

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Report on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to note the sincerity and energy which many individuals and groups are bringing to bear upon the problem of civil defense. As a result, we are gaining ground in a program designed to meet the crucial need of safeguarding nearly 70 million of our citizens in 70 critical target areas. The critical areas had been so designated by the Federal Government on July 1, 1953.

To date, however, progress has not been uniformly rapid nor sufficiently extensive; consequently, our Nation continues to face a serious potential threat which could almost at any moment envelop decisive segments of our population. With our present ineffectively coordinated levels of civil-defense administration and operational organization, sufficient gaps and soft spots exist to enable an enemy attack drastically to reduce our capability and will to resist. Too much remains to be desired in a program which should recognize the compelling need for National, State, and local cooperative endeavor.

Remarkable progress characterizes the present status of development in the atomic-hydrogen age. Even the conventional atomic bomb is in some respects now obsolete except as a means of triggering the mechanism for the hydrogen bomb. Of extreme significance in the general area of civil defense is yet another obsolescence brought on by the recent dramatic detonation of a thermonuclear test device. What progress we had made up to the moment of this successful test has now been dissipated since previous civil-defense plans have very little, if any, significant meaning. Whereas formerly all persons caught within the crucial radius of the A-bomb were instructed to "duck and cover," such procedure would have little effect when a survivor of incineration, radiation, and burial under debris had to contend with carbon-monoxide poisoning. In the H-bomb era the only effective defense known at the present time is absence from the critical diameter.

Were such successful developments in nuclear fission confined entirely to the democratic powers or the free governments among nations, there may have been a lesser need for emphasis on civil defense. Since that has not been our experience, however, we can make nothing less than a truly realistic assessment of the potential danger and of what recourse we must take as a consequence. We can afford nothing less than a concerted plan of action designed to nullify, as far as possible, the dreaded prospects latent in the present interna-

tional difficulties. It is imperative that we substitute vigorous action for apathetic and blissful forbearance. We may one day be grateful for the respite now granted us during which time we enjoy the golden opportunity to make necessary plans and preparations.

The recent press and radio releases with their dramatic descriptions and pictures of the destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb have effectively served one of the main reasons for the disclosure to the public. A great many individuals, both in and out of government service, have been suddenly and thoroughly indoctrinated with the vast and dire implications of thermonuclear fission. I have been deeply impressed, myself. News and military analysts have been writing prolifically regarding the potential capacity of the new bomb and publishing local maps defining the very large areas of partial and complete annihilation. Although specific references were made to the original hydrogen bomb detonated well over a year ago, news releases clearly indicate that a subsequently developed bomb is even more destructive. Let us fervently hope that the efforts of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as well as other jurisdictions concerned with our home defense will be vigorously stimulated.

I have given the problem of civil defense a great deal of thought and have arrived at some definite conclusions. First and foremost is the critical need for a positive and comprehensive program adopted without delay. Valuable time is ebbing away while we take only sporadic action. There should be centralized planning, with a strong initiative and leadership assumed at the national level, and with commensurate responsibility allocated to State and local groups.

In this respect I am heartened by the increasing thought and attention that is being directed towards organization at the national level. As an example, recommendations have been made for the creation, within the Department of Defense, of a Department of Civil Defense with equal status in relation to the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

In view of the urgent and compelling need to revamp the administrative and operational features of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, I am thoroughly convinced that the establishment of a Secretary of Civil Defense will result in a greatly improved overall organization. Our present program is founded on the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. The result has been a loose, dissociated confederation comprised of the several States, with the Federal Government's participation being little more than that of an information coordinating activity. I do not mean to reflect disparagingly either upon the Federal Civil Defense Administration or upon the excellent progress and achievement that some of our States and municipalities have made. It is at the national level however, where we are most

urgently in need of organizational improvement; in some of our States as well much remains to be done. The proper and adequate organization at the highest levels, predicated upon the requirements and the capacities of subordinate jurisdictions, will serve to provide all citizens with reasonable assurance that their civil defense needs have been carefully considered and acted upon.

There is too great a dependence upon the voluntary and individual efforts of each State under our current system. Since the need for civil defense cannot be limited to any one State or region, the effective planning of defensive measures automatically devolves upon the Federal Government. The need continues, however, for the Government's closely coordinated cooperative endeavor with the several States and with their respective communities.

Recent technological advances which are reflected in the perfected hydrogen bomb further emphasize the need for a new look at civil defense requirements. An effective corps of trained personnel is more essential now than ever before. Coordinated programs, with a sharing of research and development between all levels—the National, State, and local—are urgently needed if we are to realize desirable efficiency in seeking to avoid national disaster attributable to poorly organized civil defense.

Since, in many respects, the task of civil defense is very closely related to our national defense program, the Federal Government must assume a greater share of the responsibilities which thus far are jointly borne by the States. The wide variation in the economic ability of certain States to support an adequate civil defense program is readily known through reliable statistics and from previous experience relating to other problems. Also, the present voluntary participation has demonstrated great variations in the quality and quantity of effort expended. There is a frequent tendency in many quarters to view the need for civil defense as some remote problem to be taken seriously only if and when we are faced with an emergency.

The Office of Civil Defense in the State of California is doing a remarkable job in organizing, training, and equipping a competent statewide civil defense corps. I am both eager and proud to acknowledge this wonderful achievement. Perhaps my distinguished colleagues in the House may be interested in a brief description of the activities of this Office which functions under the excellent direction of Walter M. Robertson, major general, United States Army, retired. It is hoped that other States may find inspiration in the fine example set in my home State of California.

Realizing the importance of providing complete and accurate news information and instructions to the public in an emergency, the California Office of Civil Defense, in cooperation with the

University of California (Los Angeles) School of Medicine planned and organized a brief but comprehensive indoctrination course in civil defense organization and operations. Thus far, the course has been taken by a score of top Los Angeles newsmen, while plans are underway in the meantime, for representatives from other newspapers, wire services, and radio news organizations also to attend the course.

In recognition of the necessity for pre-disaster planning for emergency publication of newspapers and integration of the staffs and printing facilities of newspapers in communities outside major target areas into such plans, all who pursue the course will be indoctrinated with the need for such emergency publication. Similar stress will be given the need for educating the public in dispersal and other civil defense plans as they are developed. As the best procedures are determined, they will be taught to those who are in training.

The Office of Civil Defense prepared and distributed 683 individual first-aid-station kits on a statewide basis. Each kit, or unit, is made up of 75 cartons, boxes, and chests containing all necessary supplies and equipment including such items as antibiotics, surgical instruments, stretchers, blankets, burn dressings, and so forth, to treat 600 casualties in a 24-hour period. These supplies were acquired, unitized, and put in place in the field at an approximate cost of \$5 million—50 percent Federal, 50 percent State.

Twenty-four rescue trucks have been purchased on a 50-50 matching fund basis and delivered to certain cities and counties adjacent to target and critical target areas. This involved a total expenditure of \$228,000. These trucks are now being used for training crews and they are available for all disasters.

Federal funds have partially matched the cost of 16 mobile radiological laboratories. As rapidly as the radiological laboratories are equipped and technicians trained, they are assigned for use by public health agencies and research units. They are proving invaluable under present conditions where water supplies are checked and sewage is being constantly analyzed. With the advances in the nuclear sciences, private industry is making a greater use of the findings.

Through Federal matching funds, the Office of Civil Defense has completed a statewide attack warning system and has established a statewide communication system. Small amounts of Federal matching funds have been used for public information and training and education.

The most productive field for the use of Federal funds has been in the fire services, where a total of \$1,675,000—50 percent Federal, 50 percent State—has been expended, primarily for 100,000-gallon-per-minute fire pumpers. This equipment is dispersed throughout the State in accordance with the need for support in the target areas and is not procured merely to augment local fire services. It is used for training auxiliary firemen, for mutual aid, and on mul-

multiple alarm fires. In responding to a call the local jurisdiction having custody must send a minimum of 1 experienced engineer and 1 fireman with the truck.

The California Office of Civil Defense feels very strongly that adequate provision should be made for fire service funds. In view of its experiences, the fire service matching funds have paid and are paying the greatest dividends.

For the 2 years ending June 30, 1953, the State of California has expended \$4,500,219.17 in matching Federal funds. In many of the programs, the State has passed Federal funds directly to local jurisdictions on a 50-50 basis. In some phases of the program, the State has participated to the extent of 25 percent, making the contributions 25 percent local, 25 percent State, and 50 percent Federal. During the same 2-year period, local jurisdictions have contributed \$1,841,450.34 to the matching fund program.

It is apparent, therefore, that where proper attitudes toward civil defense and where sufficient determination and leadership are prevalent, a State may achieve a large measure of success in preparing for civil defense needs. Due to differences in average per capita wealth and income, however, not all States are able to provide the amount of funds deemed desirable for a good program. Because of localized budgetary difficulties, therefore, and because of the need for centralized direction and technical aid, the Federal Government should recognize and accept its responsibility in the general area of civil defense.

Congress Should Act Now To Halt Farm Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems confronting the 83d Congress is the developing recession in agriculture. This problem is of major concern for two reasons: First, it directly affects the present and future prosperity and security of nearly 30 million Americans living on the land; and, second, it has an adverse effect on the entire national economy in that it may be the first phase of a general business depression. It goes without saying, therefore, that any Congress having the interest of the farmer and the people at heart would, in such a situation, act vigorously to reverse depression-making trends and remedy the present unhealthy economic condition of farm life.

As a Democrat, I am proud to say that when my party controlled the Congress and the administration there was an honest effort to develop a sound and practical farm program. The 20 years of farm progress under Democratic leadership shows that these efforts were crowned with some success. Under the

guidance of the late Franklin Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, great gains were made in formulating an enlightened farm policy—in this connection I need only point to such basic legislation as the Triple A program, the Soil Conservation and Farm Credit Acts, and the rural-electrification law.

The record shows that these Democratic farm programs have been most successful in practice—they have contributed greatly to improved farm security and higher rural living standards. In 1932 some 42 percent of our farms were tenant-operated and most farm owners were burdened with heavy mortgages—in 1952 farm tenancy was down to 25 percent and the average landowner had a 91 percent equity in his land. Due to the REA program rural electrification increased from 10 percent in 1932 to 90 percent in 1952. In 1932 gross farm income was \$5 billion per year—in 1952 gross farm income stood at over \$32 billion.

GOP SEEKS TO TURN BACK THE CLOCK

While many GOP Congressmen recognize that today our farmers are in distress, I regret that the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, have been oblivious to the plight of agriculture. Mr. Eisenhower's 1952 campaign pledges of full parity and support for REA and soil conservation have been forgotten. The dynamic and forward-looking Democratic farm program has been repudiated, and the GOP's program of heartless disregard, inaction and do-nothingism has been substituted.

Let us look at the record. One of the first acts of Secretary Benson when he took office last year was to reduce PMA committees to advisory status and place power in the hands of his bureaucrats. Then all representatives of farm operators were fired from the Agriculture Department, and in their place spokesmen for the food processors and middlemen were appointed. Next, the administration indorsed "flexible" price supports, thus repudiating the Eisenhower campaign pledge of full parity. Last April price supports on dairy products were cut from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity—a move which is costing the Minnesota dairy industry an estimated \$3 million per month. The REA program has been sabotaged indirectly by cutting off funds for REA transmission lines and by wrecking our public power policy to please the private power lobby.

What are the end results of this GOP program—if we dignify it by calling it a program? Here again we need only look to the record and let the record speak for itself. Since the Republicans took over, farm prices and farm income have fallen steadily. In 1952 gross farm income stood at \$32.6 billion—this year estimated gross income of the farmer will be no more than \$29.5 billion. In 1947 the farmer's net income totaled \$16.7 billion—in 1953 it was down to \$12.8 billion, and this year it may go as low as \$10.8 billion.

To make a long story short, gross farm income has dropped 10 percent and net farm income has fallen 20 percent since the Eisenhower-Benson team started

running things 2 years ago. This deplorable state of affairs is the direct result of the administration's shortsightedness in refusing to accept full parity, and because of its attempt to turn back the clock to the so-called free market of the Hoover regime.

EXTEND THE DEMOCRATIC FARM PROGRAM

Since the Democratic farm program developed during the 1933-52 period has proved itself in practice, Congress should accept this program as the basic blueprint or starting point in making farm policy, and on this foundation build a new and better farm program. Thanks to former Democratic administrations we have the basic legislation in the statute books—we should extend, broaden, improve, and liberalize this New Deal legislation in the interests of farm prosperity and rural justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that the following eight-point farm program would go far toward solving the more pressing problems of our farm population, and I recommend that Congress give these policy proposals full consideration.

First. Congress should liberalize the present farm price-support program to provide 100 percent parity on all farm crops.

Second. The present soil-conservation program should be strengthened and more consideration should be given to flood control and reforestation as a method of stopping soil erosion.

Third. The REA program should be expanded and improved, and greater efforts should be made to produce more public electric power and to build more REA transmission lines so that REA co-ops will be assured of an adequate supply of cheap power.

Fourth. Federal lending policies should be liberalized to provide ample farm credit at easy terms and lower interest rates so as to encourage family ownership and family operation in agriculture.

Fifth. Congress should enact new legislation to restore farmer participation in farm-program administration by returning to the farm committees the authority taken from them by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

Sixth. Federal appropriations for research in animal husbandry, control of plant and livestock diseases, and in other fields of scientific agriculture, should be substantially increased.

Seventh. Farm cooperatives should be encouraged for use in the marketing of farm produce, the purchase of machinery, and other appropriate rural activities where cooperative organization has proven beneficial to farmers.

Eighth. Congress should expand our Federal forest practices program with greater emphasis being placed on woodlot forestry, tree planting, and technical forest assistance to farmers so as to assist the small Minnesota farmer who derives part of his income from logging and pulpwood operations.

The policy recommendations which I have outlined above constitute the framework of an effective program for meeting the basic needs of the American farmer. Such a program would tend to

stabilize farm prices at full parity and thus correct the present farm recession; it would encourage farm production; it would aid in preserving the fertility of our soils; and it would create the economic conditions under which the family-size farm would thrive and prosper.

FULL PARITY IS AN ECONOMIC MUST

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the parity issue is the crux of the whole question of farm policy—effective price supports are the key to farm prosperity and the only method by which the present recession in agriculture can be corrected. It is also my belief that the position taken by individual Members of Congress regarding full parity is the test of each Member's good intentions on the matter of farm welfare. Every person claims to be a "friend of the farmer" in an election year, but we all know that fair words are cheap. The \$64 question that most farmers want answered is: How did my Congressman and Senators stand on full parity? Did my Representative favor higher price supports or did he betray the farmer by going along with Secretary Benson's scheme for flexible supports?

As for myself, I say without qualification that the farmer's economic welfare requires the establishment of a system of price supports providing full parity on all farm crops. I consider the Eisenhower-Benson proposals for flexible price supports to be a sell-out of rural America. I am strongly opposed to the House-passed administration farm bill, H. R. 9680, calling for flexible supports from 82.5 to 90 percent parity. I am opposed to the 15-percent cut in dairy price supports made by Secretary Benson last spring, and I look with disfavor upon the 5-percent increase compromise for dairy products contained in H. R. 9680.

While full parity on all crops is our objective, practical considerations require that liberal Congressmen support the temporary retention of 90 percent supports at the present time, and until a new farm program of full parity can be developed. Ninety percent parity is inadequate to cover cost of production and give the farmer a fair return on his labor and investment—yet we have no choice but to accept rigid supports at 90 percent parity as stopgap legislation until full parity can be guaranteed. Thus I must give my backing to the provision in the Senate farm bill, S. 3052, calling for 90-percent parity for basic commodities for another year.

Enemies of high price supports often offer two time-worn arguments in an attempt to rebut the case for full parity. One false argument is that price supports are a form of economic subsidy to the farmer. However, these antifarm forces never tell us that the so-called subsidy to the farmer is negligible compared to the special handouts given big business. According to figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture, the Government has lost less than \$1 billion because of farm price supports over a 20-year period—compare this to a \$45 billion total in Federal funds given to big business during the last 8 years in the form of reconversion payments, airline subsidies, tax writeoffs, and so forth.

A second phony argument often heard is that high price supports lead to overproduction. This claim of overproduction has no foundation in fact. Instead of overproduction we have underconsumption because millions of Americans lack the purchasing power to buy the food they need. If Congress would adopt a national food stamp plan to permit old-age pensioners—now living on about \$40 per month per person—to buy food surpluses, we would soon see these so-called food surpluses dwindle to nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the case for full parity cannot be rebutted—a price-support program giving 100 percent parity to the farmer is an economic necessity. There are nearly 30 million Americans living on the land, and these hard-working people now find themselves caught in the clutches of a recession. Only full parity is the answer. It is my hope that the Congress will accept this answer and pass appropriate legislation. Action along these lines is essential to the Nation's future prosperity and security.

Our Urban Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which creates a Department of Urbiculture for the purpose of dealing with the pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of urban land utilization. Many of our urban problems originate from our faulty techniques in the development and use of urban real estate.

Years ago approximately 75 percent or more of our people lived on farms. The most pressing economic problems of the day grew out of the utilization of farm lands. Very properly the need for research and the discovery and application of basic principles was recognized by the Federal Government and a Department of Agriculture was created with a Secretary of Agriculture assigned to the President's Cabinet. Agricultural colleges were founded throughout the country. Agricultural improvement in research stations were founded every year. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in research and educational activities for our citizens who have vital personal interests in the efficient utilization of farm lands.

At the present time I am told that less than 25 percent of our people live on farms. Our most pressing and vital social and economic problems today originate in the cities. There has been no consistent research done to discover how best to "cultivate" urban lands so as to produce maximum yields in monetary terms and amenities. There have been innumerable half-hearted attempts at the fringe of the problem as evidenced by the various building codes, zoning laws, neighborhood rehabilitation pro-

grams and many other such ideas but the science of urban land economics remains in a nebulous state.

In the meantime we are appalled by the slum conditions, decentralization movements and other phenomena which we do not really fully understand or appreciate.

I am sure that we have in this country enough sound and able thinkers to develop uriculture to a point where it can be as serviceable to owners and utilizers of urban property as the science of agriculture has been to the owners and users of agricultural property.

The Conservationist's Opposition to Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the bills making provision for use of our Nation's water resource are among the most important legislation being considered by this Congress. I wish today to discuss a few aspects of the questions which have arisen on the proposals for development of the upper Colorado River.

I am sure that none of us familiar with the problems of the Southwest would deny the basic need for development of the Colorado River to bring about the fullest utilization of its vast stores of natural resources. By the same token most of us are fully prepared to support any action which promotes the wisest use of these resources through a fully integrated plan which, in the words emanating from the early day conservation programs of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, will bring about "the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time." It is in line with this tenet that I wish to clarify the position of those who have so forcefully opposed the construction of Echo Park Dam within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument as a part of the initial development of the upper Colorado River storage facilities.

Congress, as the creator of the National Park Service in 1916 and its protector through subsequent actions, including the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Resource Act prohibiting the issuance of permits for power developments within our national parks and monuments, now finds itself involved in a controversy which touches on the very principles which guided its past action. Those who have sought to show that the upper Colorado River can be fully developed in a manner which will allow the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument have repeatedly stated that we can only insure the sanctity of this and similar areas throughout our land by dedicating them for preservation so as not to permit their subsequent destruction. Our whole

American policy for preserving our parks, monuments, and wilderness areas is based on the acceptance of two concepts: First, that our land and water resources are great enough and varied enough to make possible the preservation of a system of natural areas without sacrificing industrial considerations which make it necessary to develop our country; and second, in the planning of such a conservation program we must recognize that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited unless they are deliberately set aside and protected. For this policy to prevail we must be faithful in respecting our dedications, for otherwise the dedicated areas will inevitably disappear one by one as it seems profitable to exploit them. To merely set aside an area until we got to it with some kind of exploitation project is a policy that defrauds both our own and future generations.

It is likely that the present administration will continue to support the assurances of the present and past administrations of the Interior Department that construction of Echo Park Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation is not to be construed as a precedent for the invasion of other existing parks. But what of those who follow? Would not the precedent have been established for the interpretation of those who may lack full appreciation of the need for preserving our national parks, monuments, and wilderness areas? American history has many examples of laws and policies which have been reinterpreted in a manner much different from their original intent. Realizing that policies are no stronger or weaker than the convictions of the men who interpret them, we are obligated not to permit the invasion of our system of national parks and monuments through any action that can be construed as a precedent at any future time. The action we recommend, made clear through an amendment to delete Echo Park from the bill authorizing construction of dams in the upper Colorado River project, will function as a guidepost for those who follow us and who also wish to insure the perpetuation of the recreational resources of our parks and monuments.

One has only to witness the weekend exodus from our towns and cities to fully appreciate the inner compulsion which takes the American people to the outdoors. Some have seen in this evidences of the heritage of our forefathers who hewed a nation from the wilderness and knew how in their few leisure moments to enjoy fully the outdoors as a place where their energies could be refreshed. Others point to this growing appreciation of the outdoors as a safety valve for people who suffer, as most of us do, from the tensions and rapid pace of our modern-day living. But whatever the cause, there can be no denial of the cataclysmic increase in the use of our outdoor areas. During the period from 1946 to 1953 there has been a rise of 112 percent in the number of visitors to the areas administered by the National Park Service. Last year over 46 million visits were made to these recreation spots, with more than 4 million people being attracted to the areas within the system

in the State of California alone. In addition, some 35 million people fished, hunted, hiked, and enjoyed other outdoor pastimes within our national forests. The sale within recent years of 28 million hunting and fishing licenses can also be used to demonstrate the interest in the outdoors which takes the American public to our country's streams and lakes, fields and forests. Excluding those who are allowed to go afield for fish and game without the regularly required licenses, this number represents nearly 1 person out of every 6 men, women, and children in the country. In terms of dollars, the expenditures of sportsmen alone exceed 10 billion annually, placing this industry well ahead of those of filling stations, dealers in farm equipment, and business represented by either the cattle or hog markets. These figures make it apparent that the "outdoor industry" is one of unequaled importance to our national economy.

In our analysis of the controversy which has arisen over this proposed invasion of our national parks and monuments, it is important that we carefully consider the testimony of those conservation organizations, representing a large and important segment of the American public, which have most actively supported our systems of public recreational areas. These organizations find their main support in the millions of citizens who are willing to preserve and develop our publicly owned areas for the benefits that are to be realized in the form of outdoor recreation. We sometimes note derision in the voices of those who make attempts to demonstrate through inference and implication that the spokesmen for the lay conservationists represent a misty-eyed sect of idealists who spurn reality in their battles to obstruct the progress of normal development and use of our country's resources. These are gross misrepresentations which I, as a conservationist, take pleasure in refuting. The spokesmen for sportsmen, professional and lay naturalists, and other civic-minded citizens whom we find opposing the current legislation to authorize construction of Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument are realists. They are as different from the 19th century's preservationists and nature lovers as the modern-day doctor is from the blood-letter of yesterday. They support a conservation program that affirms the necessity for assuring fullest development of water and land resources in a manner which takes cognizance not only of the multiple-purpose needs of the present but also of the long-term needs of the future. Their memberships represent an important and rapidly growing segment of the public that is learning of the sadly neglected facilities of our national parks and monuments, the national forests, and other public lands. They are people who recognize the urgency for development of adequate road and trail systems and the need for installation of outdoor facilities sufficient to meet the great tide of humanity which washes over these public areas during the busy seasons. They recognize the inadequacy of appropriations for the agencies

administering these resources as a denial of the wholesome enjoyment of public recreation areas that could be afforded the American people.

It is generally recognized that the battle of controversy sometimes brings into full flower a force which is destined to play a major role on the American scene. Certainly the conservation movement has made remarkable strides during the last few years when the principles for which it has worked were so seriously threatened. We have seen the unification of its members, who represent a diversity of interests, in a successful effort to defend from invasion our public lands that have recreational and other values far beyond those described by those groups who seek to appropriate these areas for their own uses. In the case of the Echo Park Dam controversy, the conservationists have suggested workable alternatives which do not jeopardize the sanctity of our system of National Parks and Monuments. They have disproved for all practical purposes the argument that evaporation losses from the alternate sites would be excessive and have brought to our attention the drastic revisions in the Bureau of Reclamation's figures which were originally used to justify the construction of Echo Park Dam. They have shown that the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers within Dinosaur National Monument are unequaled in their beauty and grandeur and cannot be duplicated in any other publicly owned area.

In a practical manner, our modern-day conservationists are looking ahead to decades of rapidly expanding population, more leisure, and greater mobility when every recreational resource will be desperately needed. They have shown that with only a fraction of the \$21 million provided in the authorizing bill for development of the Echo Park Dam's recreational resources, they could make Dinosaur one of the Nation's leading outdoor recreation areas, furnishing a much wider range of qualitative experience than that which could be realized from one more impoundment in a vast series of artificially produced lakes that are planned for the upper Colorado River. An adequate system of roads and trails and public facilities would make this area as important a part of the American people's outdoor heritage as Yosemite, Glacier, Yellowstone, or the Grand Canyon. They have clearly shown that a postponement of the time when the values of this area can be fully appreciated does not justify the destruction of its most striking features by building the proposed dam at Echo Park. They have heeded the warning of former Secretary of the Interior John Barton Payne, who commented in the course of the successful defense of Yellowstone National Park against proposals for a dam at Yellowstone Lake that "once you establish the principle that you can encroach on a national park for irrigation or water power, you commence a process which will end only in the commercialization of them all."

In concluding I should like to reemphasize the fact that we are not faced

with a choice between water and the irreplaceable values of Dinosaur National Monument: sound planning will conserve both. If we are successful in turning back this threatened invasion we shall be reaffirming the sanctity of areas dedicated by the American people for preservation.

The Maritime Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter of the utmost concern to those of us who are interested in preventing waste of the taxpayers' money and who look askance at corruption and improper acts perpetrated by Government officials. Certain conditions in the Maritime Administration demand our careful scrutiny and I am coming to the conclusion that a good housecleaning is necessary if we are to remedy certain conditions which exist under suspicious circumstances.

The Republican administration has made a point of requiring that Government officials and workers sever their industry connections when they enter Government service. This is particularly true when the Government official's former business stands to profit by his new Government position. I have just learned that one of the most sensitive positions in the Maritime Administration, namely, Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, has for the past month been held by one John McMullen, a person whose private business stands to reap great benefits by his current Government position. Mr. McMullen and his father for many years have been engaged in the ship-repair business, operating under the name of the Hudson Marine Co. When Mr. McMullen came to Government he spent half time here in Washington serving as Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, and half time in New York getting business from ship companies for his father's firm, the Hudson Marine Co. It is very possible that Mr. McMullen is still working part time and if he is not, the change has been very recently.

Mr. McMullen has recently increased the staff at Hudson Marine Co. to include personnel whose job is to solicit business for the company. Efforts in this direction are concentrated on companies having Maritime Administration business. In his job at Maritime, Mr. McMullen has an opportunity to know what shipyards and ship operators have ship subsidies and the status of each subsidy. He also is in a position to throw a monkeywrench into the works if a shipyard or ship operator does not cooperate with him. It may be a strange coincidence, but the Moore-McCormack Ship Co., which has been in the process of having detailed plans drawn for a new

vessel, has suddenly, and at the last minute, had those plans held up by Mr. McMullen's office in Maritime Administration. At the same time, the Moore-McCormack Co. has been approached by an employee of Mr. McMullen's company, the Hudson Marine Co., soliciting business—business that would amount to well over half a million dollars in the next year. The Moore-McCormack Co. plans had, over the months, been discussed at length with officials of the Maritime Administration and it was anticipated that they would be acceptable. I ask you, gentlemen, does it not seem a little odd that now, at the crucial moment when the plans are up for final clearance, they have been held up in what looks like, at best, most suspicious circumstances?

It seems evident that there are many questions to be asked, and I ask your permission to bring them up:

First. Is it proper for a Government official to use his public office to benefit his private business?

Second. If a Government official is using his public office to further the interests of his private business, is not his chief—in this case the Administrator of the Maritime Board—responsible, and should he not take proper action?

Third. Recently the attention of this body was brought to the fact that the Maritime Board was contemplating scrapping the *Cornhusker Mariner*, a \$10 million vessel, rather than repair it for \$2,300,000. Does it not seem that the Maritime Board is a little "loose" with the use of the taxpayers' money when it is willing to scrap a \$10 million investment that can be protected by an expenditure of only \$2,300,000?

Fourth. If this vessel is scrapped, is this not a jeopardy to our national defense in view of the fact that the Administrator of the Maritime Administration recently stated before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, "We need every one of the ships in our reserve and more."

Fifth. How can the Maritime Board justify the scrapping of the *Cornhusker Mariner* when it is one of the largest, fastest cargo vessels in our fleet, capable of attaining more than 23 knots, when most of the ships in the fleet have a speed of only 16 knots?

Sixth. Only a few days ago the Administrator of the Maritime Board announced in a press release that he intends to scrap the \$10 million *Cornhusker Mariner* which has seen only 6 months' service. His position on the *Cornhusker Mariner* is influenced by the opinions of one of his subordinates, Charles H. McGuire, Director of the Office of National Shipping Authority and Government Aid. On March 12, 1954, this is what the House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee had to say about Mr. McGuire:

We think it reprehensible in the extreme that a Government employee in a position of responsibility, presumed to be able to exercise discretion and judgment in matters of public concern, would have so little regard for truth and accuracy, that he would permit the head of an agency to harbor false and unsupported charges against another department of the Government. Such conduct is reckless (p. 12, hearing and report

of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services).

Now we find that another subordinate of the Administrator of the Maritime Board, namely, the Chief, Office of Ship Construction and Repair, seems to be engaging in practices that are not acceptable to Members of Congress, or for that matter, to anyone who has a sense of ethics. Under these conditions, I ask you, gentlemen, whether it does not seem in order for Mr. Rothschild to carefully study the personnel in his agency and immediately weed out those who are not working in the best interests of the public?

And I further suggest that Mr. Rothschild should be more careful and considerate of the taxpayers' money. In view of his own recent statements on the necessity for maintaining a reserve fleet, he should rescind the order to scrap the *Cornhusker Mariner* and instead have the vessel repaired.

Does Mr. Rothschild intend to rely on "lip service" and pious protestations or does he intend to perform in accordance with his words which obviously belie his deeds?

H. R. 7840

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of Congress that the Rules Committee yesterday granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 7840, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. This bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 21, 1954. It is a very worthy bill, and is financially sound. This bill should have the whole-hearted approval of the House of Representatives.

In order that the Members of the House may be fully informed as to this legislation, I should like to summarize, briefly, the provisions of H. R. 7840, as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

PROVISIONS OF BILL

I

The amendments proposed to the Railroad Retirement Act are shown on pages 3 to 5 of the committee's report on this bill, House Report No. 1899. Briefly, these amendments are:

First. Benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents at age 60 instead of age 65.

Second. Benefits to widowed mothers with physically or mentally disabled children over age 18.

Third. Full survivor benefits to widows, dependent widowers, and dependent parents who are also eligible for a railroad retirement annuity in their own right.

Fourth. Increasing the creditable compensation from the present maximum of \$300 a month to a maximum of \$350 a month in the calculation of a retirement or survivor annuity.

Fifth. Disregarding the compensation earned after age 65, if the crediting of such compensation would diminish the annuity.

Sixth. Changing the disability work clause to a maximum of \$100 in earnings for any month without loss of the annuity for that month.

Seventh. Excluding the service of certain delegates to national or international conventions of railway labor organizations from coverage under this act.

Eighth. Elimination of the requirement in the present law that a child over age 16 and under 18 years must attend school regularly in order to be eligible for a survivor's annuity.

Ninth. Waiver of retirement benefits for certain individuals who are receiving non-service-connected veterans' pensions

II

The principal amendment proposed to the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would increase the tax base from \$300 to \$350 a month, leaving the tax rate of 6¼ percent unchanged.

A similar increase in the tax base for employment covered under the Social Security Act was approved by the House on June 1, 1954, when it passed H. R. 9366. This bill provides, among other things, for the increase in the creditable and taxable wage base from \$3,600 to \$4,200 a year.

Almost two-thirds of the railroad employees now earn more than \$300 a month, and they would pay the tax on their additional monthly compensation in excess of \$300, but not in excess of \$350. In return for this additional tax, these employees would get increased benefits resulting from the crediting of this additional compensation in the computation of their annuities. On the average, these employees would obtain benefit rights at the rate of \$3 for each \$1 in taxes they would pay. Furthermore, the liberalization of the survivor benefits provided for in the bill would apply across the board, and the families of all railroad workers would benefit, regardless of whether or not the employee was taxed at the rate of \$300 a month or \$350 a month.

It has been estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that the increase in tax base from \$300 to \$350 a month would increase retirement-tax collections by \$56 million a year, on a level cost basis. This amount is sufficient to pay for all the additional retirement and survivor benefits provided for by this bill.

III

The amendments proposed by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are shown on pages 6 to 8 of the committee's report on H. R. 7840. Briefly, the schedule of base year compensation is slightly altered, and the daily benefit rates for unemployment are increased by 50 cents a step, with a maximum daily rate of \$8.50. Moreover, an eligible employee would be entitled to receive a daily benefit rate equal to half of his

daily rate of compensation for the last employment in which he was engaged in the last calendar year. The total amount of benefits which may be paid to an employee separately for unemployment or sickness within a benefit year would not exceed his total compensation in the base year. The reported bill also would increase the maximum compensation subject to contribution from \$300 to \$350 a month.

SPONSORS OF BILL

The reported bill has the support of all standard railway labor unions, including the 4 train and engine service brotherhoods and all the 19 organizations affiliated with the Railway Labor Executives' Association. These organizations represent almost all of the railroad workers in the United States.

Colonel Kelley, chairman, and Mr. Harper, labor member, of the Railroad Retirement Board, favor enactment of the reported bill. The Bureau of the Budget favors enactment of the bill.

H. R. 7840 IS SOUND AND NECESSARY LEGISLATION

More than 60 bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act have been introduced and referred to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am happy to state that the committee held hearings on all these bills, and considered each bill very carefully.

In the consideration of all these bills, the committee has placed great emphasis on the effect of the proposed amendments on the financial soundness of the railroad retirement account. The committee is unanimously of the opinion that, regardless of the desirability of certain proposals for the liberalization of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, no amendments should be made to the law which would jeopardize the financial soundness of the railroad retirement system. This principle is accepted by all the standard railway labor organizations as well as railroad management.

I am happy to state that the financing provisions of the reported bill are adequate to cover the costs of the additional benefits provided for in the bill.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce believes that the provisions of the reported bill, H. R. 7840, are sound and necessary legislation, and that this legislation is consistent with the program recommended by the President. I urge the House to act favorably on this bill.

Sovereignty for West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans who recall their history of Europe look upon the partition of Germany into East and West as a weird political anomaly which cannot endure.

We think in terms of the natural affiliations of the German people, their historic ties, their common boundaries, and the artificial separation imposed by the Communists upon the country. All of us expect that, ultimately, by one means or another, unification will be achieved.

France looks upon the German situation through entirely different glasses. She remembers aggressions in the days of Bismarck, Wilhelm II, and Adolf Hitler. Germany is not regarded as a stable ally in Paris. And the French are not too deeply interested in the establishment of a strong Germany as a possible buffer against aggressive communism because France does not expect to fight Communist expansionism any more than she fought Nazi expansionism, down to the last ditch.

In this tightrope situation, our Senate Foreign Relations Committee is urging recognition of West Germany sovereignty by the United States. Such a step would force France's hand on the whole problem of European security and would stimulate German efforts to achieve its own salvation. It would be a bold move in a timid world, and boldness by the West may be the one effective answer to terrorism by the Soviets.

H. R. 4213 Should Be Enacted To Provide for Waterfowl Management in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I hope both Houses of Congress will support H. R. 4213 and the purpose it seeks to accomplish. It is a good one. It will to some extent correct an unforeseen evil resulting from otherwise very useful and valuable works. It is a desirable bill from the standpoint of conservation.

The bill provides for construction of the necessary works and authorizes the utilization of water available under the Central Valley project for better waterfowl management in the San Joaquin Valley.

It has been estimated that 50 percent of all Pacific flyway birds winter in California, a large proportion of them in the San Joaquin Valley. Unfortunately, since the inception of the various components of the Central Valley project the balance of nature has been upset to some extent. Areas long frequented by migratory fowl have become dried up; consequently, there is a scarcity of the natural foods of these birds. This is unfortunate. The number of waterfowl is directly related to the available forage. Any factor affecting that supply will inevitably affect the number of birds.

This has long been recognized by experts in the field. Back in October 1950 the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service,

the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, and the California Division of Fish and Game completed a study of the situation in the so-called Grasslands area of the San Joaquin Valley.

This area was found to be one of the primary wintering areas of the West. At one time California had extensive marshes and ponds which were the natural habitat of migratory fowl. Now much of this land has been reclaimed for agriculture. In the State of California, over 2½ million acres of land are involved in drainage enterprise, 1,402,766 acres of which have installed drains. Of this amount some 80 percent are in the Central Valley. Thus, the natural habitat of waterfowl has been shrinking. In other areas previously favored by waterfowl the story is the same. Marshlands at the mouth of the Colorado River at the head of the Gulf of California have been reclaimed for agriculture.

Drainage and extensive cultivation have so concentrated the wintering migratory birds on the ever-dwindling area of natural environment that they have become seriously overcrowded. In their search for food the fowl have been forced by circumstances to depend on cultivated areas. Thus, waterfowl depredations to rice and other crops have become a matter of increasingly serious concern.

Hunting of waterfowl in California is a big business. Duck stamp sales in the State were 173,136 in 1951-52 fiscal year, and 214,456 in fiscal year 1952-53. In 1948 it was estimated that waterfowl hunters spent over \$28 million while indulging in the sport. This, from an economic standpoint alone, makes it important to protect the waterfowl resources of the State.

Lands that historically were highly valuable wintering areas for migratory waterfowl have been drained. Now their natural resting places have so shrunk that over \$2 million damages per year are suffered by the farmers of the State at the hands of birds seeking food no longer available to them.

This condition had become so serious by 1948 that the Federal and State government agencies undertook a detailed study of the problem. Their conclusions were made public in December 1950 in a study entitled "Waterfowl Conservation in the Lower San Joaquin Valley." H. R. 4213 represents an effort to implement the recommendations made at that time.

The study recognized the inadequacy of then existing waterfowl refuges in the area. Congress, in 1948, authorized the purchase of 20,000 acres of land in California by the Secretary of the Interior for waterfowl management area purposes and the State of California had a program calling for the immediate purchase of 10,000 acres in the lower San Joaquin Valley for the same purpose, or an amount equal to that recommended by the Department of the Interior in the same area. However, the study mentioned above noted that such a program was worthless without the assurance of an adequate supply of water.

Among the specific recommendations of this study were:

First. The State plan for the area be immediately carried out.

Second. There be developed from sources within the area a supply of water to replace interim supplies then being secured from Millerton Lake, to provide 13 second-feet to the Los Banos State Refuge.

Third. Development of nearby water resources of the Central Valley project to supplement existing supplies for a proposed enlargement of the Los Banos refuge having an area of 6,700 acres.

Fourth. The same for a proposed 12,000 acre Federal waterfowl management area in Merced County east of the river.

Fifth. Drainage and underground waters to be utilized to perpetuate the Grasslands area as waterfowl habitat; principally through efforts of the landowners in the area through the formation of a special district for the purpose.

Sixth. Should local landowners not do as recommended by July 1, 1953, Federal and State agencies should acquire, develop and operate suitable waterfowl management areas; the water supply in this contingency be developed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Seventh. Costs of providing and developing water under recommendations 2, 3, 4, and, if necessary, 6, to be included in a nonreimbursable allocation for fish and wildlife conservation to be made to the Central Valley project.

Eighth. Any further authorization of the Central Valley project necessary to include the measures herein recommended are approved.

Under this program the Fish and Wildlife Service and State of California would acquire, develop and operate management areas, while water supplies would be made available by Bureau of Reclamation.

Total supply of water needed to accomplish this program would include 7,000 acre-feet for supplemental water to Los Banos—expanded—and 40,000 acre-feet for the proposed Federal area.

It was believed that additional authorization of the Central Valley project was called for.

The bill introduced to accomplish this goal is H. R. 4213.

I am heartily in favor of the objective of this bill.

It will make available water to recreate the necessary natural habitat for waterfowl.

It will mitigate farmers' losses of grain due to foraging of waterfowl unable to survive on available refuges.

It will better enable the proper authorities to carry out a sound, well-balanced program of conservation.

It will be of assistance to the United States in carrying out its obligations under the migratory waterfowl treaty with Canada and Mexico.

It fully recognizes the rights of the State to control its own water resources.

In short, it accomplishes a worthwhile purpose and I heartily endorse it. I hope by colleagues interested in this bill will join me in urging the other body to act favorably on it in this session of Congress.

A Bill To Change the Name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in South Dakota to Lake Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Evans.

I am introducing this bill at the request of the people of my State, including the State press association, Rotary and service clubs, which have passed resolutions requesting change of the name to honor George O. Evans, area engineer, who has been in charge of Fort Randall Dam construction since work first started on that project in 1946.

Mr. Evans deserves much credit and commendation for the faithful performance of his duties as engineer in charge of construction of the third largest earthen dam in the Missouri River development plan, Fort Randall. The tremendous job of chief engineer required great skill and patience. He left no stone unturned in making sure that everything was planned down to the smallest detail.

George O. Evans was born February 5, 1900, graduating with a bachelor of science in civil engineering from Mississippi A. and M. in 1926. He accepted a job as a surveyor with the Vicksburg engineers office in 1927, working his way up until he moved to the Fort Peck Reservation. In 1934 he was transferred to the Omaha district where he was chief engineer in charge of Fort Randall. Mr. Evans served as a lieutenant colonel during World War II and was discharged as a full colonel.

The story of the Fort Randall Dam began many years ago when the Corps of Engineers saw the possibilities of the construction of a dam in an ideal spot on the Missouri River. They recognized the importance of such a dam, that would provide control of floods, uniform downstream flow, power, irrigation, and recreation.

Of greatest importance to the people living in the surrounding area of this project is the generation of cheap, dependable electric power. Eight giant turbines will generate 320,000 kilowatts of electricity. The first power surged out on the high lines on March 15, 1954, when President Eisenhower pressed a buzzer in his office in the White House signaling Gov. Sigurd Anderson, at Pickstown, S. Dak., to throw the starting switch.

Recreation facilities are another of the many advantages of this huge reservoir. Fishermen and campers will enjoy the fruits of labors which began 8 years ago.

It is fitting and proper that such an important project should be named in honor of the man who has so faithfully

contributed his abilities toward its construction.

I hope consideration will be given to the request that the reservoir be named after George O. Evans.

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, it is still true, especially since we have had some experience with TVA socialism, that most Americans in private and public life believe that the free-enterprise system of economics is by all odds the best system. Some compromise of the principle has crept in by alleging, but seldom proving, financial incapacity to build a power dam, for example. However, this reasoning does not advocate that the Government should supplant private industry. Government should never operate in an area that could be occupied by private industry. That is what Adlai E. Stevenson, titular head of the Democratic Party says. On May 1, 1952, in a speech delivered at Portland, Oreg., Mr. Stevenson had this to say about the production of power:

Where private enterprise can and is willing to do the job, I think it should be left free to do so. It seems to me that Government enterprise should be primarily addressed to the maintenance and enforcement of competition in our economic life and not its destruction. But where private initiative is incapable of, or for any reason fails to meet the legitimate needs of the people, whether it be for electric power or anything else, then I believe the Government will and should step in.

Everything up to that point where free enterprise is incapable must be reserved as free areas for free enterprise.

That being so, what is left of the controversy? Here we have a choice between taxpayers continuing to finance TVA, to build a powerplant or contracting private enterprise, capable and willing, to do it and finance it with private capital. How can that be a difficult choice.

A curious argument advanced against the Dixon-Yates proposal, is that it will enjoy virtual Federal tax exemption. Certainly TVA can't object to that, for it is exempt not only from Federal, but State and local taxes as well.

The last of the remaining arguments against President Eisenhower's proposal, is that TVA could supply the required power at lower costs. A comparison of the rates set by Dixon-Yates contract and what TVA is currently charging AEC shows no appreciable difference. In fact I expect the taxpayer will benefit from Dixon-Yates plan since a private utility must make its operations pay and cannot request annual appropriations and cannot avoid taxes or pass deficits in operations to the taxpayers.

The record of the private-utility companies is an impressive one and deserves mention here. In the 7-year period of 1947-53 the private-power companies have spent \$15 billion expanding their facilities and this in spite of the Federal, State, and local taxes they must pay. In 1953 alone, construction expenditures totaled \$2,876,000,000. During that 7-year period, the private companies increased their productive capacities from 42 million kilowatts to over 71 million kilowatts. Government agencies, Federal and local, increased their capacity in the same period by about 9 million kilowatts. By 1956 the private companies expect to expand their capacity by another 20 million kilowatts. Thus in 9 years they will have increased their capacity by 50 million kilowatts, or more than double what they had produced previously. No other industry can demonstrate a better record and it stands as the best proof that the industry is capable of performing what is required of it.

It should be pointed out that this expansion has made few headlines. The \$15 billion were raised without any fuss, without any controversy, and without any politics. This is in contrast to the yearly squabble that develops in Congress when the annual subsidy to TVA is considered. Countless days are spent in Congress each year, arguing about TVA appropriations, but not 1 hour was necessary to authorize the \$15 billion expended by the private companies on expansion in the last 7 years.

The annual bickering in Congress about TVA appropriations stems from the honest concern of most legislators to control and limit government spending. Indeed it was this concern of Congress, together with the equal concern of the President, that gave rise to the Dixon-Yates formula. This is an attempt to lessen the drain on the Treasury by insuring that the power will be supplied but not at the expense of the general taxpayer.

The proposal has another practical aspect to it that should be heartening to the advocates of TVA. It is common knowledge that TVA has not been able to meet the demands for power in the area it serves. It goes without saying that the additional power requirement involved in this controversy would not decrease the shortage. If the burden is removed from TVA it will be better able to meet the serious shortage it faces in its present territory.

The activity of the Socialists in the field of power production was outlined by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8 of this year. Suffice it to say that these people not only want the Government to remain in the power production business to the extent that it is already committed, but to expand the Government operations. They do not intend to relinquish their gains easily and they will fight unscrupulously to further their purposes. Now if socialism is involved in this controversy, as I believe it is, let it be brought out into the open, so that we may have an honest discussion.

In conclusion, may I say that the people of Tennessee are reported as not

being disturbed by the proposal. Indeed the businessmen in Memphis, Tenn., across the Mississippi River from the proposed site, have endorsed the Dixon-Yates contract. I submit the following resolution to that effect adopted recently by the Memphis Chamber of Commerce:

Resolved, That this board favors the construction of the present proposed steam generating plant in West Memphis, Ark., to insure adequate power for future industrial development of the city of Memphis and its surrounding territory.

Dated July 16, 1954.

Upper Colorado Political Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to water—the cornerstone of California's past, present, and future economy—the administration has let us down with a loud splash.

From the President down they have been beating the political drums for the gigantic upper Colorado River project which would seriously damage our vital supply of water from the lower Colorado.

In addition to depriving California of an immense amount of Colorado River water, to which we have contract rights, this upper Colorado River project would cost the taxpayers of California more than \$93 million.

It would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than a billion.

But how much would it cost the taxpayers of the States which would supposedly benefit from it? Those States are Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. It would cost the taxpayers of those 3 States about \$15 million.

These are not my figures. They are based on reports from the most reputable organizations, such as the Tax Foundation, the National Council of Taxpayer Executives, and testimony of expert witnesses before the House Interior Committee.

As a member of the committee, although anxious to foster sound development of the upper Colorado Basin, I found it necessary to vote against the administration proposal. It passed out of the committee by a vote of 13 to 12, largely because some Republican members cast aside their loudly proclaimed program of economy in favor of pork-barrel politics.

Disregarding California's welfare, and disregarding the taxpayers, Republican politicians obviously decided to take up the cudgels for the upper Colorado project to make the West believe they were great advocates of reclamation. High-powered strategists of the administration evidently bulldozed the Budget Bureau and the White House advisers into going along with them. It appears that

the high-level political staff of the administration does not know much about western water problems. And after examining their actions of the past few months, it is apparent they do not care to learn.

The upper Colorado project is the most infeasible, costly, and impractical water and power scheme ever concocted by a Federal Bureau. It is a magnificent example of a purely political project.

If this gigantic farce were ever approved by Congress it would inflict on the American public a catastrophic burden. It would probably mean the end of all reclamation development.

The Republican strategists thought they could put this political project over, and they are still trying to do it. But they have learned that the road they selected contains some pitfalls, and they now appear somewhat hesitant in moving ahead.

Let us see what has happened since the GOP deep thinkers launched the upper Colorado scheme.

First, they adopted the project as part of their program. Now a President has innumerable duties and obligations. He cannot be an expert on every matter put before him. So he must rely on his White House and department advisers. That is what Mr. Eisenhower did. He most certainly took the word of assistants and department heads that the upper Colorado project was a necessary, sound project, and on March 20, 1954, issued a statement in which he said:

The development will conserve water * * *. It will develop much-needed electric power * * *. The development calls for sound financing.

Mr. Eisenhower was misled by men influencing the course of this country and responsible for its welfare.

Shall it be said that the men advising the President did not know what they were doing? No, they knew. They knew that the upper Colorado project was nothing more than a political water project, that it could not pay out ever, that there was no market in the area for the power, that it would inflict on the taxpayers an unjustifiable load.

But the die had been cast, and the Republican machine was ordered to support the project before the public and in Congress. Secretary of the Interior McKay was appointed generalissimo, and he carried out his orders.

In May, Secretary McKay told the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington that by supporting the upper Colorado project—

In the first months of its incumbency this administration has provided concrete demonstrations of its determination to carry out the full responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to water resources development.

Again in May, Mr. McKay told a \$100-a-plate Republican dinner in Salt Lake City:

Let me cite the Colorado River storage project as a specific example of the type of development which we vigorously support.

There we have the Republican leadership firmly on record supporting a proj-

ect that will cost the taxpayers of California more than \$93 million, and the taxpayers of the Nation more than a billion dollars.

There we have the Republicans on one hand proposing a gigantic, costly, totally unworkable project to bring in more highly subsidized acreage, while on the other hand the Secretary of Agriculture is cutting agricultural acreage.

Behind the Republican campaign for the upper Colorado project is a purely political motive. They are disregarding the economic welfare of both California and the Nation. They are thinking only in terms of the elections in the upper Colorado States.

The Republican support of the upper Colorado project is a move of desperation. To maintain political ground they are in danger of losing, they are willing to sacrifice sound economy and good government. Someone should get all the facts to the President and slow down his "politics at any price" strategists who have sold him a bill of goods. Evidently he listened to some tall fish tales during his Colorado vacation.

Red China Shows Her Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist press throughout the world has been ranting in uninterrupted ecstasy over the Indochinese surrender ever since it took place. Like fanatics drunk with new power, they have been urging their followers on to new visions of things to come. Britain and France were expected to follow up the Indochina peace with overtures looking toward the admission of Red China to the United Nations, but the reaction of international communism has given pause even to Churchill and Mendes-France.

But nothing said or done at Geneva is likely to have more influence than the ruthless shooting down of a British airliner over international waters, and the attacks upon American planes searching for survivors by the Chinese Communists. The arrogance with which Red China has treated the situation is enough to shock the most cynical diplomat. Peiping has warned the United States to stop our "provocations" or "suffer the consequences." Peiping has also told the British to limit their search for the destroyed airliner to one plane.

This is the answer of Red China to the demonstrations of conciliation and good will which were most marked on the part of Churchill and Anthony Eden, at the Geneva meetings. Give the Communists an inch, and they will reach for a mile.

**The Vincennes Sun-Commercial: 150
Years of Public Service**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 the city of Vincennes, Ind., will celebrate the 150th anniversary of the printing of the first newspaper in the Midwest, the Indiana Gazette, which is now the Vincennes Sun-Commercial.

When this newspaper was founded in 1804, Vincennes was the center of government for the Indiana Territory, which included the area which now forms the States of Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and parts of Michigan and Minnesota. Four years before, Gen. William Henry Harrison had persuaded Congress to divide the Northwest Territory; and the Indiana Territory was organized with General Harrison as its Governor. It is recorded that one of his duties was to "look after the Indians and get them out of the way of the oncoming settlers." This was truly a pioneer outpost beckoning to the rugged men and women in search of new lands and free homes.

Perhaps the real America as we know it today started in this area between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi River. In the early days of our country the people were divided into colonies that were clannish and sought to carry on the traditions brought from England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Germany, France, Belgium, and other European countries. When these early Americans broke their ties of race and colony and crossed the mountains into the Northwest Territory, they mingled as neighbors and friends; they worked together; they intermarried. From this association or melting pot emerged the true spirit of a new race of people—Americans. This early newspaper at Vincennes became a medium for recording the day-by-day blending and integration of these real Americans.

These early Americans were a strong and a courageous people. One writer termed them "the strong and the brave, because only the brave started and only the strong got here." These early Americans were deeply religious and genuinely interested in education. This attribute is still evidenced in Vincennes and community to this day by their churches and schools.

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 wisely counseled:

Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The Vincennes community took this advice to heart, and was one of the educational leaders of those early days. An area of land was designated to be sold and used to found a "Seminary of learn-

ing." So in 1806 Vincennes University was founded.

People so sincerely interested in religious and educational pursuits felt the need of a newspaper. There were only a few newspapers in the Nation when the Indiana Gazette was founded on July 4, 1804—the 28th anniversary of our national independence. Journalism was still in its infancy. The large, well-known newspapers of today in the United States were not established until years later.

At the time of the paper's founding, Jefferson was President of the United States, Napoleon was being crowned Emperor, and the Code Napoleon was established. Beethoven was composing one of his famous symphonies. Alexander the First was extending the power of Russia eastward across the Bering Strait to found Sitka in 1804. In our country Fulton was about to launch a steamboat on the Hudson; Lewis and Clark were starting on their western expedition; Louisiana had just been purchased; and the Capital had just been moved to Washington.

A vast panorama of American history has been chronicled in the pages of this Vincennes paper, which is almost as old as this Nation itself. Jackson's victory at New Orleans and the British sacking of Washington; the fall of the Alamo; the battles of the Civil War, from Fort Sumpter to Appomattox, were duly recorded, as was Custer's last stand. An interesting item appeared in its columns stating that "there is strong talk of building a railroad from Vincennes to the village of Chicago on Lake Michigan." Industrial expansion and the race of the pioneers across the continent were recorded in the old Vincennes Sun. The charge at San Juan Hill and the exploits of our fighting men in two World Wars and in Korea have been retold in its pages. Although the lines of communication were limited at first, this newspaper became the agency which linked the daring pioneers and settlers to the current events and the overall trends in thinking of our Nation and of western civilization.

One is awed by the thought of the tremendous influence this great paper, located in the heart of America, has exercised in the past 150 years.

Let me cite just one of a multitude of instances in which this paper was a part of, as well as a recorder of, history. Abraham Lincoln grew from child to man in southern Indiana in a real American atmosphere steeped in a love of freedom and a belief in God and in the dignity of man. The first newspaper plant that Abraham Lincoln ever saw was that of the Vincennes Sun when the Lincoln family passed through Vincennes in migrating from Indiana to Illinois in 1834. Recalling the stories of Lincoln's eagerness to read and his search for the limited amount of reading material of that time, we can appreciate even more what a copy of the Vincennes Sun meant to him and others of that period.

Just as the Vincennes Sun played a stellar role in the life of the early

Indiana Territory, it has continued to be an outstanding publication, reporting the news, espousing causes for civic betterment, disseminating the facts of living and culture and thinking.

I salute the Vincennes Sun-Commercial, its editor, Ross Garrigus, its general manager, Howard Greenlee, its publisher, Eugene C. Pulliam.

One hundred and fifty years of public service is only a good beginning for this paper on the banks of the Wabash. It will surely carry on this proud record of service so long as the institutions of free men endure.

Public Laws 437 to 450, Inclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on Public Laws 437 to 450, inclusive, as follows:

**THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT ON LEGISLATION OF THE
83D CONGRESS**

DEAR FRIEND: Continuing my report to you on the new laws of the land:

PUBLIC LAW 437

H. R. 8779, appropriations for Department of Agriculture and for Farm Credit Administration: Appropriations will be covered in a separate and later report.

PUBLIC LAW 438

Senate Joint Resolution 167, extending provisions of Housing Act 1 month: Housing Act of 1954 being still in conference, Public Law 438 extended for 1 month provisions (such as FNMA, Wherry Act, GI loans) otherwise expiring June 30, 1954. Also extends RFC, now in process of litigation, 1 more month.

PUBLIC LAW 439

S. 129, limitation in contingent legal fees: The Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 sets 10 percent of judgments recovered as the maximum fee to be allowed attorneys. But the Jurisdictional Act of 1935, relating to the Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, sets up a 5-percent maximum. Public Law 439 raises it to 10 percent to conform with the general rule. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs thought this equitable and reasonable.

I have an open mind. It is impossible for me fully to inform myself on Indian affairs. By establishing a 10-percent maximum, as in the case of veterans' pensions, perhaps adequate protection against exorbitant fees has been afforded the Indians who are our wards.

In the 81st Congress when the rent-control law was being written by the committee of which I was a member I urged a 10-percent limitation on fees for lawyers representing either tenants or landlords. The failure of my efforts meant, of course, that the fees

were very much larger, in most cases swallowing up the benefits intended to help landlords meet increased expenses and thus penalizing both tenants and landlords.

PUBLIC LAW 440

S. 2742, Ute Indian Tribe: This law makes more money available for per capita distribution among the Ute Indians of Utah. Some \$17 million was the tribe's share of the 1950 judgment. After expenditure of about \$6 million (including a juicy attorney's bill for \$430,000) the tribe, including principal and accumulated interest, has some \$13 million left on deposit.

I do hope that in advancing toward the desired objective of placing the Indian on the common level of American citizenship the program is giving ample protection against the spoilers. You will have noticed in these reports many Indian laws enacted by this Congress. I think it is a subject that merits a full-dress review by the 84th Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 441

S. 2777, travel in Alaskan waters: This extends for another year the exemption of certain Alaskan ports from the law restricting to vessels of the United States transportation from one port of this country to another port of the United States. Reason: there is no American steamer on this route, only Canadian. See Public Law 124, enacted during the first session. It has to be done every year, pending the availability of American vessels in this area.

PUBLIC LAW 442

S. 2844, transactions by disbursing officers: Routine amendment to the act of 1944 authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 443

S. 3103, extending title II of First War Powers Act: This was passed on the recommendation of the Department of Defense as necessary to insure an uninterrupted performance of contracts to facilitate the national defense. It extends title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941, revived during the Korean emergency, to June 30, 1955. Seems the Department of Defense is still functioning on a war (or expectant war) basis.

PUBLIC LAW 444

S. 3364, hospitalization of Indians: In 1949 Congress authorized a \$1.5 million appropriation for a hospital to be built in cooperation with New Mexico and at which 100 Indian patients, wards of the Federal Government, were to be treated. There has been a delay in construction. Public Law 444 merely extends to 1957 the date for submission of certain reports by the Secretary of the Interior.

PUBLIC LAW 445

H. R. 445, Hawaiian bond issues: Whether the legislature of Hawaii is empowered by the Organic Law of Hawaii to authorize bond issues, without the consent of Congress, is a question raised by attorneys for prospective purchasers. Public Law 445 settles the point by approving of such bond issues, past, present, future. Merely a justification for legal eagles to collect a fee.

PUBLIC LAW 446

H. R. 2848, wharf landings in Hawaii: This permits the Territory of Hawaii to collect landing and wharf fees from United States vessels on the same basis as States of the Union in continental United States. Fair enough.

PUBLIC LAW 447

H. R. 6276, mortgages on foreign-flag vessels: Under this act ship mortgages on foreign-flag vessels may be foreclosed in the admiralty courts of the United States exactly

as is done in the case of American-flag vessels. Previously foreign-flag vessels had an advantage over our own vessels.

PUBLIC LAW 448

H. R. 5840, land exchange in Hawaii: This authorizes Hawaii to exchange some 994 acres of public lands near Waimea for 1,250 acres of privately owned lands of equal value. Organic law of Hawaii requires approval by Congress of any exchange of public lands exceeding 40 acres in area. Hence the necessity of another public law.

PUBLIC LAW 449

H. R. 6154, Fort Peck Indian Tribes: Another of a long series of acts aimed at putting the American Indian on his own with other American citizens. Public Law 449 gives the Indian tribes at Fort Peck in Montana control of their own money. Recent oil discoveries are carrying the Fort Peck Indians on a wave of prosperity.

PUBLIC LAW 450

H. R. 8729, Federal Reserve: This extends until June 30, 1956, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts up to a total of \$5 billion.

Here is an illustration of how it works: Prior to receipt of income taxes (starting to come in on March 15, 1954) the Treasury borrowed \$190 million from the Federal Reserve. On March 17, 1954, the Treasury paid back the entire \$190 million loan from the money received from income-tax payers.

The committee of which your Representative is a member has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve. The committee was unanimous in reporting out this bill. The subject is somewhat complicated. I hope my simple illustration will be helpful in pointing the outlines.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

What's Ahead for Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, in a world of uncertainties highlighted by the H-bomb, the A-bomb, and dire predictions of a C-bomb, Americans, like the rest of the world, have much to disturb us. But, upon the seemingly sound assumption that the world does not intend to commit suicide in the foreseeable future, all of us should be planning ahead for life and the expectation of posterity.

During the past year's time, our population has increased from 159,900,000 to 162,700,000. The last 12 months have set a new record of 4 million births. With all the talk of hard times, some of it stimulated by political soothsayers, consumer spending throughout the Nation has dropped from the record year of 1953 by less than 1 percent. In fact, our country spent more on homes, new housing, and the family automobile than was spent last year. During this same brief period, the movement outward from cities into

newer suburbs has affected well over a million people. More than 1 million new homes not located on farms have been erected in cities and suburban areas. Incredible as it may seem, we have 2½ million more automobiles on the highways than we had 1 year ago.

If these are not signs of a vital and expanding economy, we just do not know how to read. The secret of stock-market rises is no secret at all. It is based upon the belief in a continuing market and a continuous growth for the American way of life.

This Is Not the Time To Raise Postal Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 23, 1954

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, when I appear before this House in opposition to H. R. 6052, a bill to increase rates of postage, I am heartened and supported by the fact that I represent the interests of many individuals and business firms, not only in my own district but throughout the Nation. Over the past year my office has been deluged with hundreds of letters and telegrams protesting the hasty and ill-considered action to increase business costs.

I know I speak for the man in the street when I urge that the House not pass the proposed increase in first-class mail. I know his sentiments are pretty well summed up in the following question. Was not this administration elected on a platform of economy so that taxes could be reduced? Since a 33½-percent increase in first-class mail is in the nature of a tax, no wonder the average citizen is asking about post-office economies that have been promised, but as yet not realized.

I know I speak for business generally when I oppose an increase in first-class mail because 80 percent of first-class mail is utilized by American business. A small-business man, operating on slim profit margins, does not view lightly this added expense burden in his business, especially when small business is facing a difficult readjustment period following the military armistice in Korea. He has a right to ask—is it really necessary?

When I oppose the additional 30-percent increase in second-class mail I know I speak for the printing and publishing industries at large. The Post Office Department has stated that there are approximately 25,000 publications with second-class entry in this country. Many of these firms are experiencing difficulties despite the fact that they derive certain benefits by having their publications in second-class mail. Of these 25,000 about half are newspapers

and half magazines. On April 1, 1954, this group received the last of three 10-percent increases imposed on second-class mail. No one knows yet what the full impact of these rate increases will be.

I know I again speak for small business when I address my remarks to this body in opposition to second-class mail rate increases. According to the 1952 Annual Survey of Manufactures, issued by the Department of Commerce in November 1953, the printing and publishing industry of this country is made up of slightly more than 30,000 establishments. Of this number 28,933 are firms which employ less than 100 persons.

I know I speak for many veterans of this country, because I have been advised by the Veterans' Administration that a total of 71,000 World War II veterans had entered training for objectives in the printing and publishing industry as of November 30, 1952. I am not an expert on costs but, allowing a general average cost indicated from the total expenditures of the Veterans' Administration, it would mean that the Federal Government had spent in excess of \$100 million in training these men for this industry.

I know I speak for the press, generally, whose force and influence in this country have never been doubted, whose daily contributions to our democratic way of life are part of our very blood stream.

When I stand in opposition to upward adjustments in third-class rates I know I speak for the thousands of business firms throughout the country who rely heavily upon the mails in the pursuit of their business objectives. Here also the printing industry is involved. Here also business firms have addressed searching letters to me inquiring why increased costs are now being foisted on them by the Post Office Department. They have good reason to raise such inquiries when recent studies have indicated that during January of this year the business of this country primarily dependent on the use of the mails reported the sharpest dips in their business since July 1951.

Gentlemen, I know I speak for your constituency and mine when I say that these general reactions to this measure only serve to reaffirm my position set forth in my minority views on March 18, 1954, namely that this postal bill was developed too hastily and in great measure by patchwork and guesswork.

To illustrate what I mean. The bill before you was presented to the Congress in its original form on July 1, 1953, 6 months after the present administration had taken office. I am sure you are all familiar with the fact that there are many considerations other than costs that go into ratemaking. Some of these are the value of the product, preferential handling, and the ability of the users to pay. Do we have any basis for concluding that such factors were carefully considered in proposing this rate measure to Congress when it was not until December 2, 1953, that the Post Office Department announced the appointment of its Director of Postal Rates and set into

motion the organization of a Rate Division, the authority for which had existed for quite some time? In the meantime the Postmaster General would have you enact a rate bill which had no benefits of the research or study to be derived by this group within his own Department.

Last year about this time the House committee brought its consideration of this rate bill to an abrupt halt because objection was made by members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in light of the survey of the Post Office Department which was a proceeding pursuant to the authority of Senate Resolution 49 under the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This study has been completed, and its findings are very vital to the solution of the postal-rate problem. It has raised many policy questions which should be considered and resolved before undertaking the enactment of a postal rate bill, and yet this bill before the House has not been modified in any way to reflect the findings of the Senate committee.

If this measure must pass the House, I had hoped that once the rate bill reached the Senate there would be ample time for a full consideration of the findings of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee under Senate Resolution 49 before the Senate committee considered this pending rate measure. However, if this bill is passed by the House and sent to the Senate, there is scarcely time for adequate consideration of the rate bill; let alone the resolution of the many policy questions raised by that Senate committee's objective findings in connection with the operations of the Post Office Department.

The administration and this Congress may well be proud of its work on the tax revision bill which has been sorely needed for many years. This new revised bill will be of tremendous benefit and assistance to American business, labor, farmers, and others, too. Likewise, I insist that before undertaking the passage of any further postal rate measure, there is great need for a new statement of our basic policies and assumptions for the operation of the United States Post Office Department. Both the Senate committee and the Post Office Department have indicated that there is a need for such basic determinations.

At this late date I strongly urge that the House delay enactment of this measure so that next January it can be considered with due consideration for the findings of the Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Finally, I am strongly persuaded that we should once more raise the question among ourselves affecting the matter of economies promised by the Post Office Department, but not yet effected. In varying terms we have been told that a Post Office deficit of approximately \$740 million has been reduced to approximately \$350 million. That may be true but I am not convinced that it was all done as a result of economies achieved

by the Post Office Department. Rather this great savings has come about principally as a result of an increase in postal rates over which the Postmaster General has control, and the shifting of expenses, such as air mail subsidies and the franked and penalty mail to other agencies of the Federal Government. If great economies can be achieved in the Post Office Department, and I am confident Postmaster General Summerfield and his great team of associates can, these should be made known after 18 months of operation. And I insist that they will have a direct and important bearing on postal rate legislation.

I was very much interested in the speech made on the floor of the Senate on July 16, 1954, in which a Member of that illustrious body pointed out that the Postmaster General had a \$100 million savings in his 1954 budget based on the failure to realize the total volume of mail previously estimated. This kind of surplus has a definite bearing on rate measures as do many other real suggestions in the Senate Advisory Council's report showing where great savings can be effected. On transportation alone the forecast of savings by the Senate Advisory Council was verified in a study which said that some \$80 million could be saved in this particular field. These and other economies ought to be thoroughly explored by the Congress before asking the American people and their business institutions once more to underwrite waste and inefficiency through increased postal rates.

Much has been stated recently about the need for combining the postal-rate bill and the postal-pay bill. I, for one, believe that they are separate matters and each should be reviewed on its own merits. It should be pointed out that this rate bill does not go into effect until January 1, 1955, and certain portions of it will not become effective until April 1955. Therefore, it would seem to me that very little revenue would be lost if consideration of this legislation is delayed until the next session of Congress.

It is a matter of record that over the past several years the consideration of a rate bill by the Senate Committee has required a minimum of 30 days, and in one instance, a period of 6 weeks. Surely there is no Member of this body who will believe that adequate consideration of this matter can now be given by the Senate committee at this term of Congress. This is a matter which vitally affects all of our people, and in that sense I consider it an item of major legislation which should not be brushed over lightly.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that this measure be returned to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee until we are apprised of the economies that the Post Office Department can achieve, until we can study and resolve the policy questions raised by the Senate Advisory Council's report, and until there exists more time in the Senate for adequate hearings to be given to all businesses affected by this measure.