against prisoners taken in action, and against any person giving aid to the enemy in any way whatever. So strong did feeling in America become that the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs on January 29, 1896, brought a report from its majority that "Congress would welcome with satisfaction the concession by Spain of complete sovereignty to the people of Cuba."

Without laboring the point further, President Cleveland and Secretary of State Richard Olney held firm control of the situation, within the scope of diplomacy, meantime fulfilling all requirements due Spain and our own integrity in fair dealing internaitonally.

After President McKinley took office in March, 1897, conditions in Cuba grew progressively worse, so much so that General Weyler was recalled in October, 1897, and the more fair-minded and just General Blanco succeeded. Conditions in Cuba were still scandalous before the whole world, but a turn for the better seemed in real prospect. Our new Minister in Madrid, General Stewart L. Woodford, secured decrees by the Spanish government for autonomy in Cuba and Puerto Rico and equality of rights for all citizens.

As nothing short of independence would satisfy the Cuban insurgents and extremists, they resisted autonomy savagely, one instance recalling the ancient custom of slaying the bearer of bad news. The Spanish Colonel Ruiz, endeavoring to lay before his friend, Colonel Aranguren, of the Cuban forces, the decree of autonomy, was summarily courtmartialed and executed. The Spanish partisans, too, the "peninsulares," opposed autonomy, which would have ended their monopoly of government offices. Notwithstanding such double opposition, in Habana and from there outward the new system slowly gained favor. General Blanco ordered that concentration be suspended, encouraged people to return to their homes and farms, promising protection. He stood for reform as a measure toward pacification. This was the reverse of Weyler's policy, of pacification first, "then I will not object to reforms if Her Majesty decides to grant them." Blanco also appropriated $100,000 for relief of starvation and to aid rehabilitation, and his appeal brought out generous contributions from Cubans of means, and with their characteristic generous sympathy our people gave largely for relief.

This favorable trend naturally gained slowly; destitution, starvation, disease, desolation, existed almost everywhere beyond Habana, and however beneficial autonomy and other reforms might prove to be, the official customs and impositions of centuries were not to be overcome in a few weeks, violently opposed as the intended reforms were. After 2 months of Blanco's promising rule, rioting broke out in Habana on January 12, 1898, requiring a large number of troops to guard the palace and our consulate and prevent demonstrations in public squares. Next day Consul-General Fitzhugh Lee telegraphed that no signs appeared of further disorder. Spanish officers had led a mob to attack offices of newspapers that had favored autonomy; one of them had disparaged the late Governor-General Weyler. He explained further that in starting the new system, the officials first appointed were Cubans, in order to assure all Cubans in arms that autonomy

was for their benefit and protection. In fine, the rioting was an affair among Spanish partisans themselves. He added that, though calm had been restored in Habana, a ship might be needed for the safety of Americans and should be held in readiness.

Our North Atlantic Squadron was still in Hampton Roads, though it had been decided in December to do the winter training in southern waters as usual for many years past, basing on Key West and Pensacola, Fla., and visiting various ports in Cuba and the Caribbean area. Against filibustering the battleship *Maine*, cruiser *Montgomery*, three torpedo boats, and several revenue cutters were stationed in the vicinity of Key West and Cuba; they had in effect been doing patrolling that properly belonged to Cuban naval vessels. But the squadron remained north for weeks after the usual time for moving south. That assembling so large a force was not the beginning of a naval mobilization but was the usual thing was made clear to the Spanish Minister in Washington; also, lest hostile intent be inferred from a move south, the squadron was being delayed there.

The Habana rioting, though of short duration, had greatly disturbed our people. The Spanish Minister noted this and promptly informed his Government, on January 14. He repeated to Madrid a private information from a New York Herald correspondent: that the President believed autonomy a failure, that he feared further disorders all over Cuba, in which event he would land consulate guards from our ships. The Minister expressed the belief that Spain would not submit to that, and the Foreign Minister in Spain said, "correct."

Ten days later, January 24, Mr. Day, the acting Secretary of State, told the Minister that the President had not departed from the attitude set forth in his speech to Congress, leaving the Spanish Government in entire liberty to develop its policy; that General Woodford's report concerning negotiations for a commercial treaty were so satisfactory that he was determined to send the *Maine* to Habana as a mark of friendship, as would be so stated to the press; that he felt it had been a mistake not to have had a man-of-war visit any Cuban port in the past 3 years, "for now what is a fresh proof of international courtesy is looked upon as a hostile act." The Minister of State in Madrid replied on January 25 cordially accepting the statement about the *Maine* and reciprocating such friendly courtesy a Spanish vessel would visit the United States. One did come, the armored cruiser *Vizcaya* arriving in New York 3 days after the *Maine's* destruction.

The Secretary of the Navy had released to the press on January 24 the statement: "The rumors which were current yesterday regarding the movement of the fleet and disturbances in Habana are far from having foundation. Circumstances have become so normal, the situation so quiet, and relations so cordial, our war vessels are to renew their friendly visits in Cuban ports, entering and leaving those ports to go to ports of other neighboring friendly countries. The first vessel to make a visit of this kind will be the *Maine*."

On the same day, Consul General Lee in Habana was informed by telegraph that the *Maine* would arrive in a day or 2. He at once telegraphed advising delay for 6 or 7 days to give the late excitement more time to disappear; and early next forenoon, January 25, he telegraphed: "In the temporary absence of the Governor General, other authorities profess to think the United States has ulterior purposes; say it will obstruct autonomy, produce excitement, most probably a demonstration." It was too late; there was then no radio; the *Maine* steamed in past Morro Castle at 11 a. m. on January 25, 1898.

It is pertinent to recall that until the First World War it was usual for a man-of-war to enter any port unannounced; only on special occasions would advance notice be sent. So for the people in general, except for the extraordinary conditions in the island, there was no cause for alarm in the *Maine's* entry, Saluting the port with the Spanish flag at the main and quietly forging toward a berth. A man-of-war usually makes an impression of favorable tendency; showing a sample of her nation's people, their standards of law and order, cleanliness, behavior, service discipline; their technical accomplishment; the ship's clean sides, gleaming brightwork, smart boats—all attract attention and among most observers good will. The old-fashioned graceful lines of hull and etching of spars and rigging were lacking; the *Maine* was more suggestive of a bulldog; but she and her contemporary *Texas* were rivals for good looks. A *Texas* midshipman delivered his executive officer's compliments to Lieutenant Commander Marix with: "The *Maine* is the finest thing afloat." Marix replied, "Tell Mr. Allibone the *Texas* is a dream."

No excitement, no demonstration attended the *Maine's* arrival. Captain Sigsbee had been enjoined to special precautions, but he soon found that the safeguards usual in our Navy were sufficient, and to have a patrol around the ship would imply distrust of the Spanish authorities. He had been in active naval service 35 years; like most of our naval commanders he was well informed on international usage. A few years later, Secretary of State John Hay was to remark, "I am always glad when the naval officer arrives on the scene; he always keeps within the situation." Captain Sigsbee formed a decided liking for General Blanco, as an administrator, as a patriot, and as a man of high character. Insurgency still racked the island; much of the distress and hunger had not been relieved; autonomy was hardly gaining; still, the prospect was hopeful. One, two, three weeks passed without untoward incident. At long last the Cuban problem seemed within sight of solution.

In the quiet evening of February 15, as the long, drawn-out notes of taps echoed back from Morro Castle, Captain Sigsbee was finishing a report wholly unrelated to Cuba. The master-at-arms reported 9 o'clock lights out; on deck were the officer of the watch, quartermaster, one of the anchor watch, and corporal of the guard; two officers were smoking by the after turret, the others below in their quarters, the crew in their hammocks. Except for the anchor light and standing lights below, darkness and quiet settled upon the ship, as usual in a man-of-war moored in a quiet, friendly harbor. All seemed serene, the captain could relax; he put on a loose coat and began a letter to his wife.

Half an hour later, earthquake and thunderclap startled all Habana. "The ship is sinking, sir." The captain and other officers and men groped their way to the poop, still above water. In the glare of burning woodwork forward could be seen the jagged ends of parts of the hull forced upward by the explosion. One boat remaining was lowered and assisted others from the Spanish cruiser *Alfonso XII* and the Ward liner *City of Washington* in rescuing survivors. Sigsbee ordered and saw the *Maine* abandoned; then in the midst of the throng on board the liner wrote a dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy:

"*Maine* blown up in Habana harbor at 9:40 tonight and destroyed. Many wounded and doubtless more killed and drowned. Wounded and others on board Spanish man-of-war and Ward Line steamer. Send lighthouse tenders from Key West for crew and the few pieces of equipment above water. No one has clothing other than that upon him. Public opinion should be suspended until further report. All officers believed to be saved. Jenkins and Merritt not yet accounted for. Many Spanish officers including representatives of General Blanco now with me to express sympathy.

"SIGSBEE."

The morning papers spread the appalling news. Expression of deep sympathy came immediately from the Spanish Government, the Navy, the Queen regent, the Spanish Minister in Washington, from General Blanco, and the Alcalde of Habana. The wounded were tenderly cared for; the recovered dead lay in state in the civil-government building for 2 days, then were borne with reverent ceremony in a formal procession of civil, military, ecclesiastical, and consular officials, attended by a vast throng all along the route to the beautiful Colon Cemetery; there the last rites were performed, three volleys fired, and taps. The authorities dedicated the ground to the United States in perpetuity.

Captain Sigsbee's warning to suspend judgment soon turned indignation to speculation on the explosion's cause. No guilt nor complicity on the part of Spain was imputed in any responsible quarter, but some critics blamed the island authorities for not safeguarding their submarine mines, attributing the explosion to stealthy action by insurgents to bring intervention by the United States.

In the depth of one night, a small rowboat from the direction of the Morro Castle passed near the *Maine* almost within hail. Had a mine and its anchor been slung underneath, their barrel-size bulk would have made the boat's progress very slow, as it had been. At her moorings the *Maine* had swung by wind or current always within one and the same semicircle. With a change of wind she swung into the other semicircle. A mine there could have been struck.

The Spanish authorities urged a joint investigation but our Government preferred a naval court of inquiry as would have been regular in any case. Capt. William T. Sampson, president, Capt. French E. Chadwick, and Cmdr. William P. Potter, members, and Lt. Cmdr. Adolf Marix, judge advocate. Any searching inside the wreck was prohibited by the Spanish authorities; in the circumstances otherwise the court made as thorough an examination and inquiry as possible, avoiding any semblance of haste through sessions lasting 23 days, signing its report on March 21. President McKinley referred it to Congress on March 28, invoking "most deliberate consideration." Without debate the report was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House adjourned.

Treating the *Maine* disaster as of no contributory significance proved futile. "Remember the *Maine*" rapidly gained popularity, and the still glaring horrors in Cuba kept our people afire. Diplomatic effort was intensified on both sides: General Woodford and the Spanish Ministers finding more and more agreement in unofficial talks; the Ministers realizing the imminence of crisis, invoking the good offices of other European powers, intimating that the President might appeal to the Pope. But other events aggravated the difficulty of averting a break. Congress on March 9 without a dissentient vote appropriated $50 million "for the national defense and each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended by the President, and to remain available until January 1, 1899." This alone spelled death to autonomy; and now the President of the Cuban home-rule Government protested any effort by the United States to force on the Cuban people any form of government against their consent. On March 17, after an unofficial visit to see Cuba at firsthand, the highly esteemed conservative United States Senator Proctor in a speech in the Senate described conditions outside Habana as "desolation and distress, misery and starvation * * * the condition of the reconcentrados not overdrawn * * * the hospi-

tals beyond the limits of my vocabulary to portray."

Affairs were sweeping toward a crisis with irresistible force, which could be arrested only by an immediate cease fire. All parties longed for that; the obstacle hitherto immovable was Spanish pride. "This," Woodford cabled on March 31, "will not permit the ministry to propose and offer an armistice, which they desire to do, knowing it would bring peace by autumn; but such an offer by the ministry would bring revolution here * * * the ministry would go as far and as fast as it could and still save the dynasty * * * they know that Cuba is lost. Public opinion in Spain has moved steadily toward peace." On April 3 he cabled, "should the United States accept the Pope's mediation, Spain would do likewise" and the "ministry ask for the withdrawal of the American squadron (by this time in considerable force at Key West), as a mark of friendliness for Spain."

But while Spain's honor was being saved, Cubans were suffering every privation, dying by hundreds weekly. We had pressed for decision by April 15; on April 5 Spain agreed for May 4, provided the Cuban assembly would then approve and an armistice be arranged with the insurgents by some other agency than the Spanish Government. At bottom it was Spanish pride versus deeply stirred American sympathy; and on the long record of promises not made good and repeated endless procrastination, what confidence could there be in similar promises now?

That the President's message would go to Congress on April 6 and the substance of it was communicated to the ministry. It would recount the conditions in Cuba, the injurious effect upon our people, the character and conditions of the conflict and the apparent hopelessness of the strife; he would not advise recognizing the independence of the insurgents but would recommend measures looking to the restoration of peace and stability of government in the island, in the interests of humanity and for the safety and tranquillity of our own country. Presentation was delayed until April 9 for reception of representatives of Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Italy, collectively appealing for further negotiation in hope for an agreement that will secure the maintenance of peace and afford the necessary guaranties for Cuba. The President replied with appreciation of the humanitarian and disinterested character of the communication and expressed confidence that equal appreciation would be shown for our earnest and unselfish endeavors to end a situation of prolonged insufferableness. The postponement had been communicated to the Spanish ministry and on that day representatives of the greater European powers suggested that Spain should accede to the solicitations of "the Pope and that the suspension of hostilities was compatible with the honor and prestige of Spanish arms." Thereupon was the armistice ordered issued, on Saturday, April 9, thus complying with one of McKinley's stated requirements. But it was too late; the President's message had been written and it went to Congress on Monday, April 11.

Presidents Grant and Cleveland and Secretaries Fish and Olney had kept control of the Spain-Cuba-United States situation in their own hands; had either in critical moments transferred the matter to Congress, war would have resulted. Now that indefinite prolongation of the Cuban situation had become intolerable, McKinley turned to Congress, closing his message with: "The issue is now with Congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution and the law, I await your action." As a supplement he stated the Queen-regent's decree of an armistice on April 9, adding "if this message attains a successful result, then our aspirations as a peace-loving Christian Nation will be realized." His stating this apart from the message implied that the Queen-regent's action came too late.

In the early morning of Tuesday, April 19, 1898, Congress adopted a joint resolution that recognized Cuban independence, demanded that Spain withdraw, authorized and directed the President to use armed force as necessary, and disclaimed any disposition to possess the island or to exercise control there except for pacification. The President signed the resolution at 11:24 a. m. on Wednesday, April 20; at daylight on the 22d Rear Admiral Sampson's fleet got underway to establish the blockade of Cuba; on April 25 Congress declared that war with Spain had existed since April 21; Commodore Dewey was cabled to capture or destroy the Spanish squadron in the Philippines.

In the week-long consideration of the President's message, the congressional committee report on which the joint resolution was based treated the destruction of the *Maine* as only a single incident in the relations with Spain and "if that calamity had never happened, the questions between the United States and that Government would press for immediate solution."

The court of inquiry reported, "The *Maine* was destroyed by the explosion of a submarine mine which caused the explosion of two or more of the forward magazines. The court has been unable to obtain evidence fixing the responsibility for the destruction of the *Maine* upon any person or persons." That was the main point in the report, based chiefly on the fact that part of the forward outer shell of the ship, normally 6 feet above the keel, had been forced up to 4 feet above water, 34 feet above where it would have been had the ship sunk uninjured; and other displacements were cited, all indicating intense pressure from below the ship.

The Spanish investigation attributed the destruction to internal explosion. The investigation record showed all diving work occupied only 17½ hours and the chief Spanish diver reported that "the bilge and keel of the vessel throughout its entire length was buried in the mud but did not appear to have suffered any damage."

The soundness of the American finding has support also in that Captain Chadwick was 1 of 2 members of the court who had attributed the destruction to internal explosion, until divers produced stark evidence of explosion under the hull. Such opinion seems explicable only by the fact that officers of their time had served in old-fashioned wooden ships where magazines were more exposed. In the Navy, magazine safety is a first priority: two inspections and temperature taking daily by a trustworthy gunner's mate; keys returned to the cabin and so reported—this is invariably strictly done. Special precautions having been enjoined, would any laxity here have been allowed in the *Maine?* Besides, smokeless powder had not been adopted; only brown gunpowder was on board, not affected by such heat changes as endanger smokeless powder.

Fourteen years later, in the administration of President William H. Taft, a considerate and sincere friend of Spain, the wreck of the *Maine* was removed from Havana. It was an obstruction, an eyesore and a reminder of differences better forgotten. A cofferdam was built and the wreck was floated. Examination in the open confirmed the finding of the court of inquiry. Yet, "convinced against their will, hold to the same opinion still," 30, even 55 years, later, belief in internal explosion persists. One correspondent present in 1898 wrote 30 years later, conceding that the court of inquiry's finding was "justified by the evidence then available, but no trace of a submarine mine had ever been found." True—like absence of most evidence of the cause of an exploded crashed airplane.

The refloated *Maine* with colors flying and naval escort was towed out of Havana to well offshore where the Gulf Stream is deep. The seacocks were opened, a national salute was fired, and photographs were taken; as her bow was about to go under, as she was half-length submerged, and as the stern, the flag still flying, disappeared in the deep.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it was revealed last summer that the Department of Agriculture had secretly sold 80,000 tons of Austrian winter peas to a syndicate of insiders at a price of $30 a ton less than the price being offered to other buyers. The buyers, of course, had special qualifications. One of the men who handled the deal for the syndicate was a member of the Secretary of Agriculture Benson's Agricultural Advisory Committee; a cousin of a high official in the Department of Agriculture. Another is a friend of a Member of the Cabinet.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture investigated this deal and to me, personally, as a member of that subcommittee, it smelled. In fact, it smelled so badly that at the conclusion of the hearing, a department official of the Agriculture Department told our committee that in so many words, "we made a mistake but we ain't going to do it no more."

Evidently the Department of Agriculture was just kidding Congress last summer because they pulled another deal that outsmells the first one. This one makes the mink coat that I exposed a few years ago look small, and furthermore, it has an odor about like a pile of fish that has been lying in the sun for about a week. My attention was called to Big Deal No. 2 at the Department of Agriculture, by a letter from the Russell-Heckle Seed Co., of Memphis, Tenn., which reads as follows:

Hon. PAT SUTTON,
Tennessee Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUTTON: We have on hand United States Department of Agriculture Commodity Stabilization Service Bulletin USDA 2744–53 announcing the sale of 15 million pounds of seed to the Albert Dickinson Co., Chicago, Ill., and 6 million pounds to the Sinason Teicher Inter-American Grain Co., New York City.

Following are the 1952 support prices advanced for this 21 million pounds of seed and the prices same was sold for as stated in the bulletin USDA 2744–53. The support prices listed for 1952 we believe to be correct, however, there may be a slight variation.

Commodity	1952 support price	Sale price	Pounds sold
	Per hundredweight	*Per hundredweight*	
Alfalfa (Washington)	$35	$10.00	6,000,000
Ladino clover	105	17.50	2,000,000
Red clover	35	13.50	4,380,000
Birdsfoot trefoil	75	10.00	120,000
Tall fescue (estimated)	20	5.00	500,000
Common vetch	6	2.77	6,000,000
Alsike clover	35	9.00	2,000,000

Bulletin USDA 2744-2753 states that this 21 million pounds of seed were sold in accordance with the Department's sales offer of October 2, 1953. We have no record of ever receiving an invitation to bid on this lot of seed and would like to know approximately how many seed concerns received this invitation to bid and if information of any kind concerning this proposed sale was given to any one of the seed-trade publications or the press.

The first information we had concerning this sale of 21 million pounds of seed was after the sale was consummated. Our firm has been in the seed business over 40 years and it is our thinking that we as well as all other seed firms should have some method of obtaining information concerning sales of this size which are being contemplated, as this information is vital to the entire seed industry in numerous ways.

We would appreciate your securing for us the following facts:

1. When invitation to bid on this seed was announced.
2. Method of announcing invitation to bid.
3. Who and how many were invited to bid.
4. Were any releases given seed publications or press.

We are mailing you under separate cover a December 9, 1953, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, one of our local newspapers which carried a story on the first page, second section, concerning this sale of seed.

Thanking you, we are

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL HECKLE SEED CO.

Also, the Washington Daily News carried an article on December 10 by Mr. James Daniel, which reads as follows:

ADVISORY FIRMS GET A BARGAIN—SEEDY SALE FOR UNITED STATES

Agricultural Department has taken a substantial loss in a sale of Government-owned seed in which all but one of the buying companies was identified with an "advisory committee" appointed to help Government get the best price for its seed.

Here's what happened:

Last spring Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson dropped price supports from hay, pasture, and winter cover crop seeds. He then appointed a 20-man advisory committee of seed dealers and farm co-op men to counsel him on disposing of the stocks acquired earlier in price-support operations.

FIRST OFFER REFUSED

Offers were submitted by seed companies in August on 23 million pounds out of a total of 120 million pounds then on hand, but Agriculture Department refused to approve any.

In October, the Department asked for offers on 21 million pounds of the same seed. This time it decided to accept the "best combination of bids," which yielded around $1,855,000.

The rejected August offers on the same amount of seeds would have brought in around $2,100,000. In other words, Government officials lost $245,000 more on the same than if they'd taken the August offers.

The bidders were substantially identical both times.

LOSS INEVITABLE

Since the seeds had originally cost Government around $6,100,000 with about $500,000 in accumulated storage, transportation, and other charges, total loss was around $4,500,000. A large part of this would have been lost no matter who bought the seeds.

In the final sale, the full quantity made available by Government of 6 out of 7 varieties of seed was acquired by a syndicate of 5 companies. The syndicate was headed by Lloyd M. Brown, president of the Albert Dickinson (seed) Co. of Chicago.

Mr. Brown also is chairman of the seed industry advisory committee (SIAC).

Other companies in the syndicate were:

The Craver Dickinson Co., of Buffalo, an affiliate of Albert Dickinson, Mr. Brown says.

Ed F. Mangelsdorf & Bro., of St. Louis, represented on the advisory committee by A. H. Mangelsdorf.

The Rudy Patrick Seed Co., of Kansas City, represented on the committee by Ross M. Eldridge.

Northrup, King & Co., of Minneapolis, represented on the advisory committee by Maurice Keating.

Here is what the syndicate got:

Six million pounds of alfalfa seed which Government bought at 35 cents a pound. The syndicate offered 12 cents in August. The sale was closed at 10 cents in October.

Two million pounds of ladino clover which Government bought at $1 to $1.25 a pound. The syndicate first offered 17½ cents and the price was the same in the final sale.

Two million pounds of alsike clover which Government bought at 25 cents. The syndicate first offered 13 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 9 cents.

A half million pounds of high fescue which Government bought at 20 cents a pound. The syndicate first offered 6 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 5 cents.

Four million three hundred and eighty pounds of red clover which Government bought at 35 cents a pound. The syndicate first offered 15 cents. The sale was closed at 13½ cents.

One hundred and twenty thousand pounds of birdsfoot trefoil which Government bought at $1 a pound. The syndicate first offered 15 cents a pound. The sale was closed at 10 cents.

In all, the syndicate got 15 million pounds of seed on an understanding that they'll have at least 6 months in which to sell the seed in Europe without competition from any other sellers given cut-rate bargains in Government-held seeds.

The other 6 million pounds of seed in the sale was sold to the Sinason-Teichner Inter-American Seed Corp. in New York. It brought 2.77 cents a pound.

Marcus B. Braswell, acting head of the Agriculture Department's Commodity Stabilization Service, gives these as the possible reasons for rejecting the earlier, higher offers:

Some seedmen feared seed would go to Canada and be reimported.

Some worried about the effect of Government sales on the price of new crop seed.

It wasn't clear in August that Europe could absorb so much seed.

The United States market price was higher in August than in October.

There were unacceptable conditions on the August bids which were compromised in October.

To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has never disputed any of the statements made by Mr. Daniel in his article.

Mr. Daniel's article, the letter from the Russell-Heckle Co., and my own inquiry have disclosed some very curious circumstances about this sale. Among other things:

First. Fifteen million pounds of seed which cost the Government more than $6 million was sold for less than one-third of its original cost.

Second. The seed was bought by a syndicate of five companies, composed of members of Secretary Benson's Seed Industry Advisory Committee and headed by the chairman of that committee.

Third. The Department of Agriculture did not advertise this bargain sale in the usual way, and never quoted any reduced prices on the seeds involved. Instead it sent out a special limited-circulation press release saying it was willing to consider offers. The Russell-Heckle Co. says it would have been happy to buy some of this seed at a higher price, but it never received any anncuncement that a sale at reduced rates was being held. All it got was an announcement that the sale had been made.

Fourth. The Department's offer of seed for sale on a negotiated basis was dated Friday, October 2, 1953. It specified that all offers to buy the seed must be received by 11 a. m. Monday, October 12, 1953. I can see no advantage to the Government in setting a time limit of just about 1 week on a multimillion dollar deal, but the advantages to a group of insiders in keeping out legitimate bidders who might pay a higher price are obvious.

Fifth. On October 1, just 1 day before the special limited circulation notice of October 2, the Department of Agriculture issued its regular monthly price list, which is published in the Federal Register and sent to all companies interested in purchasing Government-owned commodities. This regular price list quoted prices on the same 15 million pounds of seed which were sold to the syndicate later that month. The quoted prices were more than three times as high as the bargain rates paid by the syndicate. In addition, the regular price list contained this significant statement:

Assurance is given buyers * * * that prices of specified seeds will not be reduced before July 1, 1954.

Prices quoted for 5 of the 6 varieties of seed involved contained the following notation:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

This is what the Department of Agriculture was telling buyers who were not lucky enough to be on the Seed Advisory Committee while it was quietly negotiating a sale at a fraction of these prices to the men on the inside.

Sixth. In addition to cut-rate prices, the Department gave more favorable freight terms to its friends. Prices quoted to ordinary purchasers were f. o. b.; terms to the more favored were freight alongside ship at the seaport.

Seventh. Evidently the Department has once again given its friends the 6-month monopoly provision it used in the pea sale.

Eighth. The Department of Agriculture turned down bids in August on the same seed from the same people that were several hundred thousand dollars higher than the bids they accepted so quickly in October.

The Department of Agriculture issues regular monthly price lists of CCC commodities available for export and for domestic sale. These price lists are customarily published on the 1st day of each month, or the last day of the preceding month. They are widely circulated and are printed in the Federal Register.

The export sales price lists from April through October last year did not specifically list any of the seeds involved in this sale as eligible for export. However, each price list during that period contained a statement that such seeds

from the domestic sales list were also eligible for export, at the same prices offered for sale to domestic buyers. Therefore, the prices at which these seeds were offered for export were the same as domestic prices.

NORTHERN ALFALFA

The Department of Agriculture sold to its friends in the syndicate 6 million pounds of northern alfalfa, which had cost the Government 35 cents a pound, or more than $2 million. The lowest price at which this alfalfa was offered to ordinary buyers since July 1953 is 37½ cents a pound. It was still being quoted at a price of 37½ cents a pound last month. In addition, from August 1953 through January 1954, the price lists contained the following statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the syndicate bid 12 cents a pound for this alfalfa. The bid was rejected. In October the syndicate bid 10 cents a pound for the same seed and the bid was accepted. The loss to the taxpayers was about $1½ million.

LADINO CLOVER

Two million pounds of ladino clover was involved in the deal. The seed cost the Government $1.05 a pound. From June through October the Department offered this variety at not less than $1 a pound. From June through September the price lists carried the following statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending October 31, 1953.

In October the Department sold this lot to the syndicate at 17½ cents a pound. Loss to the Government was close to $2 million.

RED CLOVER

Four million three hundred and eighty thousand pounds of red clover were sold. The Department of Agriculture bought this seed at the support price of 35 cents a pound. It was offered to buyers with no influence from May 1953 through January 1954 at a price of 36¾ cents per pound. From August 1953 through January 1954 the official price lists contained this statement:

Price will not be reduced during the period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the Department refused a syndicate bid of 15 cents per pound. In October it accepted a bid of 13½ cents for the same seed from the same people. The poor taxpayer took it in the neck for another million dollars.

ALSIKE CLOVER

The Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand 2 million pounds of alsike clover for which it paid 20 cents per pound. It advertised this variety from July 1953 through January 1954 at a price never less than 27 cents a pound. From August 1953 through January 1954 the monthly price lists included this statement:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

In August the syndicate bid 13 cents a pound for this lot of seed, but the bid must have been too high because it was refused. In October, their bid on the same seed was reduced to 9 cents a pound and was accepted. The taxpayers were comparatively lucky on this little deal—it only cost them $200,000.

BIRDSFOOT TREFOIL

Government stocks of seed included 120,000 pounds of birdsfoot trefoil, acquired at a cost of $1 a pound. This seed was quoted from April 1953 through January 1954 to ordinary buyers at a price never less than 78¾ cents per pound. From August 1953, through January 1954, the monthly price lists stated:

Price will not be reduced during period ending June 30, 1954.

In August, the Department turned down a syndicate bid of 15 cents a pound. In October it accepted a syndicate bid of 10 cents a pound. For seed which had cost $120,000, the taxpayers received exactly $12,000—a 10-percent return on their investment.

We investigated this kind of a deal down at the Department of Agriculture once already. That time they all promised to be good in the future, but it evidently takes more than one little congressional investigation to keep them in the straight and narrow path. The House Agriculture Committee should undertake a thorough investigation of this matter and clean up the mess in the Department.

I am forwarding a copy of my remarks to the Justice Department, with a request that the Attorney General study the evidence for possible violation of Federal statutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend his remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today Lithuanians throughout the free world are celebrating the 36th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania, a nation with a glorious history extending over a period of 700 years, has known its periods of national sovereignty as well as its periods of alien occupation. The independence day being celebrated today covers the period of Lithuania's independence in this century.

To us Americans national independence has a great significance. We look back to the beginnings of our own national independence in 1776 and we take great pride in our American Declaration of Independence. The moral and political principles expressed in that Declaration sum up the guiding principles upon which our Nation is founded. We take great pride in our national independence and are dedicated to its preservation, no matter what the cost may be to us individually or as a nation. It is for these reasons that all thinking Americans are happy to join with their Lithuanian friends in the free world in celebrating this, the 36th anniversary of national independence.

Lithuanian independence was interrupted on June 14, 1940. On that day the masters of the Kremlin served an ultimatum on the then free and independent Lithuanian Government offering them the alternative of either signing a typical Moscow nonaggression pact or upon refusal to be immediately invaded by the Red armies. We know that the representatives of the Lithuanian Government were required to sign this pact with a gun placed at their heads. We also know that on the same day this coercive act took place, the Red armies were already invading little Lithuania. The events which followed are well-known to most of the Members of the House, and we shall never forget the crimes against humanity perpetrated by the agents of the Kremlin in Lithuania during and following World War II. We shall be ever mindful that the tyranny of the Kremlin continues unabated in the Lithuanian nation, and that the Lithuanian people have not and never will surrender to the world Communist conspiracy.

It would benefit us on this occasion to recall that Lithuania is only one of the captive nations in the prison of nations established and controlled by Moscow. The fate of other once free nations within the prison of nations is very much like that of Lithuania. Those of us who hold that Lithuania will and must be made free and independent again will find the means to this end once we come to fully recognize the Moscovite Empire as a prison of nations. Just as we cherish our national independence, so do the overwhelming majority of people in all these captive nations long for and strive for a restoration of their national homelands. A band of tyrants cannot long contain the rightful national aspirations which are today rampant within the Moscow prison of nations. When we harness this powerful human force solidly to our own national preservation, then and only then will Lithuania be free.

RESTORATION OF BILL TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the bill S. 1432 was passed. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which that was done be vacated and that the bill be restored to the Private Calendar.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. AYRES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SADLAK and to include an editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. DIES and to include a copy of H. R. 7894.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in three instances.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER in six instances.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH) and to include a report.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. MAILLIARD for 3 days, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 11, 1954, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 395. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 1129. An act for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fifflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fifflis;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb;

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck;

H. R. 1674. An act for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu;

H. R. 2813. An act for the relief of William E. Aitcheson;

H. R. 2839. An act to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands;

H. R. 2842. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle;

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

H. R. 3228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of John James T. Bell;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Eiko Tanaka;

H. R. 3619. An act for the relief of Rufin Manikowski;

H. R. 3728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek);

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder;

H. R. 4439. An act for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham;

H. R. 4577. An act for the relief of Edith Maria Gore;

H. R. 4972. An act for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho;

H. R. 5195. An act for the relief of Max Kassner;

H. R. 5379. An act to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication;

H. R. 5861. An act to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government;

H. R. 5945. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

H. R. 5959. An act to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive; and

H. J. Res. 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 17, 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:

1271. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the Department of the Army on Research and Development contracts for the period July 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1272. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration, covering operations between August 1, 1953, and January 31, 1954, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (Public Law 163); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1273. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 686, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1274. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the 18th Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1275. A letter from the Archivist 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.

1276. A letter from the secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the report of the activities of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

1277. A letter from the assistant to the president, the American Academy of Arts and Letters transmitting the report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year 1953; to the Committee on House Administration.

1278. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 26th report of action taken by the United States Maritime Administration, pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, Public Law 498, 77th Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1279. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the 16th quarterly report on the Administration of the Advance Planning Program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 352., 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7893. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota: Committee of conference. 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 (Rept. No. 1201). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1433. A bill 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2683. A bill to amend section 12 of the Alaska Public Works Act, approved August 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 629); without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2848. A bill to amend section 89 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5627. A bill to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act 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"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7328. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7541. A bill to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). 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. CANFIELD:

H. R. 7893. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 7894. A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; making membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering the revolutionary conspiracy by force and violence a criminal offense; and providing penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7895. 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. BAKER:

H. R. 7896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that, for the purpose of determining the venue of criminal prosecutions thereunder, certain acts shall be deemed to have been committed in the district in which the taxpayer resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7897. A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7898. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 7899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply to the transportation of certain farm commodities and livestock from farm to market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 7900. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation for certain service-connected disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 7901. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate the requirement that a bond be posted in connection with the transmission of installment obligations at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 7902. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7903. A bill to provide pensions for disabled unemployable veterans who served in a war, campaign, expedition, or insurrection beyond the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7904. A bill to authorize certain beach-erosion control of the shore of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7905. A bill to establish the United States Customs Port Patrol in the Bureau of Customs for the purpose of enforcing the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 7906. A bill to reenact and amend a portion of the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr LANHAM:

H. R. 7907. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7908. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to require that committees of Congress account for counterpart funds which are made available for their local currency requirements pursuant to section 115 (h) of that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 7909. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 7910. A bill to provide certain safeguards for animals which are to be used in scientific experiments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 7911. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 7912. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7913. A bill to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POFF:

H. R. 7914. A bill to incorporate the National Fund for Medical Education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 7915. A bill to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 7916. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide annuities for certain incompetent children of deceased railroad workers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7917. A bill relating to the naturalization of certain merchant seamen who later serve in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7918. A bill to provide for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration facility at Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7919. A bill to provide for payment of pension for nonservice-connected permanent and total disability to veterans of any war, regardless of length of service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 7920. A bill to require inside latches on the doors of household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7921. A bill to require motor vehicles to be provided with suitable illuminated license plates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 7922. A bill to relieve certain undocumented American pleasure vessels from the requirements of clearance and entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAND:

H. J. Res. 376. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating one day each year as National Library Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of the great Italian navigator and discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 379. Joint resolution granting the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the States of Alabama and Florida with respect to the location of the boundary line between those States at the mouth of the Perdido River and adjacent thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution establishing an academy for page boys; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Res. 446. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House in respect to investigative procedure; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly respectfully requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the

United States to call to the attention of their associates in Congress the recent action of the house of representatives in creating a special committee of said house to investigate the high cost of coffee in Rhode Island, in tangible protest at public hearing against such prevailing high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to extend the time for the operation by it of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to a study and revision of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts against the passage of legislation depriving States of the power to regulate the discontinuance of railroad services in intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to reduce the age requirements for recipients of old age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of increasing benefits under the Federal Social Security Act to a minimum allowance of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts to take action to lower the high cost of coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7923. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 7924. A bill for the relief of Giuseppi Clementi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7925. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dina Mianulli (nee Kratzer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7926. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 7927. A bill for the relief of Maria Inez Santellan Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7928. A bill for the relief of Mariana de Rojas (nee Mariana Lopez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7929. A bill to provide for the extension of a certain patent relating to one-piece dresses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 7930. A bill for the relief of Susanne Ingeborg Bernhard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 7931. A bill for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7932. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 7933. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Deutsch Meizlik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7934. A bill for the relief of Nejdat Mulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7935. A bill for the relief of Daniel and Martha Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7936. A bill for the relief of Marko Radic and Irene Radic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 7937. A bill for the relief of Hesna Hun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7938. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7939. A bill for the relief of Isaac Piha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 7940. A bill for the relief of Caterina Cantele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7941. A bill for the relief of Lt. Hayden R. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 7942. A bill for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dinka Feretic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 7944. A bill for the relief of John Nasharr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 7945. A bill for the relief of Bart Blaak (formerly Johannes J. M. Gijsbers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7946. A bill for the relief of Pai Shiu Chuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 7947. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton; 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:

509. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Democratic State Committee of the State of Rhode Island requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to support S. 1663, providing for proper increases in the compensation of the Federal judiciary, of Members of Congress, and of United States attorneys and assistants to the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Miss Bertha Cole, Spokane, Wash., and 328 other citizens in counties of Spokane, Lincoln, Stevens, and Okanogan, requesting enactment of legislation that would prohibit all liquor advertising in newspapers, magazines, billboards, and over the air; and asking for a public hearing on all antiliquor advertising bills which were introduced in the new session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

511. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Dr. J. R. McLemore, president, Paris Junior College, Paris, Tex., and 30 other presidents of junior colleges in Texas, who are members of the Texas Public Junior College Association, expressing approval of Public Law 550 as it exists and is operated at the present time; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

512. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the National Retail Hardware Association unanimously adopted at the 58th annual convention urging the support of the Davis bill (H. R. 5598), opposing a general sales tax and supporting certain amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

513. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Vicente A. Matias, Manila, Philippines, relative to Army of the United States status being revoked; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. Also, petition of the president, California Federation of Women's Clubs, San Francisco, Calif., requesting the introduction of legislation to cover certain suggested omissions in the food and drug and cosmetic law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. Also, petition of the Chief Clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

516. Also, petition of the secretary, Roseburg Central Labor Council, Roseburg, Oreg., favoring personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source and opposing any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Farmers' Home Administration Doing a Commendable Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to review briefly the progress made under the lending program we set up last summer to help distressed livestock producers. I frankly believe that this program saved the livestock industry. I refer to the Farmers' Home Administration.

Last June cattlemen were faced with what looked like another dry summer. In some of the States—Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Wyoming, and Texas—the drought was entering its fourth year.

Many of the cattlemen were liquidating their foundation herds. They had to. They lacked feed and they lacked the money to buy feed. In fact, many of them were carrying debts that they had run up fighting the drought of the year before. In normal times, feed dealers and bankers would have been able to carry them. But these were not normal times. The lenders already had a lot of credit on their books, the ranchers already had liens on most everything they owned.

Around mid-June the House Agriculture Committee held hearings on the need for emergency livestock credit and several of us took a quick trip to the drought area to get firsthand information on the situation. By the middle of July we had enabling legislation and appropriations to carry out the legislation cleared through both the House and the Senate. The emergency livestock loan program was ready to go.

We were fortunate, I believe, in having an organization already established and ready to take the authorities and funds that we made available and put them to use quickly. The Farmers' Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture has a nationwide organization that serves every agricultural county. This agency has many years of experience in the agricultural credit field and had handled emergency credit programs before. By the first week in August they had loan funds available in county offices from one end of the country to the other.

To date more than $29 million has been loaned to 2,900 livestock producers. That is an average of more than a million dollars a week. That is service where and when service is needed.

Let me tell you what that $29 million has done. It has kept foundation herds together, animals that if slaughtered, would have taken years to replace.

It has helped families hang on to their means of livelihood.

It helped thousands of cattlemen who never applied for a loan for it brought about orderly marketings that in turn strengthened the whole cattle market.

It helped the consumer for if there had been mass slaughterings of cattle last summer the cost of beef by next summer would have been so high you could not touch a steak with a 10-foot pole.

It helped private lenders for it bolstered the security of the loans they held.

By and large it strengthened, and I believe saved, the whole livestock industry.

Let me tell you how this loan program works.

The emergency credit is extended throughout the country to established producers and feeders of cattle who are temporarily unable to get the credit they need for regular credit sources. These cattlemen must of course have a good record of livestock operations and reasonable prospects for success with the help of the loan.

The loans are made to meet any usual expenses necessary to successful livestock operations.

Loans are made repayable within 3 years and bear 5 percent interest. Livestock loan committees, composed of men who are familiar with local livestock operations decide whether the applicant is eligible and approve the loans. Applications are made at the county offices of the Farmers' Home Administration.

I believe that everyone who took part in creating and carrying out this program of assistance to cattlemen takes pride in their accomplishments. I know that I do. When the legislation was being considered I was able to call attention to the fact that there are thousands of ranchers who carry on feeding operations as a part of their farming operation. These men raise their own feed and then buy enough young stock to consume this feed supply. The bill was revised to provide for the needs of these farmers. I also supported the measure as a whole.

Time does not permit naming all who took part in formulating this program. But let me mention a few. The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, spearheaded the action in the House, his capable counterpart in the Senate, the Honorable GEORGE AIKEN handled the bill in the Senate.

President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson both took an extremely active interest in the legislation. In the Department of Agriculture, Robert Farrington and R. B. McLeaish, under whose direction the Farmers' Home Administration operates, worked long hours nights and weekends to see that the service was made available to farmers with maximum speed and efficiency.

The whole country can take pride in this program. For in the manner in which it was conceived and carried out we proved once more our ability to cope with any crisis. A nation's strength and endurance depends in the long run on its ability to meet emergency situations. The livestock loan program is a testimonial to this Nation's strength.

Special livestock loans as of Feb. 5, 1954

State	Loans approved		Applications pending	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Alabama	14	$100,975	0	0
Arizona	13	360,890	7	$264,815
Arkansas	338	524,855	23	68,280
California	[1] 13	511,880	9	197,940
Colorado	136	3,093,875	38	891,245
Florida	37	562,265	4	192,075
Georgia	32	306,550	0	0
Idaho	18	637,964	15	943,820
Illinois	2	18,600	0	0
Indiana	7	168,400	1	6,800
Iowa	1	2,000	1	1,575
Kansas	87	1,431,900	18	171,410
Kentucky	23	37,470	7	14,135
Louisiana	4	62,250	1	5,000
Massachusetts	5	11,100	1	1,600
Michigan	2	13,000	0	0
Minnesota	3	13,875	0	0
Mississippi	4	29,195	0	0
Missouri	692	946,490	48	46,680
Montana	93	2,658,845	41	1,358,765
Nebraska	4	62,450	0	0
Nevada	46	879,715	3	34,570
New Hampshire	1	1,000	5	5,320
New Jersey	13	32,690	0	0
New Mexico	210	2,437,408	22	490,880
New York	16	23,460	10	18,390
North Carolina	1	3,315	0	0
North Dakota	6	24,835	0	0
Ohio	5	7,790	0	0
Oklahoma	160	2,103,230	24	443,500
Oregon	3	149,113	5	364,580
Pennsylvania	19	28,395	15	17,850
South Carolina	1	7,870	0	0
South Dakota	50	593,340	11	170,970
Tennessee	18	25,400	2	1,500
Texas	709	10,004,890	64	795,350
Utah	38	606,304	9	187,885
Vermont	2	5,280	3	6,000
Virginia	52	167,630	6	7,900
Washington	0	0	3	115,857
West Virginia	22	12,395	3	655
Wyoming	28	636,695	8	324,700
Hawaii	5	47,675	2	8,200
Total	2,933	29,353,254	409	7,158,247

[1] 1 loan in the amount of $23,900 tentatively approved, has been finally rejected.

Due Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the people who live along the shores of Lake Ontario have been threatened with catastrophic damages to their homes and property if and when the two great international developments on the lake, the seaway and power project, become operative. Both projects can and may raise the water levels of the lake. Either or both may do so to the point where hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage may be done to lakeshore properties.

We have a treaty with Canada which, presumably, protects people who are injured by virtue of water project developments along the international boundary.

But time and costly litigation have proved these guaranties almost meaningless. Because these are international waters our own courts have suggested hesitancy in assuming jurisdiction; and where they have done so, the Government of Canada has pleaded sovereignty and withheld agreement to be sued. As a result, the people of the lakeshore find themselves in an international no-man's land, where their constitutional guaranties under the "due process" clause are meaningless, and there is no machinery to implement the treaty guaranties which are, presumably, operative.

In order to overcome this dilemma, Representative KEATING and I have requested the International Joint Commission to undertake the establishment of an international tribunal to which residents of the lakeshore may turn for protection.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a copy of the letter which we addressed to the International Joint Commission earlier this month, together with a copy of the reply which we have just received from the assistant to the legal counsel of the Department of State:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.

CHAIRMAN,
International Joint Comission,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been noted with satisfaction that the order of approval authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence power project, under date of October 29, 1952, contains specific guaranties to the effect that "All interests on either side of the international boundary which are injured by reason of the construction, maintenance and operation of the works shall be given suitable and adequate protection and indemnity in accordance with the laws in Canada or the Constitution and laws in the United States respectively, and in accordance with the requirements of Article VIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty."

Nevertheless, long and costly experience, involving protracted litigation, has demonstrated that, in the absence of specific designation as to who is legally and financially responsible for such injury, the rights and properties of thousands of citizens of both countries may be destroyed and that they are, in fact, without adequate legal protection. Two recent instances illustrate the inadequacy of present machinery to deal with these matters.

In one case, affecting the water levels of Lake Ontario, the Canadian Government specifically assumed responsibility for damage to the properties of United States citizens which might result from the construction of a dam in the outlet from the lake. Yet, when destructive water levels resulted, and recourse was had to the courts of the United States, the Canadian Government interposed a plea of sovereignty, arguing that it could not be sued.

In a second case, recently adjudicated by the United States court of appeals, it was held that there is "at least considerable doubt" as to whether an order of the International Joint Commission is subject to judicial review.

Thus, in the first case (which, we are aware, does not directly involve the International Joint Commission, although the Commission acted to provide relief from the damaging high waters), the legal and Constitutional guaranties of protection and indemnity are inadequate; and in the second case, involving projects which involve great potential damage to the lakeshore property owners, the Court has indicated that orders of the International Joint Commission are probably above the law, so far as judicial recourse in the United States is concerned.

Under such circumstances, the guaranties of protection and indemnity written into the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and reaffirmed in the International Joint Commission's Order of Approval of October 29, 1952, are meaningless, and, in fact, convey an implication of assurance that is deceitful.

The two great projects which are now taking shape on the St. Lawrence River, however much they may benefit certain interests, may spell catastrophe to the lakeshore property owners. We refer, of course, to the St. Lawrence seaway and St. Lawrence power project. These projects will involve not 1 but 4 entities, 2 on each side of the international boundary, any or all of which may be responsible for changes in the water levels of Lake Ontario which could be disastrous to the residents of the lakeshore. As evidence of the diffusion of responsibility in these developments, the International Joint Commission's order of approval of the power project vests control of the water levels of the lake at various points in (1) the Secretary of the Army, (2) the International Joint Commission, (3) the Federal Power Commission, and (4) the Congress. The Federal Power Commission, meanwhile, in authorizing the New York State Power Authority to proceed with development of power, has required that the power authority, rather than the United States Government, be held responsible for damages which may result from the project, notwithstanding the fact that the power authority has no funds and no program for taking care of such contingencies.

In this plethora of agencies, among whom legal and financial responsibility is hopelessly confused and diffused, the rights of the individual citizen who may be injured by their joint or several operations become lost in a fog of international complexities. Each of the entities involved can point to someone else as responsible, and there is no agency anywhere to adjudicate the matter.

In view of this situation, may we request that the International Joint Commission undertake, as a part of its continuing responsibility for the St. Lawrence power project and its study of the Great Lakes water levels, to formulate, without further delay, the precise means by which parties injured as a result of projects authorized by it in these international waters may obtain the protection and indemnification which, under the Boundary Waters Treaty, it is obliged to provide.

It is clearly insufficient to point to the appropriate courts of the respective countries, or to the Constitution and the laws of the two countries, as a proper recourse for injured citizens, for costly experience has shown these remedies to be inadequate. These are damages sustained as the result of the undertakings of supranational agencies with intermeshing objectives, and it may well require the creation of a supranational body to hear and adjudicate claims arising therefrom.

We are cognizant of the fact that the International Joint Commission is presently awaiting the findings of the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers, with a view to making certain corrections in method of regulation No. 5. The treaty mandate to provide suitable and adequate protection and indemnity is not alone an engineering problem, however; it is juridical as well. Just as the Commission has created international boards of engineers and boards of control at various points along the international boundary, to handle the development and operation of these great international projects, it now appears essential to set up juridical instrumentalities to insure that legal and financial responsibility is defined and fixed in these undertakings. Otherwise, the rights of individuals, private and corporate, whose properties are damaged or destroyed by these developments, are in danger of being abandoned in an international no man's land.

May we request a statement from you at your early convenience as to what steps the Commission may contemplate with respect to this vitally important matter?

Very sincerely yours,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Member of Congress.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 15, 1954.

The Honorable HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: The receipt is acknowledged of a letter signed by you and Representative KENNETH B. KEATING dated February 4, 1954, concerning your desire to have the International Joint Commission undertake to formulate, without further delay, the precise means by which parties injured as a result of projects authorized by it in the St. Lawrence River may obtain the protection and indemnification which is provided for under the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909.

It is understood that a similar letter has been addressed to the United States section of the Commission and that this matter is receiving active consideration by its members.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM R. VALLANCE,
Assistant to the Legal Adviser.

Malenkov Will Not Tell "Nothing to Nobody"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Macy's does not tell Gimbel's but Malenkov goes Macy's one better. He will not tell anybody. The U. N. has just published its fifth annual yearbook which amounts to a statistician's nightmare. It tells everything about everybody starting with the amount of money spent for agates and going down somewhere to zygotes. That is, it tells about every country except Russia.

Mr. Malenkov refuses to furnish any figures on the day-to-day living costs of his people and the expenses of the Soviet Union for such items as military defense are clouded by all kinds of guesswork. Not only does Mr. M. refuse to tell, he also stops Albania, Bulgaria, mainland China, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Poland, and Rumania from telling.

A good clue to why Malenkov will not talk comes from some of the living standard items. Out of 230 million radios in the entire world, approximately one-half are in the United States. Twenty-five million of these radios are in American automobiles. We have 1 physician for every 800 inhabitants. Only New Zealand reaches this mark with us. We use up 60 percent of the world's newsprint. Our farmers have

one-third of the world's fertilizer available.

No wonder Mr. Malenkov will not talk. He does not have much to talk about.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the past 20 years, many attempts have been made to remake American laws that have to deal with the domestic and foreign concepts of our American way of life. Some of these attempted changes have been openly made, but generally these substitutions and alterations have been deceitful, deceptive, and fraudulent. These modifications, in our age-old American rights, have generally been placed in a gaudy package bound with pinkish, red, and glittering tinsel, with a motto on the outside, "in the name of worldwide humanity." But the opponents of the Bricker amendment have used different wrapping paper because when you cut through their phony legalistic phrases, we see very clearly that their package is wrapped in the clearest of cellophane. Their whole package is designed to make the United States a vassal state in which the internationalists, one-worlders can get control of the sovereignty of the United States.

We, in America, have always won our battles for freedom and sovereignty when we could see our enemy. But the enemy who hides behind the Constitution, while plotting its destruction, is sometimes difficult to control. These modern international Socialists and Communists who use the fifth amendment as a cloak to carry on their so-called enlightening reforms are not always easy to apprehend.

The Bricker amendment, in simple language, is nothing more or less than an attempt to preserve and protect our American heritage.

It might be well to recall that this attempt to destroy our American heritage was started at San Francisco at the first organization meeting of the United Nations—and remember—the basic architect after months of scheming with the internationalist, socialistic, pink-fringe crowd was Alger Hiss.

The San Francisco meeting was nothing more or less than the public stage from which the United Nations concept would be launched—and again the United Nations package was wrapped up in gaudy tinsel—to proclaim to the world an organization for international peace—but the real objective of Alger Hiss, Joe Stalin and all the Red international socialists was a back-door entry to steal the sovereignty of the United States.

This weird organizational meeting opened without prayer so the atheists and other international one-worlders might not be offended at the mention of God's name.

Did the people of the United States elect the delegates to this organizational meeting? No. They were appointed. These delegates simply gambled with the destiny and sovereignty of the American people. Joe Stalin was not there. It was not necessary—because he had Alger Hiss there as Secretary-General. Edward R. Stettinius, one of the United States delegates, told the President of the United States that this United Nations—was a declaration and a constitution.

Emphasis was used as usual by the proponents of the U. N. to show that it was basically designed as a peace organization. Korea is the tragic example of this phony concept. When this U. N. Charter was ratified, it was a blow at American independence—it was dishonoring to the sound doctrine of George Washington and an insult to the memory of the Continental Army—and above all a slave act for the American people.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, has said:

> I made an error which I shall regret all the days of my life when I voted for the United Nations.

The basic objective of the Bricker amendment is to assure two things: that world government cannot be forced on the American people through the back door or by using the Trojan horse technique—and to be doubly sure that the civil liberties of the people of the United States be not destroyed.

Perhaps the Bricker amendment's chief and final objective is to guarantee our basic domestic rights. It is certainly a long jump from our fundamental concepts of basic American rights—if foreign states can change, alter or compel us to change our basic domestic laws. Yet many of those who oppose the Bricker amendment say we must submit to this—in order to show international cooperation.

Our own Constitution would have never been ratified by the States if the Bill of Rights had not been added to the Constitution as the first ten amendments.

The makers of our Constitution thought the Federal Government would only be concerned with treaties concerning boundaries, freedom of the seas, right to trade with foreign nations, etc.

Article VI of the Constitution says:

> . . . All Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Edgar W. Waybright of Florida has this to say about the intent of the framers of the Constitution:

> They did not foresee that in 1848, a little man who had failed at everything, by the name of Karl Marx, would devise a scheme for a cruel worldwide dictatorship to enslave all mankind. They did not foresee that thousands of college professors, school teachers, ministers, labor bosses, writers, businessmen, lawyers, and doctors, could be led by a few sinister men consumed by the lust for power to turn the words of the Constitution upside down, and inside out, so that they would mean what the writers never intended.
>
> They never could in the wildest nightmare have imagined that these sinister men and these well meaning but shallow thinkers could take from the preamble of this great instrument the phrase "promote the general welfare" and interpret it to mean that these words taken from the context authorized, ignoring the rest of the Constitution, the creation of a Communist, Socialist, or Fascist "welfare" state.
>
> Likewise, the framers of this great instrument could never have dreamed that these same men could twist the above quoted words from article VI to mean that the President of the United Sates and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, could by ratification of a treaty destroy at one fell swoop the Constitution of the United States, every State constitution in each and every one of the 48 States of the Union, and every State and Federal law.

By use of the present doctrine in the area of domestic law, the President with consent of the Senate can do anything he wants to do by treaty, regardless of the restrictions and prohibitions in the Constitution. This may seem to be a bold statement, but stranger and sadder things than this have happened.

Harry Truman, by a stroke of a pen and a telephone call, caused 130,000 Americans to die in Korea—simply using the authority granted in the United Nations Charter. The Constitution was nullified because it plainly states—only the Congress can declare war.

Patrick Henry well expressed the danger in these words:

> If treaties are made to infringe our liberties, it will be too late to say our rights have been violated.

Those who oppose the Bricker amendment just say "it can't happen here," domestic American laws are in no danger.

Recently the United States Supreme Court had this to say in one of their decisions:

> The U. N. Charter represents a moral commitment of foremost importance and we (the Court) must not permit the spirit of our pledge to be compromised or disparaged in either our domestic or foreign affairs.

These words coming from the Supreme Court—should warn us all—as a red flag of danger.

Secretary Dulles, before he was Secretary of State, pointed out on two separate occasions the necessity for the Bricker amendment. He said in a Louisville, Ky., speech—that treaties can change our domestic law and override the Constitution. But since he has become Secretary of State, he says the danger is unimportant because we will not do anything to undermine the Constitution. That in effect is what all dictators in history have said: "Just give me the power and I'll never misuse it."

Secretary Dulles now says the Bricker amendment would interfere with the international position of the United States. This statement leads to asking Mr. Dulles, the former associate and successor to Mr. Dean Acheson, "which is more important, the international position of the United States or the basic constitutional domestic rights of the American people?"

The great mass of the internationalists, the bleeding hearts for the downtrodden world humanity, the pinks, many scholarly unthinking degree-laden college professors, all are saying, "If we pass the Bricker amendment, we will be placing the President in a straitjacket in his treaty making power." That is just the point—he should be placed in a stratijacket if he makes any treaty or recommends one that in any shape, form or manner interferes or takes away any basic domestic rights of American citizens.

The American people have been accustomed to living under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I believe they still prefer to live under the constitutional safeguards—rather than upon the mere promises of a court. Under the U. N., a supreme court consisting of Chinese, Russians, Arabs, Jews, Italians, and so forth, can make laws and ratify them because we are a part of the United Nations.

It is, therefore, virtually certain that unless we withdraw from the United Nations or secure an amendment to its charter or amend article 6 of our own Federal Constitution, all segregation laws, all laws prohibiting intermarriage of races, all laws fixing national quotas for immigration, and all laws which in some ways affect different races, different religions, different sexes, and different language speaking peoples will fail. This is already the supreme law of the land. The Charter of the United Nations was a treaty.

How easily could such a vicious treaty be slipped through? At least three recent treaties were legally ratified by one United States Senator. He didn't cast the deciding vote, he cast the only vote. They are now the supreme law of the land. If they had concealed any jokers, American law could not protect you.

Several major treaties have been ratified by a small handful of Senators. For instance, our mutual assistance treaty with Turkey was made the supreme law of the land by six Senators.

A distinguished jurist, Florence E. Allen, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, recently had this to say:

> At first I was not particularly alarmed about all this, I said to myself, "Well, these international Socialists can draft all the laws they want to, but it will not affect the United States." But then I learned two things I should have known before, but did not. And these two things are the reason for the proposed Bricker amendment. Here they are:
>
> "Bear in mind, as I said before, that an international law called a convention is considered a treaty. In the United States treaties are submitted only to the Senate. They are not submitted to the House of Representatives. An ILO convention, for example, can be ratified as a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Members of the Senate present on the day the vote is taken. Not two-thirds of the Senate—two-thirds of those present; and unless the question of a quorum is raised, only a handful present could put through the vote. That's how ratification of a convention might be slipped through."

I am sure we all remember when President Truman seized the steel companies. The Constitution gave him no power to take private property—so said a majority of the Supreme Court. But remember that the three dissenting judges said that our ratification of the U. N. had given our President power to seize private property, in defiance of our Constitution. Had these 3 judges been able to persuade 2 more judges to their way of thinking, our Constitution would be dead and we would be completely at the mercy of the United Nations.

Some years ago the Congress enacted a law concerning migratory birds; namely, ducks and geese. The President approved; no one questioned the validity of this act at the time of its passage. But subsequently, someone got arrested for shooting ducks out of season, and this migratory law was attacked because Congress had no power to legislate in this field—that the States had this power. The courts decided that this migratory bird law was unconstitutional. What happened: The United States made a treaty with Great Britain. Then the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government had jurisdiction over migratory birds; but they got this power by the treaty and Congress then got power from the treaty, which it did not otherwise have, to pass the law regulating the hunting of migratory birds.

That was the much discussed case of Missouri vs. Holland, decided by the Supreme Court in 1920. The Court there decided, notwithstanding the contrary view of Thomas Jefferson and many others, that although Congress under the Constitution did not have power to legislate on the subject of migratory birds, still if a treaty was first made, then Congress got from the treaty power which Congress otherwise hasn't got; and that the 10th amendment which, in the absence of a treaty, reserves all those powers to the States, did not stand in the way once a treaty was made. In other words, when the Constitution forbids the Federal Government from doing something, then all the Government needs to do is to make a treaty on the subject with some friendly country, and then the Federal Government acquires power over the subject. This has been called the "bootstrap doctrine" of Federal power, namely, that when the Constitution denies the power, the Government by its own voluntary act of making a treaty with another country, can acquire the power. So, by a broad treaty such as the United Nations Charter covering the whole gamut of human activity, the Federal Government becomes a government of unlimited power, so far as the States and people are concerned—the exact opposite of what the Founding Fathers thought they were creating when they carefully designed a federal government of limited powers only, as we all learned in school.

The Pink case in 1942 went even further. That was a "pink case" indeed. The Soviet Government confiscated the money of a private Russian insurance company held in New York for the protection of policyholders and creditors. In connection with recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933, President F. D. Roosevelt by a letter accepted from Soviet Russia an assignment of these confiscated private funds, agreeing to apply them on Soviet Government debts in the United States. The policyholders and creditors claimed the money, but the Supreme Court, by a 5 to 2 vote, solemnly decided that this "executive agreement" made by the exchange of letters overrode the fifth amendment and also the law of the State of New York. Under that decision, if a subject can be said to be part of the President's foreign policy, the 10 amendments and the Constitution cannot stand in the way. Thus the President, by signing a letter, takes over a large part of the legislative power. He gets dangerously close to one-man government by decree. Hence the Federal Government can by treaty or executive agreement do almost anything, regardless of the Constitution of the United States or the laws of the several States of the Union. To be specific, under the doctrine of the Pink case, we can send Americans abroad for trial on account of crimes committed here, without the constitutional safeguards to which they are entitled, or we can join a world government by treaty.

Perhaps there are many of you—who think that these executive agreements apply to big international policy matters and that your rights as a private American citizen are secure.

Treaties are going out of style because the internationalists say treaties are so cumbersome—and the most radical of the New York leftwing crowd say, "Congress is so provincial in an atomic age, this bunch of squareheads just doesn't have the proper viewpoint."

We all know about Roosevelt's secret agreements at Yalta and Teheran. It is estimated by the U. S. News & World Report that in the last 10 years, over 10,000 agreements have been made—most of them secret as far as the American people know.

We now know about Roosevelt's deals, throughout the world—let us take a look at a few bags of potatoes, under Truman's administration.

A man by the name of Capps, a Virgina potato dealer, found out that he could buy potatoes in Canada, pay freight, customs, and still sell them in Florida at a profit.

The reciprocal trade adherents who are always all preaching we must have free trade throughout the world to show this country's friendly good will and cooperation, evidently did not come to the defense of Capps and his potato purchase.

Capps, the Virginia merchant, bought about 50,000 bags of potatoes in Canada. He paid the Canadian price $88,350—freight charges of $19,417.60, customs duties of United States $37,000—and made a profit of $18,000. Two years later the United States Government sued him in Federal court for $150,486.

There had been an exchange of letters between Harry Truman's State Department and the Canadian Government in which it was agreed that Canada would attempt to prevent shipment of potatoes to the United States.

The Federal Government sued Mr. Capps on this executive agreement. The Federal Government also based its case on the fact that there was a high support price on American potatoes and Capps

had undersold our United States potatoes; hence this was used as the measure of the damages.

The Federal court in Virginia held that this exchange of letters had "the force of law" but also held the Government had not proved its measure of damages. The United States court of appeals sustained Mr. Capps. However, Mr. Brownell, the Attorney General, has appealed to the Supreme Court. He had told the Supreme Court "Nothing in the Constitution forbids this established practice," and that such letters as written by the President to the Canadian Government "are the law of the land."

It seems readily apparent if they can take the gold from insurance company stock holders by an agreement and give Russia a free hand in Asia by commitments at Yalta and Teheran, sue a dealer for a few bags of potatoes, it is high time that this loophole be plugged.

Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, answers the foregoing question in the following manner:

> The only possible answer that can be made to this is that in recent years there has gradually developed in our midst another kind of American than those who founded this great Republic—the American who is impatient with the slow and safe processes of law—impatient of constitutional restraints—the kind of American who prefers unrestrained power—the kind of American who believes in so-called 'unhandicapped' executive power.
>
> Behind all this changed attitude of mind on the part of many of our high officials of Government is also the desire to change America from a republic to a socialistic state by and through the treaty process and eventually to use this device to put us into some form of world government. Mr. Dulles in his Boston speech on August 26, 1953, before the annual meeting of the American Bar Association 'let the cat out of the bag,' or half out of the bag, with respect to this matter. He pointed out that the United Nations Charter, by its own terms, comes up for amendment in 1955. It is now no secret that Mr. Dulles and others believe in strengthening the charter in the direction of world government, and that they are planning and hoping to do this by the treaty method in 1955. The clear answer to these diplomatic planners of world government is that whether we have or do not have world government is a matter for the American people to decide. World government should not be imposed upon them through 'treaty law' and through mere action of the President, the State Department, and two-thirds of the members of the Senate present and voting.

The former Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and now ratified by Secretary Dulles, proclaim that there is no difference between foreign and domestic affairs and that treaties are supreme and can override the Constitution. Secretary Dulles has said, "Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law."

As you think about the merits or demerits of this Bricker amendment, keep this thought always in your mind. The Bill of Rights in the Constitution forbids the Congress to change your basic American rights, but without the Bricker amendment, since this Republic is now a member of the United Nations, your basic rights can be taken away by a treatymaking agency which consists of the President and two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

The passage of this amendment will establish once and for all, the American theory that basic American rights cannot be changed by treaties or executive agreements; but without the Bricker amendment these rights can be changed and destroyed by such instruments.

The important thing for everybody to remember is that we are up against the most sinister, diabolical conspiracy in the history of the world to destroy the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, destroy "the opportunity state" which has made us great, and substitute by the combination of outside force, internal fifth-column activities of force and deception, a slave state in which a government—a world government—shall dominate and control everybody in everything. It is unimportant whether this is called a "liberal" or "progressive" government, a welfare state, Socialist, a Fascist, or a Communist system, they all end up at the same goal post—a totalitarian dictatorship.

In any discussion that is had about the forces and events that are taking place throughout the world, particularly in Asia, Africa, and the Near East, one is always struck most forcibly with this phrase: "self-autonomy—home ruie." This is the uppermost in these people's minds—these thoughts even come from Uganda, deep in the jungles of equatorial Africa. These backward and illiterate peoples, just emerging into modern civilization, are trying to light their future with the bright rays of "freedom and self-determination."

While many people of the United States seemingly want to hide our bright light of freedom in the dark recesses of that hideous, deceptive, and fraudulent house of the United Nations, this house of the United Nations could in the years to come, be just a shroud for our Constitution.

To the people of the Sixth Congressional District—Kansans all—people of northwest Kansas, descendants of men of royal blood, the pioneers, men and women who subdued and conquered the high plains with its drought—its violent upheavals of weather, dust storms, a land of water courses without water, a land of no high mountain peaks, no wonderland of scenic valleys nestling between forest covered hillsides, there is no hallowed Plymouth Rock, nor a Bunker Hili Monument, nor a statue of a Jefferson, Washington or Lincoln on a high hill to remind us of our ancient heritage. But there are living monuments in each city, town, and village and on the ancient homesteads—these are the men who in yesteryear gave their services in the Argonne, Belleau Wood, and on the Rhine, men who built bridges over the rivers of Europe, who drove tanks through the Siegfried Line, men who crawled off the ships on the beach of Normandy and waded through the snows of Belgium during the Bulge, and more lately men who took and held Baldy and Pork Chop Hills in Korea.

Most of these men are home. They want to live as free men in a free nation, paying a fair share of taxes to help maintain a government that is theirs—a free man's government—and not a government whose laws can be changed by an international body on some foreign shore.

Men of the Revolution, North and South, gave us our Constitution. We must protect it. The United States is your Government. It is not yet international.

Our trust must be in God, not men.

Ours is a government of constitutional law, not officeholders. Let us keep it so.

Lift your voice, protest to those who would come sneaking through the back door to steal your basic American rights.

The Bricker amendment must be passed.

Outlaw Communist-Dominated Unions in Defense Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES J. KERSTEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPPESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I plan to introduce a bill in the House to prohibit the Government of the United States from entering into any defense contracts with any contractor or supplier where there are reasonable grounds to believe the employees are represented by a Communist-dominated union.

Communist-dominated unions are endangering the security of the United States. The United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, commonly known as the UE, is a Communist-dominated union which has infiltrated its Red tentacles into that indispensable industry of all-American production—the electrical industry. Right today there are many plants working on classified defense contracts where the UE is the collective-bargaining agent for the employees.

One such company where the UE is the collective bargaining representative of the employees is Vickers, Inc., of Detroit, Mich., a plant which I understand is almost entirely devoted to classified defense work. This plant is a glaring example of how the security of the United States is being endangered by the Communist-dominated United Electrical Workers Union. Vickers, Inc., is primarily engaged in producing hydraulic pumps which are an integral part of the control equipment for our military airplanes and ships. Without this essential, complicated hydraulic control equipment, these planes and ships cannot operate. It is essential to American security that no more war contracts be placed with companies such as Vickers, Inc., as long as the bargaining representative of the employees is a Communist-dominated union.

The legislation which I proposed would prohibit the Federal Government

from placing war contracts with companies such as Vickers, Inc., and other companies where the Communist UE or other Communist unions prevail.

This bill would also amend the Taft-Hartley Act by redefining the term "labor organization" to exclude organizations which are Communist dominated. Any Communist-dominated union would thereby cease to have any right to act as a bona fide union or representative of employees. The bill specifically empowers the Subversive Activities Control Board to investigate and determine if a labor union is a Communist-action or Communist-front organization as defined in the Subversives Control Act of 1950.

The bill also expands the Taft-Hartley non-Communist oath by requiring both labor officials and employers to execute such an oath annually and extends the oath to cover not only the Communist Party but also any other organizations determined to be Communist organizations by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

Following the MacArthur-Hoover Policies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent statement that he would withdraw two divisions from Korea and his firm warning to Russia that, if it is guilty of military aggression, there will be no fooling, indicates that we may at last have a sound traditional American foreign policy.

One of the reasons for recalling General MacArthur from the Far East, as you may well remember, was that he proposed that, if we were to continue at war in Korea, orders to limit our fighting to a certain area should be rescinded and he should be permitted to fight as a true soldier always fights—aggressively, with all the force and means at his command—to end the war with a victory as quickly and with as little loss as possible.

But, apparently, the Communist sympathizers in the State Department and in the administration wanted none of that, so MacArthur was recalled. They apparently preferred a stalemate.

You will also remember that former President Hoover suggested that, instead of dissipating our forces all over the world, trying to hold outposts that could not successfully be supplied and maintained with either men or munitions of war, we determine upon a line of national defense—one necessary to protect us—and one that we could successfully hold against all enemies.

In suggestions which I made, inserted in the RECORD, and sent out to the district, while deploring the war, I several times voiced the same thought—suggested that, if our men were to be sent to Asia to fight and die in what I considered unnecessary wars, we should, if we had the weapons which our military advisers said would win that kind of a war, by plane and bomb carry the war to Moscow.

In talks made on the floor and sent out into the district, it was my privilege several times to suggest a course of action similar to that outlined by General MacArthur and former President Hoover. I claim no credit for the conclusions reached at that time. They were just commonsense—the opinion of nine-tenths of our people, many of us without any personal knowledge of the wishes or power possessed by other nations.

Those conclusions were based upon our knowledge of history, upon our personal experience, upon the fact known to every man, woman, and child who has reached the age of discretion, that it is one of the easiest things in the world to attempt more than one can finish.

If now we will stay out of Indochina, avoid involvement in wars which do not vitally concern us, build up our own national defense, we will save American lives and ultimately attain a sound and lasting peace.

Preventing or lessening unemployment by sending young men to fight and die abroad is a destructive, inhuman policy.

That Day Is Here Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, March 15 has had a long and inglorious history from Roman times to our own. If President Eisenhower's suggested change of the tax deadline is pushed back to April 15, a whole new crop of radio and TV jokes will have to be hatched, and banks whose loans go up sharply in March will be revising their own estimates for some years to come.

Whatever may be the obstacles in the way of adopting the President's plan, there would certainly be a few psychological advantages of some importance. The head of the household would have 30 days more to recover from the deluge of Christmas bills which overtook him along about February 1, and the shock of out-go as opposed to the pleasure of intake would be lessened. Moreover, the spring of the year with other pleasant diversions looming on the horizon in the form of the opening game might alleviate the natural distress provoked by the drain and strain of tax day.

No matter how you look at it, March 15 or April 15, the responsibilities of our times may permit us to postpone, but not to eliminate our annual day of reckoning. The only thing that bothers so many of us is the thought that other folks in other lands whose arms we are strengthening do not always seem to be doing their fair share of our common tax task.

Sound Doctrine Then, Sound Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln is quoted as having said in 1863:

> You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. * * * You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn * * * and you cannot help permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

That one paragraph contains three statements, each a sermon in itself, each applicable to our present situation.

In recent years, we have heard much about "soaking the rich." Frequently, President Roosevelt, though he was a wealthy man himself, pilloried those who had more of this world's material wealth than did the average man. He denounced them as "princes of privilege." What he forgot or ignored, as do many others, was that one cannot take his worldly goods with him when he dies; that even if the very wealthy spend foolishly, someone profits by their foolish spending. He also ignored the fact—and it is a fact—that many who accumulate wealth furnish either employment or the opportunity to purchase necessities or luxuries which otherwise would not be available. Without money, a man cannot operate a mercantile establishment, build and operate a factory, both of which mean jobs. Why should anyone complain just because another has more wealth—especially when we all profit when it is used or spent?

The same truth is applicable to national affairs. To other nations we have given billions upon billions of dollars until it has now become a question of whether we can maintain a sound economic policy, enable our citizens to continue to have the same standard of living they have previously enjoyed.

If we continue indefinitely our domestic policy of, from the earnings of all, meeting the demands of, first, this, then that, and other pressure groups, we will find that we have finally, while increasing the number of those who have been aided by benefits paid from the Public Treasury, lessened the number of those who pay taxes until they can no longer carry the burden. Without an adequate tax collection from those who have, the Government cannot operate.

That we "cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than we earn" is a self-evident truth which we should now realize and act upon.

We now have a public debt of around $275 billion, with an interest charge of approximately $7 billion a year, and a deficit of $3,274,000,000 for the fiscal year ending in June of 1954; a predicted deficit in the fiscal year of 1955 of $2,928,000,000.

The remedy is not an increase in taxes. The remedy is to cut down our expenditures. If we do, we'll find that we can

get along very well without things which we mistakenly think are necessities.

Help the unfortunate? Certainly. But for those who are able to help themselves make available an opportunity to earn, not a gift, and then see that they do something for themselves.

Many of our troubles would be over if we would just follow the advice Lincoln—the honest, industrious, patriotic, and successful man—gave us so many years ago. Instead of crying about our troubles, why not rejoice over our blessings?

H. R. 7894

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

H. R. 7894

A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; making membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering the revolutionary conspiracy by force and violence a criminal offense; and providing penalties

SECTION 1. Upon evidence which has been presented and proof which has been established before the Congress of the United States and the courts of the United States, there exists an international revolutionary Communist conspiracy which is committed to the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States and of the several States, such conspiracy including the Communist Party of the United States, its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and the members thereof.

SEC. 2. The Communist Party of the United States and its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and all other organizations, no matter under what name, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein by force and violence, are hereby declared illegal and not entitled to any of the rights, privileges, and immunities attendant upon legal bodies created under the jurisdiction of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof; and whatever rights, privileges, and immunities which have heretofore been granted to said party, its various components of affiliated, subsidiary, and frontal organizations and other organizations with the same revolutionary purposes, by reason of the laws of the United States or any political subdivision thereof, are hereby terminated.

SEC. 3. Whoever, therefore, being a member of the Communist Party of the United States or any affiliated, subsidiary, or frontal organization thereof, or any other organization, no matter how named, whose object or purpose is to overthrow the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, or the government of any political subdivision therein by force or violence, knowing the revolutionary object or purpose thereof; or whoever participates in the revolutionary activities of the Communist Party or any affiliated subsidiary or frontal organization thereof, or any other organization with the same revolutionary purpose, knowing the revolutionary object or purpose thereof, is guilty of a Federal offense, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for not exceeding 10 years or fined not exceeding $10,000, or both.

House Resolution 407

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of barriers to the free flow of interstate commerce which are now being restored as the result of action by various States in retaliation for Ohio's axle-mile truck tax.

Since the introduction of that resolution, four southern States—Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia—have begun to tax trucks from Ohio in the dispute over reciprocal agreements and several other States have announced the cancellation of their agreements effective March 1.

The net effect of the breakdown in these reciprocal arrangements, under which trucks from one State could go into another without paying any additional fees or charges, is to resurrect the customs barriers which the commerce clause in the Constitution was designed to eliminate. With each passing day, the situation in the interstate trucking industry is becoming more urgent.

I have recently received a communication from Representative Roger Cloud, of the Ohio House of Representatives, the author of Ohio's axle-mile tax. Mr. Cloud has endorsed a congressional study such as I proposed, recognizing that the movement in free interstate commerce by trucks has increased so substantially in the past 15 years that problems have been created which the States themselves have not yet been able to solve.

It would seem that the time is propitious for the Federal Government to consider legislation standardizing loading rules for commercial vehicles engaged in interstate commerce and, if possible, to levy a uniform use tax applying equally to all such commerce in each State—

Mr. Cloud wrote.

Such a tax should not be levied, however, unless the Federal Government simultaneously vacated the gasoline tax, which it is now collecting, to the States. By no means should the Federal highway-tax load be increased in total. Like many other people I am averse to increased Federal intervention in governmental affairs but from the inception of our Government, interstate commerce has been conceded to be a field requiring Federal regulation—

Mr. Cloud added.

Admittedly, the issues arising out of the Ohio axle-mile tax are complex. They are far-reaching and of vital importance to the general public and economy of the Nation. Mr. Cloud is to be commended on the time and effort he has applied to this serious problem.

I am convinced that the creeping breakdown of reciprocity among the States is a proper area for examination by the Congress of the United States. It is the very purpose of the commerce clause in the Constitution to foster free trade among the several States.

Pleas for Federal action have come to me and, I am sure, to other Members of Congress from many of our constituents affected by the Ohio truck tax. It has been suggested that the Federal Government should step in to solve the problems of interstate relationships. Other proposals call for Federal standardization of rules and fees for interstate truck traffic. Other recommendations are that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline tax field and permit the States to tap additional gasoline revenues in order to help finance their highway construction program.

The trucking industry itself, I understand, is to meet in Chicago March 8, 9, and 10 to discuss what Federal action might be necessary to restore reciprocity and alleviate the heavy burdens that will have to be borne by consumers from pyramiding of truck transportation costs.

I urge leaders of the trucking industry to be statesmanlike in their approach and to consider constructive proposals for halting the trend toward the breakdown of the American system of highways while at the same time recognizing the legitimate needs of States for additional highway revenues.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following letter addressed to me by Roger Cloud, of the Ohio house of representatives:

OHIO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbus, February 4, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I understand that you have recently introduced a resolution calling for a congressional study of taxes levied on commercial vehicles which are used in interstate commerce and particularly the Ohio mileage tax. I do not know the purpose for the introduction of the resolution, but if it is to promote a study on the proper rules to be adopted for the use of such vehicles in interstate traffic, then I commend you for it. There is an opportunity for you to perform a real public service in this field. There is now, and has been for some time, a real need for a standardization of rules for intercharges between States for vehicles engaged in such commerce and also for uniform rules governing load limits and vehicular dimensions.

The enactment of a road use charge for heavy vehicle highway usage in Ohio was made necessary by the adoption of a long-delayed highway improvement program. It is presently being levied on all heavy vehicles which use Ohio highways whether or not they are licensed within this State. Use taxes, including the gasoline tax, cannot be levied equitably unless applied equally to all highway users.

Nevertheless the charge has been made that the Ohio mileage tax has disturbed reciprocity and created trade barriers between States. Use taxes, again including gasoline taxes, do not erect trade barriers. Under them, all who are subject to their

application are charged in direct relationship to the benefit derived. There has never been any contention that gasoline taxes and turnpike charges, which are levied on all vehicles without regard to State lines, have acted as trade barriers. Rather, it is the imposition of high flat taxes on out-of-State vehicles which create obstacles to interstate commerce since these have no relationship to usage or benefit. The Ohio mileage tax does not serve as a barrier to trade, but Kentucky's high flat fee does. Ohio's charge is related directly to actual highway usage, while Kentucky's flat charge against Ohio trucks has no real relationship to usage. The courts, including the United States Supreme Court, have held that highway use taxes which are directly related to benefit are not in violation of the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution but that the exaction of flat privilege fees would be so construed.

The word reciprocity seems to hold different meanings for various persons. The dictionary defines it as equal treatment, but it is used by some, in the field of highway taxation, as meaning blanket forgiveness of taxation; wherein truck operators would pay truck taxes for use of highways in their own State, but none would be required to pay such taxes in any State except the State in which they were domiciled. It would seem hardly possible that the highway expansion programs which are needed in every State could be financed on such a basis. Again, this strange theory has never been applied to the major highway supporting tax—the gasoline tax.

It is wise to refrain from charging license fees, or other flat charges, on out-of-State vehicles and Ohio proposes to adhere to this practice. There are many indications that other States, also wrestling with highway finance problems, are leaning toward the adoption of a policy of avoiding flat fees in interstate highway charges.

The movement of freight in interstate commerce by truck has grown so tremendously in the past 15 years, that problems have been created in this field which have not yet been fully solved. If prudence is exercised, solutions can be reached which will not be damaging to the industry and will still accomplish a proper finance program for highway construction.

It would seem that the time is propitious for the Federal Government to consider legislation standardizing loading rules for commercial vehicles engaged in interstate commerce and, if possible, to levy a uniform use tax applying equally to all such commerce in each State. Such a tax should not be levied, however, unless the Federal Government simultaneously vacated the gasoline tax, which it is now collecting, to the States. By no means should the Federal highway tax load be increased in total.

Like many other people, I am averse to increased Federal intervention in governmental affairs but from the inception of our Government, interstate commerce has been conceded to be a field requiring Federal regulation.

In the absence of such Federal action, mileage taxes can operate successfully in individual States. Such problems of interstate relationships as do arise immediately after the adoption of such a tax in any State, can be readily solved by legislative action by individual States or through pacts made by several States. While Federal standardization of rules and charges in interstate truck traffic would be most advantageous to the commercial trucking industry, such is not necessary to the use of truck mileage or use taxes for highway finance.

I am now convinced, as I have always been, that the Ohio mileage tax is fair and just and that it can operate successfully. I am also convinced that the accomplishment of the highway program, to be partially supported by this tax, will reflect to the benefit of the trucking industry more than to any other class of highway users. This is as it should be for the trucking industry is a most important segment of our economy.

I have gone to considerable length to present some of my views to you for there seems to be considerable misunderstanding as to the views held by several of us who have recently been involved in the enactment of highway finance legislation.

Wishing you complete success in this and every other endeavor, and reiterating the belief that there is afforded you in this matter a real opportunity to render a distinct public service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROGER CLOUD.

Packages to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on the floor of the House of my deep concern over Poland's distressing plight, and today I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Packages to Poland," which appears in the February issue of the publication News From Behind the Iron Curtain, published by the National Committee for a Free Europe, which follows:

PACKAGES TO POLAND

A Polish decree imposing crippling customs duties on parcels from abroad appeared to be a new step in the Communist anti-West campaign. Propaganda proclaiming the imminent economic collapse of the United States and the low living standards prevalent throughout the West has too often been dispelled by the receipt of gift packages from abroad. It is estimated that 100,000 parcels, mostly from the United States, are shipped to Poland monthly, and that since the end of the war Poles have received $100 million worth of goods. Hitherto, the regime has tolerated these packages because they have relieved considerably the acute shortage of consumer supplies; now, they are to be curtailed, not only because they are an "invidious" form of pro-Western propaganda, but because the government must boost its supply of foreign currency.

Under the new decree, only books, periodicals, photographs, and medical equipment, such as hearing aids and artificial limbs, will be admitted duty free. For other goods, import duties are excessive; at the current official exchange rate of four zlotys to the dollar, Poles will have to pay about $15 on a new pair of nylon stockings and $10 on a used pair. The intention of the decree is that money rather than parcels should be sent from abroad to the official import-export agency, PKO (General Bureau of Savings). Then PKO will keep the money and the recipient of the gift will be given the equivalent in goods from special state stores. The government will thus be assured a supply of foreign currencies.

Due to the unfavorable artificial exchange rate of the zloty it is expected that people will be discouraged from sending money to Poland in place of goods. Ten dollars exchanged for zlotys at the official rate will buy just one pound of coffee. With the curtailment of gift parcels, the Polish people will be deprived of many products which are either unobtainable or far too expensive. A new pair of shoes—of poor quality—costs a person in Poland more than $40.

Mr. Speaker, the purport of the decree issued by the satellite Government of Poland seems to me to be aimed at breaking one of the few remaining ties which exists between the enslaved Poles and their kind friends in the United States.

Poland, which today exists in the state of enslavement to Moscow, knows that once the Communist conquest of a nation is achieved, then the true nature of the ruling power in the Kremlin reveals itself in the most tyrannical form of modern imperialism. The exorbitant taxing of parcels from the United States fits into the well-known pattern of complete Comunist bondage so ruthlessly imposed on peoples behind the iron curtain. In bringing this regrettable situation to the attention of my colleagues, I urge you to wholeheartedly support House Resolution 422, introduced by Congressman EDMUND P. RADWAN, of New York, protesting this latest Soviet state-sponsored device for internally solidifying its power in Poland.

Boy Scout Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, in connection with the annual observance of Boy Scout Week, I was privileged to meet in my office two Cub Scouts who were selected from the northwest area of our Nation's Capital to make presentations of Scout pins to Members of Congress. These boys, members of Pack 57, are Jimmy Korman, 3314 Stephenson Place NW., and Barry Handloff, 6120 33d Street NW., and were accompanied by their mothers.

During the presentation Jimmy stated to me:

I am a member of Pack 57. This week the Boy Scouts of America celebrate their 44th anniversary. As a representative of the Boy Scouts, I invite you to honor our celebration by wearing this pin during Boy Scout Week.

Then Barry placed the pin on my coat with the following statement:

It is a great honor for me to present this pin and we hope you will wear it in your lapel.

I was pleased to tell these boys that I most certainly appreciated their thinking about me, and that I would wear the pin with pride and honor.

The Boy Scouts of America is a wonderful organization, having high ideals for our boys, and their group is to be congratulated on the very fine work they are doing in molding the characters of American youth.

Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, February 18, the Armenian people rebelled against and overthrew a ruthless communistic dictatorship, which had been illegally and forcibly imposed upon them. Although these brave people have again felt the mailed fist of totalitarian communism, the spirit of liberty still abides with them, and in their land, and among all peoples of Armenian blood wherever they may be.

The Armenian people have a proud and noble ancient heritage. Throughout history their contributions have been noteworthy in trade, commerce, culture, and devotion to freedom. The Armenian people are not surpassed. Their family life and loyalty to each other in the things in which they believe have always been an inspiration. Those of them who have come to this country and their descendants live among us as good neighbors, as lawabiding, industrious, liberty-loving, loyal citizens. Like many other racial stocks, they have come here from distant parts of the world. Their historic culture, blended with our own, has thus added to the composite beauty and fullness of American life.

I have many friends among the Armenian people, whom I consider to be, not only good neighbors and good friends, but among our very best American citizens. They are wedded to the arts and practices of peace, yet their sons and daughters have ably, bravely, and unselfishly served this Nation in time of war and peril.

I am pleased, on this historic day, to pay my tribute to the Armenian people and the Armenian Nation and to pledge my absolute fealty to their cause of liberation and the recapture of their cherished civil liberties. I hope the day is not far distant when they will be freed from abominable slavery and bondage and be restored and reunited, as is their ardent, ever-present desire and purpose, to all free peoples throughout the earth.

May our good Armenian friends in this country be soon relieved of the anguish they feel for their homeland and for their dear ones so far away from our shores, who are visited with cruel serfdom and persecution for no reason than they are true to the faith of their fathers and to the principles of human liberty.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, where will you get your tax money next week?

Twelfth Report on Legislation of the 83d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include my 12th report on the legislation of the 83d Congress, which covers all of the legislation so far enacted at this session. It is my practice to report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on all measures that have passed both bodies and have been approved by the President. As my vote is in reality their vote, I feel under the moral obligation of an agent reporting to a principal to let my constituents know how I voted on each measure.

The 12th report follows:

DEAR FRIEND: In the first 6 weeks of the 2d session of the 83d Congress exactly 7 bills passed by House and Senate have been signed by the President, thus becoming public laws. This is the accomplishment up to date.

In previous reports to you I have covered the legislation of the 1st session of the 83d Congress. Report No. 11, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1954, pages 766–769, completes the coverage up to the opening of the second session.

Now continue:

PUBLIC LAW 289

S. 727. Repayment contracts for irrigation construction.

This is the first public law of the 2d session of the 83d Congress. It was passed by the Senate on July 18, 1953, in the closing weeks of the 1st session. Exactly 6 months later (January 18, 1954, 12 days after the convening of the 2d session) it reached the House and was passed on a voice vote without opposition. The measure was approved by the President on January 30, 1954.

I think you will find some interest in this. In irrigation projects the ability of the water users to absorb and repay the costs of irrigation construction is determined by studies undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation. Amendatory repayment contracts become necessary where existing contract requirements are beyond the wealth-producing ability of the project lands. The cost of the physical and economic analyses incident to the renegotiations has never been charged up to the irrigation districts as reimbursable. However, in legislation of recent years (affecting the Deaver, Prosser, Belle Fourche, Willwood, Bitterroot, Kittitas, and Okanogan Irrigation Districts) through inadvertance to authority was given to make the study costs nonreimbursable. Public Law 289 accomplishes that end.

PUBLIC LAW 290

H. R. 6665. Cotton allotments and marketing quotas:

There are about 26 million acres planted to cotton in 19 States (9,656,400 in Texas, 2,400 in Illinois). Public Law 290 sets a total national cotton-acreage allotment of 21,379, 342 acres for 1954. That means about 5 million acres of cotton land left to be plowed under or turned to other crops.

To add to the headaches (very real in Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi) California and Arizona have gone into cotton growing in a big way. In California acreage is up from under 600,000 acres in 1950 to 1,400,000 acres. One reason: utilization of large tracts of irrigated lands by corporations with large capital and benefiting from special tax dispensations, much in the nature of subsidies. If interested further, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1954, pages 171–172, for colloquy between Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator ANDERSON on $15,791,000 in tax certificates to one corporation and its subsidiary.

Arkansas, third State in the Union in cotton production, has 100,000 cotton farmers, average farm acreage 20. South Carolina has 39,000 cotton farmers with an average acreage of less than 5. On the other hand California, which has skyrocketed to fifth place in cotton production, has only 8,000 cotton growers, many corporations, practically no small farmers. With cotton now in overproduction the historical cotton States of Dixie are worried.

Irrigation in the Southwest is nurturing a competing giant for them; likewise, the development of water power in the Tennessee Valley is aiding and abetting the South's threat to the industrial position of the Middle West. An interesting and a changing world. By attention to the debates in Congress I try to keep sensitive to regional trends, to see signs of pending changes, some fairly immediate and some remote, and the effect upon the district and the people I am privileged to represent.

I voted for Public Law 290 as a matter of routine duty. There had been no cotton marketing quotas since 1950, due to Korea. But production for 1953 much exceeding 12 million bales (actually it went 2 million bales above the estimate of late summer); the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 required the proclamation of marketing quotas for 1954. As planting time was at hand delay in fixing the acreage allotment would have been unfair. The members from the cotton States seemed agreed that the limitation upon the acreage was not so drastic as to destroy the cotton economy. These included Congressman PAUL BROWN, who as No. 2 Democratic member of the Banking and Currency Committee invariably has shown sympathetic understanding of urban problems I have presented in the committee. Congressman BROWN is from the cotton country and I hold him in high esteem.

Public Law 290 was signed by the President on January 30, 1954. In its original form it had passed the House on July 31, 1953 (first session) but did not get to the floor of the Senate until January 12, 1954, in the second week of the second session. Bills introduced in the first session of Congress continue alive in the second session until disposed of.

PUBLIC LAW 291

H. R. 7209. Extends the Missing Persons Act until July 1, 1955:

The Department of Defense is currently carrying 3,205 persons as captured or missing in Korea. Latest official figures: Army, 2,608; Air Force, 336; Navy, 74; Marine Corps, 187. How many of these have been killed, how many are secret prisoners is not ascertainable. Our Government still maintains the Chinese are holding many American prisoners.

The Missing Persons Act (first enacted in 1942) is the only legislative authority for keeping them on the payroll and continuing payments to dependents. It was scheduled to expire February 1, 1954, but the Congress and the President came through with the extension just in the nick of time. Public Law 291 was signed by the President on January 30, 1954. It had passed the House 3 days previously. Of course, I with all other Members on the floor at the time voted for this measure.

PUBLIC LAW 292

S. 373. Trading with the enemy: Under the Trading With the Enemy Act right was given for the filing of claims for the return of property seized by the Custodian of Alien Property. This right, however, expired in 1949. Because of war-aftermath conditions, notice of the right did not come to general attention with the result that many with meritorious claims were shut out. Public

Law 292 extends the time for filing to February 9, 1955. Several claimants in the second district have spoken to me on this matter. I would suggest that they file their claims at once, as it is unlikely there will be another extension. As a matter of fairness, Public Law 292 went through by consent. Further extension, however, would interfere with the expeditious liquidation of the Office of Alien Property.

PUBLIC LAW 293

House Joint Resolution 354. Sixty thousand dollars for travel.

In 1953 the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created in 1953 and known as the Hoover Commission, was limited to a $14,700 expenditure for travel. Public Law 293 increases the travel allowance to $60,000. Why? Congressman PHILLIPS (subcommittee chairman, appropriations), in recommending the increase to the House, said: "A great many of the members, advisers, staff members, and other people interested in the Commission are men who serve without pay; they are paid only traveling expenses." I am sure that Mr. PHILLIPS did not intend what a literal interpretation of his words might imply. There is, of course, no valid reason why the expense of travel and food should be greater for a volunteer than in the case of a paid staff worker.

The original Hoover Commission did a splendid work, because it was entirely nonpartisan, nonpolitical. Unfortunately, Public Law 108 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress, which created the present Hoover Commission, has no provision for minority representation. Despite the fact that in this regard it was politically rigged, I voted for it because of my deep belief in the objectives of the Hoover Commission as we had known it in earlier years. For the same reason, I voted for Public Law 293, but only after assurance had been publicly given to the House that no part of the $60,000 would be spent in foreign travel.

PUBLIC LAW 294

S. 15. Additional Federal judges: Republican lawyers seeking the security and dignity of the Federal bench will find interest in this legislation creating 27 new judges, 3 in the United States circuit court, 24 in the district court. None is in the Chicago area; one in Michigan. I voted to recommit the bill for the purpose of deleting the additional judges for Nevada and Utah. At present there is a Federal judge in each of these States (Judge Roger Foley of Nevada grew up in the Second District, was graduated from Chicago Kent College of Law.) I thought it an unwarranted waste of public money to create judicial jobs for patronage use and where no real need existed. Unfortunately, the House defeated the motion to recommit.

PUBLIC LAW 295

House Joint Resolution 358. Discharges indebtedness of Commodity Credit Corporation:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is the agency which the United States Government uses to support farm prices. It has been spending money so rapidly (storage charges alone total $14 million a month) that it got within a few dollars of its authorized debt limitation of $6.75 billion. In short, CCC and the farm support program were broke. To complicate matters, the Secretary of Agriculture seemed hesitant about asking Congress to raise the limitation on CCC's debt because that would add to the national debt which already is close to the authorized limitation.

What Public Law 295 does is unusual to say the least. CCC owes the United States Treasury $741,548,788. Public Law 295 orders the United States Treasury to give CCC a receipt in full, canceling the entire indebtedness. Thus CCC is given three-fourths of a billion dollars, not by an appropriation bill but by a subterfuge. In that its one and only purpose is to make it possible for CCC to violate the debt limitation law it is downright dishonest.

I think most Members of Congress resented the position in which we were put. The Department of Agriculture did not make known to Congress its financial condition until the very last moment. It was then a matter of going along with the Department in a weird and immoral act of legislation or permitting the farm-support program to collapse. Meanwhile a meeting of the House Banking and Currency Committee has been called for February 24, 1954, to consider H. R. 7339, a bill to increase CCC's borrowing authority.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

In addition to the above bills that became public laws with the Presidential signature the House and Senate passed another bill which the President vetoed. This was H. R. 1917, providing for the coining of 50-cent pieces commemorating the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

I supported this measure in the Banking and Currency Committee on the reasoning that a commemorative coin is among the intangible influences to pride and patriotism that cannot be evaluated by the measure of small inconvenience its issue might impose upon the mint. Apparently this was the view of my colleagues generally since no vote against the measure was cast in either body.

In his veto message President Eisenhower referred to the fact that President Hoover had vetoed a bill of similar character.

President Hoover in his veto message of April 21, 1930, said:

"The monetary system of the country is created and exists for certain well-defined and essential purposes. Sound practice demands that it should not be diverted to other uses."

President Eisenhower in his veto message of February 3, 1954, said:

"The principal objection to commemorative coins is that they detract from the fundamental function of the coinage as a medium of exchange."

BARRATT O'HARA.

Next Item on Atom Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, out in Oak Ridge, Tenn., the atom scientists are hard at work on the next big step in the use of atomic energy for peacetime purposes. They are finishing work on a project which may lead to nuclear-powered aircraft.

The big difficulty is the perfection of some method which will protect the pilots of such planes from being exposed to the radiation of the atom. Thick walls or lots of water are the present methods of shielding the folks who have to work with atomic energy today.

But the people who are launching this project think that the techniques will be found. Some substance will come along with the magic properties required.

Ability, Not Disability, Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the sixth national wheelchair basketball tournament will be held in New York City on April 9, 10, and 11. It will be sponsored by the Fifty-two Association of New York, Inc., a nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpolitical organization which since 1945 has been keeping its pledge that "the wounded shall never be forgotten" with outstanding programs of entertainment, job assistance, hobby programs, adapted sports, and other special rehabilitation services for hospitalized servicemen and veterans from Massachusetts to Virginia. Other chapters of the Fifty-two Association serve the wounded in Chicago, Buffalo, Los Angeles, and Miami Beach.

The national wheelchair basketball tournament is an exciting and dramatic sports demonstration of the significant rehabilitation idea that "ability, not disability, counts." The players come from California, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, New England, New Jersey, and the New York City area. They include veterans and nonveterans, disabled by polio, amputations, and paraplegia. Every game convinces the spectators that if these men can play wheelchair basketball so effectively, surely they can "play" wheelchair bookkeeping, bench assembly, watch repair, and many other kinds of useful work just as well.

The tournament will be held in the 212th AAA Group Armory, Columbus Avenue and 62d Street in New York City. There will be two games at each session, with sessions on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday afternoons, and Friday and Saturday evenings. Because this activity, like all of the Fifty-two Association's activities, is a nonprofit activity, ticket prices are set remarkably low in the hope that the largest possible number will attend.

It is worth noting that very few changes have been made in regular basketball rules as a concession to the fact that this game is played in wheelchairs. The safety record of this sport is as good or better than other competitive sports. Thrills and excitement are as high or higher.

Because of the game's tremendous values in physical, social, and vocational rehabilitation, the Fifty-two Association willingly accepts the financial responsibility, knowing that the tournament will probably result in a deficit. Last year's deficit of $2,500 was underwritten by the Bulova Foundation.

Attitudes toward the severely disabled, which play such a large role in the total adjustment of those disabled, are bound to be affected favorably by the encouragement of this activity; all who witness the games are inspired by the courage and ability of all the participants.

America is strong because we respect each individual for the contribution he can make to the national welfare. America is strong because of voluntary groups of citizens like the Fifty-two Association. America is strong because of the performance and spirit of all our men and women whether they are more or less disabled.

Wheelchair basketball may seem to be just a game. Actually, it is a moving symbol of our Nation's character. Men and women of good will can help to keep that character sound by encouraging such worthwhile public service activities like the national wheelchair basketball tournament. The Fifty-two Association at 840 Eighth Avenue, New York 19, would be delighted to receive communications from all who would like to attend any of the tournament sessions or know more about how they can organize or sponsor wheelchair basketball activities in their own communities.

Report on Military Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members the report on surplus military property prepared by the Subcommittee on Military Operations under the chairmanship of the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN. The report is identified as House Report No. 1196, being the sixth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations.

It was my privilege as a member of the Riehlman subcommittee to participate in a number of the subcommittee hearings at various military installations. Chairman RIEHLMAN and other members of the subcommittee, as well as the staff, are to be commended for their hard work and careful investigations in the field of military supply management in an endeavor to save the taxpayers' money and to improve the efficiency of the military services.

Judging from our findings in surplus property, Mr. Speaker, there is considerable room for improvement. Today we are witnessing the end results of excessive procurement, unrealistic stock levels and ineffective utilization of military supplies. The military services have on their hands a gigantic problem of surplus property disposal. During fiscal 1953 the Department of Defense disposed of personal property—as differentiated from real property—which originally cost the taxpayers $1¼ billion. In the next few years the magnitude of their problem will be several times greater.

Several years ago, when I called attention on this floor to the imminent development of a surplus-property problem—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 13, 1952—and to the importance of devising effective machinery to cope with that problem, it was difficult to arouse much interest. The agencies of government, content to pursue their usual routine, were inclined to make light of the problem. They displayed no great interest or concern to make ready for what is upon us today.

When the Hoover Commission was reestablished during the 83d Congress, and I was honored by the Speaker in being appointed to that Commission, I proposed that a task force be created to deal with the specific subject matter on surplus-property disposal. My colleagues on the Commission immediately accepted that recommendation and agreed to set up such a task force. The group now is engaged in making the necessary studies, and I am hopeful that it will present soundly conceived recommendations to the Congress at a later date.

In the meantime, I believe our Subcommittee on Military Operations is performing a very useful service by inquiring into the surplus-property field. The report to which I call attention today will be followed by further reports.

The Members will note in this report that for the $1¼ billion worth of property sold as surplus by the military services in fiscal 1953, the return averaged something like 6 cents on the dollar. I am convinced that the txapayers should be getting a better deal from returns on surplus. A major difficulty is the lack of interest and experience of military officials in doing an effective merchandising job. In view of the billions of dollars involved in the entire program, surplus-property disposal requires a new appraisal and a fresh approach; it should no longer be regarded as a dull, routine chore by military officers temporarily assigned the disposal task.

It has been my view, and this report bears me out, that civilian merchandising experience should be brought into disposal operations. By offering some incentives to private industry merchandisers under proper safeguards to protect the Government, I believe that large portions of this vast surplus can be sold more expeditiously and for a larger percentage of return to the Treasury.

In a previous report—House Report No. 857, 83d Congress, 1st session—our subcommittee called upon the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration to prepare jointly a program for effective disposal of surplus. Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the General Services Administration has basic jurisdiction in this field. I trust that the Agency will display enough ingenuity and imagination to come up with a sound and workable program and will not sidestep its primary responsibilities in handling surplus disposal.

Mr. Edmund B. Mansure, the General Services Administrator is aware of this rapidly growing problem of surplus property disposal and has recognized his primary responsibility under the statute for developing a formula which will insure maximum use of excess property among Federal agencies and maximum dollar recovery to the Government from final surplus disposal.

Further, he has assured our chairman, Mr. RIEHLMAN, that the subcommittee will be kept informed of the progress of the present study which is being made by his staff in this field.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Bricker amendment, as amended by the George amendment, was an effort to amend the Constitution so as to prevent a President, without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or the people, making what is known as an executive agreement with another nation or group of nations, which would have the effect of permitting the imposition upon the people of the United States of laws restricting their rights which have not been enacted by either the States or the Congress.

Our forefathers, in writing the Constitution, did a remarkably fine job, but they could not anticipate changing conditions, practices, or needs which might arise in the future.

That they expected the Constitution to be amended is evident from the fact that in article V they provided the procedure for adopting constitutional amendments. Twenty-two times the people have amended the Constitution in accordance with that procedure, once repealed an amendment.

It follows then that all this hue and cry by the opponents of the Bricker amendment that it, or any substitute offered in lieu thereof, would destroy the Constitution is—to use a common expression—"bunk."

The question now before the Senate is not whether President Eisenhower should be deprived of the power to make executive agreements with other nations without the knowledge or consent of the Congress or the people, but whether any President should have opportunity to exercise that power.

Apparently, no one dreamed of the necessity of an amendment similar in substance to the Bricker proposal until we discovered that both former President Roosevelt and former President Truman had made executive agreements, the results of which were to get us into two unnecessary wars, impose laws upon us which neither the States nor Congress had passed.

Our taxpayers are now being asked by United Nations to pay thousands of dollars to U. N. employees who were discharged because they were either commies or invoked the fifth amendment.

The thought and purpose involved in the Bricker amendment were sponsored by 64 Senators—more than two-thirds of the Senate membership—including both

Michigan Senators. Then, the internationalists—that is, those who want to permit the President of the United States and the United States to make secret executive agreements, that is, become involved in foreign entanglements, contrary to Washington's advise—and some who are willing to take a chance, apparently thinking more of pleasing foreign powers than they do of maintaining our independence, began to cry that the adoption of such an amendment was a declaration of a lack of confidence in President Eisenhower. It is no such thing.

Obviously, under the Constitution, President Eisenhower cannot hold that office to exceed two terms. What those who are in favor of this proposal to amend the Constitution are trying to do is to prevent any President from hereafter following the precedents set by former President Roosevelt and former President Truman in making secret agreements with other nations, which would automatically curtail the liberties of our citizens, impair the security of our Nation. Certainly, the people should be permitted to vote upon that proposition.

Though on the 26th of February, the amendment was defeated 61 to 30, lacking 1 vote of the necessary two-thirds, it will be up again. The Michigan Senators voted one for, one against.

President Eisenhower's Program: Eye Opener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eisenhower has given Congress a program which calls for action as well as study and debate. In an analysis prepared by an independent research organization, 196 separate proposals outlined by the President are listed. This is a bigger load than anything dished out for congressional consideration in the last 20 years. The only series to match this list came in the famous 100 days of 1933 when an avalanche hit the Nation.

The President's program is part of his effort to tighten the spending policies of the country, to balance the budget, to institute conservative financing, and, at the same time, to put our social-security program and our social outlook as well on a sound basis. Included in Mr. Eisenhower's requests are propositions for improved public-health facilities, more social-security benefits, a wider spread of homeownership, changes in the unemployment insurance setup, and modified agricultural benefits.

What is remarkable about the President's program is the universal agreement that it can be achieved without bankrupting the Nation. No greater testimonial could be offered to the skill and intelligence with which the Republican national administration has been handling its problems. Under the Democrats, a program comparable to President Eisenhower's would have called for spending more money than China has rice.

Postal Workers Deserve an Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee recently began its hearings on H. R. 2344, concerning the salaries of postal workers, I submitted a statement to the committee in support of that bill. The text of my statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. LOUIS B. HELLER, OF NEW YORK, TO THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ON H. R. 2344

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views to your committee concerning H. R. 2344, the bill to provide for an increase in the salaries of postal workers.

As in previous years, I am again glad to state my views and to urge full support and favorable action before your committee on this measure.

I have always maintained that the salaries of these employed in our postal service have never been adequately adjusted to meet the high cost of living since the end of World War II. I am even more so convinced of this fact today. Postal employees are a hard-working, conscientious, and loyal group, and they deserve due consideration.

Last July, a few weeks before the 1953 session of Congress had ended, I made a last-minute frantic appeal in the House of Representatives to take immediate action to approve salary increases for postal workers. I called the attention of my colleagues in Congress to two very important facts:

1. That long before the Government inserted no-strike provisions in laws affecting Federal employees, the postal workers had voluntarily given up all rights to engage in strikes—which is labor's most effective weapon.

2. That postal workers and other Government employees are prohibited from engaging in political activity in order to improve their situation.

I also stressed the fact that on their present rate of salaries postal workers are having a difficult time to cope with the high cost of living, which had reached an alltime high in 1953 and was still moving upward. I cited statistics to illustrate the plight of postal employees, stating that 75 percent are forced to supplement their income by taking on a second job or through the employment of their wives, and that many postal workers have incurred increased debts and numerous others are forced to borrow on their insurance.

Let me cite to you my concluding remarks on that occasion:

"There is no logical reason for Congress to tolerate such a situation. These postal employees deserve a fair and adequate remuneration for the services they perform. They should not be placed in a position where they are forced to take on additional jobs to be able to meet the high cost of living, or to have to borrow on their insurance or when their wives are compelled to seek employment.

"Action today is worth more than all the promises for tomorrow. It is still not too late, if there is a real and earnest will to remedy the situation."

The rest is history—and history records that nothing had been done in the matter during the remainder of that session. Now we are at the start of a new congressional session. I am hopeful that the long-awaited and overdue salary increase will be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely recommend to the committee that it give favorable consideration at an early date to this bill, H. R. 2344. Its adoption will be of tremendous importance to the entire postal system and will be an important factor in improving conditions in that system and establishing the highest possible morale. I want to thank you for allowing me this opportunity to present my views in the matter.

Question of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 16, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what is really going on in Indochina? Not only we cannot tell who is winning; we do not even seem to know who is fighting.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 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 Thou who art the light that never fails and the love that follows all the way, we bow at this wayside shrine of Thy grace confessing the sins that have stained our record; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us. We have fallen short of Thy expectations of us. We are shamed not only by the things we have done, but also by the things we have not done. We come praying for Thy cleansing and forgiveness and with an inner hatred for all that hinders Thy fullness from dwelling in us.

Trusting in the everlasting mercy, at the beginning of another day of service to our country and to Thee, our Father God, we would silence our thoughts, that, with all earth's strident voices hushed, we may feel Thee near. Even as we pause in reverence for this moment of communion, purge our shortcomings, we beseech Thee, in the flame of Thy love, that once more in the light of Thy countenance we may find peace. We ask it in the name of Him who is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.