in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named persons for appointments in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 408, 82d Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress;

To be captains

Gleason, Walter J., MSC, O996923.
Hoagland, Peter W., MC, O2263944.
Mendelson, Janice A., MC.

To be first lieutenants

Barnes, Joan A., WMSC, M2899.
Carleton, Jane A., WMSC, J100163.
Decker, Julia E., ANC, N806164.
Duffield, John R., MC, O4003831.
Henley, Stephen, MSC, O973459.
Jacox, Gilbert L., MSC, O1925716.
Kraemer, Vidalia L., ANC, N900337.
Leff, Arthur L., JAGC, O2270518.
Norton, Jack, JAGC, O987519.
Paradise, Leo J., MSC, O997955.
Richey, Eldred T., Jr., MC, O1941930.
Ryan, Patricia A., ANC, N804846.
Simmons, John L., MSC, O1876923.
Thompson, Calvin W., DC, O2104366.

To be second lieutenants

Anthony, Frances J., WMSC, R2661.
Campbell, William J., MSC, O1941403.
Damsbo, Ann M., WMSC, M2977.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

To be first lieutenants

Allen, John W.
Ford, Samuel M., O2211040.
Small, Harold S.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified.

Mallonee, Paul G., O65832.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of sec. 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

To be first lieutenant

Hobbs, Donald I., O1877220.

To be second lieutenant

Proietto, Raymond T., O4009836.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sec. 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Bartell, Harold T.
Berger, Calvin A.
Castiglia, Joseph J.
Cuthbertson, Robert J.
Dailey, Donas H., O4012031.
Dister, Arthur C., Jr.
Grether, Ralph W.
Hawk, John A., Jr.
Henry, Charles E.
Leonard, John D.
Lynch, Francis D.
Manz, Robert D.
May, Curry J.
Miller, Charles H.
Pruden, Thomas E., Jr.
Radford, James T.
Sanford, William F.
Stephens, George E.
Walker, Kenneth S.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

John E. Loustalot, Bakersfield.
Bernhard A. Ruth, Jr., Cutler.
Thomas H. Moorman, Richardson Springs.
George H. Whalen, Saratoga.
Sarah E. Robbins, Seaside.

KANSAS

Burris B. Moore, Fort Scott.
Benjamin Taylor, Independence.
Fern E. Warnock, Partridge.

LOUISIANA

Edwin A. O'Brien, Lafayette.

MINNESOTA

John W. Burch, Cannon Falls.
Arthur C. Reetz, Dakota.
Faith V. Erickson, Silver Bay.

NEW YORK

Joseph C. Latham, Canisteo.
Kenneth C. Lasher, Dover Plains.
Charles Walter Smallman, Fort Covington.
Abbott L. Dibblee, Garden City.
Leslie G. Clark, Lakemont.

PENNSYLVANIA

LeRoy W. Creasy, Bloomsburg.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Horace K. Sanders, Myrtle Beach.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bland K. Hesse, Fayetteville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, as we again come unto Thee in the fellowship of prayer, may we unite our hearts in the sacrament of adoration and thanksgiving.

May we always respond to Thy loving kindness and goodness in a spirit of fidelity and devotion.

Grant that our Speaker, our chosen Representatives, and all who have served our country in whatever capacity, during this session of the Congress, may receive the benediction of Thy praise.

We commend one another to Thy love and care and unto Him who is able to keep us in the paths of righteousness and to present us faultless before Thy presence, to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 30, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 482. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 593. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service;

H. R. 2149. An act to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 2553. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, relating to the use of corporation property by a shareholder;

H. R. 2559. An act to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers;

H. R. 2619. An act to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951;

H. R. 3235. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Richard Raffo Hanson;

H. R. 4394. An act to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 4410. An act for the relief of William E. Ryan;

H. R. 4581. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax on cutting oils;

H. R. 4663. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H. R. 4672. An act to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 5249. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund or credit of internal revenue taxes and custom duties paid on distilled spirits and wines lost, rendered unmarketable, or condemned by health authorities as a result of the hurricanes of 1954;

H. R. 5647. An act to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles;

H. R. 6066. An act authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California;

H. R. 6122. An act to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillons of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.;

H. R. 6182. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H. R. 6417. An act to revive and reenact the act "authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939;

H. R. 6585. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6590. An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6600. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6727. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.;

H. R. 7018. An act to authorize subpenas in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7034. An act to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7035. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720);

H. R. 7095. An act to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to certain athletic events held for the benefit of the United States Olympic Association;

H. R. 7245. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7300. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of income received from patent infringement suits;

H. R. 7628. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the White House office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 257. An act to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain cases of a sale or exchange of a taxpayer's residence, certain periods of limitation shall not run against the taxpayer while he is on extended active duty in the Armed Forces;

H. R. 1459. An act to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Orange County, N. Y., to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y.;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon and Ken C. Quon;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 4508. An act for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry;

H. R. 4763. An act for the relief of Elzie C. Brown;

H. R. 5168. An act to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal farm credit system; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6634. An act to provide for the conveyance of 1⅜₁₀ acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage-disposal purposes;

H. R. 6994. An act to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7588. An act for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas; and

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes.

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

S. 65. An act to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 125. An act for the relief of the State of Illinois;

S. 637. An act to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard, and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 792. An act for the relief of Spyros Nicholaou Lekatsas;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski;

S. 1415. An act for the relief of Anna Mertikas;

S. 1455. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard;

S. 1748. An act to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1749. An act adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine;

S. 1959. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acre tract of land out of a one hundred ninety-nine and nine hundred fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Houston, Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 2088. An act for the relief of Ladislav Mencl;

S. 2130. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Beltsos;

S. 2154. An act for the relief of Lucia Mary Ann Lucchesi Marchi;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Nickolas Menis;

S. 2182. An act for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.;

S. 2339. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes;

S. 2364. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2374. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies from flood control and river and harbor projects;

S. 2514. An act to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85°54'43.5" east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers harbor line system are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream;

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes;

S. 2591. An act to amend section 602 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus property under the control of executive agencies; and

S. 2671. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1041) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1077) entitled "An act to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BRICKER, be excused as conferee on the bill (S. 2391) entitled "An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes," and that the Senator from New York, Mr. IVES, be appointed in lieu.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from Idaho, Mr. WELKER, be excused as conferee on the bill (S. 1077) entitled "An act to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947," and that the Senator from Utah, Mr. WATKINS, be appointed in lieu.

PERMITTING THE MINING DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 100) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1610)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 100) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLIFTON YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
W. KERR SCOTT,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 100) permitting the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the bill:

The Senate amendments, which are numbered 1 to 6 consecutively for easy reference are as follows:

1. Lines 5 and 6, page 1, insert the word "heretofore" between "States" and "Now".

2. Line 5, page 1, insert the letter "(a)" after "SEC. 2.".

3. Line 7, page 1, strike out "by statutory rights".

4. Line 7, page 2 after "second session)" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"*And provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed to open for the purposes described in this section any lands (1) which are included in any project operating or being constructed under a license or permit issued under the Federal Power Act or other Act of Congress, or (2) which are under examination and survey by a prospective licensee of the Federal Power Commission, if such prospective licensee holds an uncanceled preliminary permit issued under the Federal Power Act authorizing him to conduct such examination and survey with respect to such lands and such permit has not been renewed in the case of such prospective licensee more than once.

"(b) The locator of a placer claim under this Act, however, shall conduct no mining operations for a period of 60 days after the filing of a notice of location pursuant to section 4 of this Act. If the Secretary of the Interior, within 60 days from the filing of the notice of location, notifies the locator by registered mail of the Secretary's intention to hold a public hearing to determine whether placer mining operations would substantially interfere with other uses of the land included within the placer claim, mining operations on that claim shall be further suspended until the Secretary has held the hearing and has issued an appropriate order. The order issued by the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for one of the following: (1) a complete prohibition of placer mining; (2) a permission to engage in placer mining upon the condition that the locator shall, following placer operations, restore the surface of the claim to the condition in which it was immediately prior to those operat ns; or (3) a general permission to engage in placer mining. No order by the Secretary with respect to such operations shall be valid unless a certified copy is filed in the same State or county office in which the locator's notice of location has been filed in compliance with the United States mining laws.

"The Secretary shall establish such rules and regulations as he deems desirable concerning bonds and deposits with respect to the restoration of lands to their condition prior to placer mining operations. Moneys received from any bond or deposit shall be used for the restoration of the surface of the claim involved and any money received in excess of the amount needed for the restoration of the surface of that claim shall be refunded.

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall affect the validity of withdrawals or reservations for purposes other than power development."

5. Line 13, page 3, after word "reservation", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following:

"*Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or restrict the rights of the owner or owners of any mining claim who are diligently working to make a discovery of valuable minerals at the time any future withdrawal or reservation for power development is made."

6. Starting with line 20, page 3, strike out all of section 7.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

Amendments 1, 2, and 3 are perfecting in nature.

Amendment 4 serves a dual purpose: Language in the form of a proviso has been added to the first paragraph of section 2 in response to a suggestion of the Federal Power Commission. Its purpose is to protect the rights and interests of holders of outstanding valid operational, construction, and preliminary licenses or permits authorized by law on lands previously withdrawn for power purposes or power sites.

In addition, language has been adopted in the form of a new subsection added to section 2 affecting placer-mining claims which may be located on lands opened to mining entry by H. R. 100. The House managers agree that the Secretary of the Interior should be advised immediately when placer claims are initiated since serious conflict frequently arises between mining activity and other lands uses when placer mining and dredging operations are involved, as this amendment provides. The language adopted would give to the Secretary authority in the case of placer-mining claims to hold public hearings to determine whether placer-mining operations in the areas would be detrimental to other uses of the lands. When necessary, the Secretary may require the locators of placer-mining claims to execute bonds or undertakings to the United States or to make deposits of money to assure restoration of the lands to their former condition. If the locators or their sureties fail to restore the lands, the deposits or bonds should be forfeited and the receipts obtained made immediately available for restoration of the lands by the Secretary.

Amendment 5 adds a proviso to section 5, with an aim of protecting rights of a mining claim owner diligently working to make a discovery of valuable minerals at the time of any future power withdrawal or reservation.

Amendment 6, which deletes section 7 of the House version of the bill, came about after careful consideration and recognition of the fact that its retention might seriously prejudice chances of final passage. Managers concluded that its retention would inevitably result in little or no development of mineral resources on unsurveyed lands, and very substantial title complications. Your conferees are fully sympathetic with the problems of States unable to utilize school-grant lands guaranteed them by their enabling acts simply because survey has not been completed. It is believed, however, that separate legislation should be developed to deal with this question.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLIFTON YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1953

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1611)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments and agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLIFTON YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
W. KERR SCOTT,
By JAMES E. MURRAY,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GEORGE W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6373) amending the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the bill:

The conference agreement accepts the bill as it passed the House. It is believed by your conferees that the dollar limitation provided in the bill for additional gross purchase transactions would prove inadequate for the carefully considered programs if the Senate amendments were adopted.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
CLIFTON YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order during the remainder of this session for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence for the remainder of the session.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE WILLIAM EDWARD BARTON

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce to this body the passing of a former Member of Congress from Missouri, William Edward Barton. This fine and distinguished gentleman served in the 72d Congress from March 4, 1931, to March 3, 1933. He gave the old 16th Congressional District of Missouri—comprising many of the counties I represent today—the finest kind of representation and he served well the counties of Maries, Dallas, Laclede, Pulaski, Phelps, Crawford, Dent, Webster, Wright, Texas, and Shannon.

The State was represented by 13 Members at Large of Congress during the 73d Congress to which he was an unsuccessful candidate for renomination. Subsequently the State was redistricted at which time most of the counties of Judge Barton's old congressional district fell into the Eighth Congressional District which was represented by a revered friend, the honorable Clyde Williams.

Judge Barton was born April 11, 1868, in Pickens County, S. C., and in 1869 moved to Missouri with his parents, who settled in Crawford County, near Bourbon. He attended the public schools and the Steelville Normal and Business Institute, Steelville, Mo. Prior to graduation from the law department of the University of Missouri at Columbia in 1894, he was employed as a farmhand, miner, in a railroad office, and taught school near Bourbon, Mo. He was admitted to the bar the same year he graduated and commenced practice of law in Houston, Mo. He was a delegate to the State judicial conventions in 1896 and 1906. During the Spanish-American War he served as a sergeant in Company M, Second Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry. He served as prosecuting attorney of Texas County in 1901 and 1902. He was elected judge of the 19th Judicial Circuit, 1923–28, following which service he was elected as a Democrat to the 72d Congress. He was again elected judge of the 19th Judicial Circuit of Missouri and served from 1934 to 1946. He then resumed the private practice of law at Houston, Mo., where he died July 29, 1955.

Funeral services were held on July 31 at the Baptist Church in Houston, with Masonic rites. He was buried at Houston, Mo. Mrs. Barton preceded him in death.

Judge Barton was well known and respected by folks in all walks of life and we will all miss his wise and helpful counsel. Our Nation is deeply indebted to this man for he gave unselfishly. His loss will be felt keenly by myself and I am sure by many others. I extend my sympathy to those closest to Judge Barton, a truly great American.

PROVIDE FOR AN ADEQUATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the absolute need of taking some positive action to build an adequate highway system in our great country. This has been recommended by our great President Dwight D. Eisenhower. During this past year the Public Works Committee of the House held long hearings on this subject. Bills were introduced and considered at this session. However, no favorable action has been taken and yet the need increases daily, not only for economic and defense purposes, but because thousands of lives are being lost on our highways every year. The President rightly is asking for action now so that work on planning can get started at once.

I have, therefore, today addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Public Works Committee, to the effect that this committee, of which I have the honor to serve as a member, be called into meeting sometime in the early fall. That proper hearings be held for a period not exceeding 2 weeks, that all interested parties be given a chance to be heard on all phases of financing and other pertinent suggestions. That a new bill be properly prepared after these hearings for early action at the very beginning of the next session of the 84th Congress. It is not my intention that the Public Works Committee usurp the powers of any other committee on the matter of financing, but this question should be worked out in advance of any hearings by the leaders and respective committee chairmen of the House.

I was, and am now, very much in favor of the plan submitted by the Clay committee and covered in the bill defeated last week known as H. R. 4060 and still believe a bill encompassing these same features could be put into effect to great advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I am also addressing letters to the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and minority leader, asking that they urge a special meeting this fall of the Public Works Committee to hold the hearings suggested above and have a bill in readiness for passage in the beginning of the next session.

I ask this in all sincerity, heartily agreeing with the President and all witnesses who appeared before the Public Works Committee this past session, pointing up the need for a definite interstate highway program to be started at the earliest possible moment.

FARM PRICES

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, average farm prices during the past month have declined another 2 percent. Since February 1951 they have dropped 23 percent. Since 1955 is apparently going to be a major crop year, there is every indication that farm prices will continue their decline through the remainder of the year.

In contrast, the prices which farmers must pay for the things they buy have declined in the past 3 years only 3 percent. In the past year, however, they have turned upward again. There seems to be little question that with the increase in the price of steel and other basic commodities, other than those produced on our farms, the cost of the things which farmers buy is going still higher in the last half of this year.

Month by month the relative position of the farmer in our economy declines. This is the great sore spot in an otherwise prosperous America. The farmer has always been a major consumer of much of the industrial production of this Nation. I cannot believe that our national economy is sound when we follow policies which reduce the farmer's income and likewise reduce his products.

I hope that Members of this House, as they return to their homes, will take occasion to visit the farmers who reside in their districts. I hope that they will come back to Washington next January alert to the problems of the farmers and equipped with first-hand knowledge of their increasing difficulties. I hope that Members will not limit their visits to the larger and perhaps more prosperous farms, but will seek out some of the smaller, marginal farming operations which have been most distressed by the decline in farm prices.

I do not believe that we can afford to let another year go by without taking positive action to improve the relative position of the farmer in our economy. I do not believe that we can long allow a policy to continue which is driving thousands of our farmers out of agriculture.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "subsections" and insert "subsection."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND WITHIN GRAPEVINE DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT TO GRAPEVINE, TEX.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6634) to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage-disposal purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and without monetary consideration therefor" and insert "upon payment of 50 percent of the fair appraised market value thereof."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ENTRY AND LOCATION, ON DISCOVERY OF VALUABLE SOURCE MATERIAL, UPON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES CLASSIFIED AS OR KNOWN TO BE VALUABLE FOR COAL

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6994) to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, subject to the conditions and provisions of this act and to any valid intervening rights acquired under the laws of the United States, public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws and which are open to location and entry subject to the conditions and provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), unless embraced within a coal prospecting permit or lease, shall also be open to location and entry under the mining laws of the United States upon the discovery of a valuable source material occurring within any seam, bed, or deposit of lignite in such lands: *Provided,* That a copy of the notice of any mining location made for source material occurring in any such bed, seam, or deposit, shall be filed for record in the land office of the Bureau of Land Management for the State in which the claim is situated within 90 days after the date of its location: *Provided further,* That the claimant to any such mining location shall report annually to the Mining Supervisor of the Geological Survey the amount of lignite mined or stripped in the recovery of such valuable source material during each calendar year and tender payment to him of 10 cents per ton thereon. Any mineral patents issued hereunder shall be made subject to the recording and payment requirements of this section and shall contain a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals owned by the United States other than lignite containing valuable source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of such material. Mining claims located and mineral patents issued under the provisions of this act shall not include rights to lignite not containing valuable source material except to the extent it may be necessary to mine or strip such lignite in order to mine the source material and, with respect to lode claims, shall not include extralateral rights. For all purposes of this act 'source material' and 'lignite' shall have the meanings given in section 6 of this act.

"SEC. 2. Any mining claim located in a manner prescribed by the mining laws of the United States upon lands of the character described in section 1 of this act, prior to May 25, 1955, if based upon a discovery of valuable source material contained in lignite shall be effective to the same extent as if such lands at the time of location, and at all times thereafter, had not been classified as or known to be valuable for coal subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, subject, however, to the provisions of section 1 hereof: *Provided,* That no extralateral rights shall attach to any mining location validated under this section: *And provided further,* That the locator or locators of such a mining claim shall, not later than 180 days from and after the date of this act, post on the claim and file for record in the office where the notice or certificate of location is of record, an amended notice of the mining location stating that such amended notice is filed pursuant to the provisions of this act and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits thereof; and that a copy of said amended notice is, within the said 180-day period, filed in the land office of the Bureau of Land Management for the State in which the mining location is situated, and the mining locator thereafter complied with the requirements of this act.

"SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act, any mining location made under the mining laws of the United States, including the act of August 13, 1954, on lands of the character described in section 1 of this act, except locations made for lands within the exterior boundaries of a prior coal prospecting permit or lease, if based upon a discovery of valuable source material in deposits other than deposits of Leasing Act minerals, shall include the right to mine, remove, and dispose of lignite containing valuable source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of source material contained in lignite, subject to the reporting and payment requirements of section 1 of this act, and subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 919), and upon filing in the land office designated in section 1 hereof, an adequate description of his claim or claims containing such lignite: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict the rights acquired by virtue of a mining claim heretofore or hereafter located, under the 1872 Mining Act, as amended, or to impose any additional obligation with respect to the mining and removal of source material which does not occur within any seam, bed, or deposit of lignite.

"SEC. 4. The entryman or owner of any land or the assignee of rights therein, including lands granted to States, with respect to which the coal deposits have been reserved to the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 844), or the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. 583), excepting lands embraced within a coal prospecting permit or lease, upon the discovery of valuable source material in lignite situated within such entered, granted, or patented lands, who, except for the reservation of coal to the United States would have the right to mine and remove such material, shall have the exclusive right to mine, remove, and dispose of lignite containing such source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of such material, subject to the reporting and payment requirements of section 1 of this act, and subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, upon filing in the land office designated in section 1 hereof, an adequate description sufficient to identify the land containing such lignite.

"SEC. 5. The holders of coal leases issued under the provision of the mineral leasing laws, including the act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913), prior to the date of this act, or thereafter if based upon a prospecting permit issued prior to that date, upon the discovery during the term of such lease of valuable source material in any bed or deposit of lignite situated within the leased lands, shall have the exclusive right to locate such source material under the provisions of this act but the mining and disposal of such source material shall be subject to the operating provisions of the lease and to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall not apply to coal prospecting permits or leases on lands embraced within entered, granted or patented lands described in section 4 of this act.

"SEC. 6. As used in this act 'mineral leasing laws' shall mean the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741); the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437); the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301); the act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057); and all acts heretofore or hereinafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing acts; 'Leasing Act minerals' shall mean all minerals which, upon the effective date of this act, are provided in the mineral leasing laws to be disposed of thereunder; 'lignite' shall mean coal classified as ASTM designation: D 388–38, according to the standards established in the American Society for Testing Materials on Coal and Coke under standard specifications for Classification of Coals by Rank, contained in public-land deposits considered as valuable under the coal-land classification standards established by the Secretary of the Interior and prescribed in section 30, Code of Federal Regulations, part 201; and 'source material' shall mean uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Atomic Enery Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 61 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to be source material.

"SEC. 7. All moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and distributed in the same manner as provided in section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and section 9 of the Alaska Coal Leasing Act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741).

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend or repeal any provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), or any right granted thereunder.

"SEC. 10. Twenty years after the effective date of this act, all lands subject to the provisions of section 1 shall be withdrawn from all forms of entry under this act. All claims made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall expire at that time, except for (1) claims for which patent has already been issued, and (2) claims on which application for patent has already been made and on which patent is subsequently issued: *Provided*, That, if the President shall so provide by Executive order, the provisions of this section shall not become effective until 30 years after the effective date of this act."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 302) to provide for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in carrying out its duties during the 84th Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I was just going to ask the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the House Administration Committee, if he would explain to the House that this is authorized by a previous resolution.

Mr. BURLESON. That is true; this is authorized by a previous resolution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Committee on Ways and Means have justified their budget. It is not a very large amount.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman may have in mind another request by the Committee on Ways and Means which is for an investigation. That resolution has not cleared the Committee on House Administration but will be offered by unanimous request on a resolution offered Saturday of last week by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is the one I had in mind; that was cleared?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 305) providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 304, 84th Congress, from the Committee on House Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 304, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 299) providing further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 114 of the 84th Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the problems of small business, not to exceed $35,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sum heretofore made available for conducting such study and investigation, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, is this not the Small Business Committee resolution?

Mr. BURLESON. It is.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. Also, I serve notice that the resolution is going to be fought.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 142]

Andrews	Bell	Celler
Anfuso	Buchanan	Chiperfield
Bass, N. H.	Burdick	Christopher
Clevenger	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Dawson, Ill.	Keating	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dies	Kilburn	Riehlman
Diggs	Krueger	Robsion, Ky.
Dingell	McConnell	Sheehan
Dolliver, Iowa	McGregor	Short
Eberharter	Macdonald	Shuford
Feighan	Mason	Sieminski
Fenton	Morano	Siler
Frazier	Mumma	Sisk
Gamble	Nelson	Smith, Kans.
Gathings	Norblad	Taylor
Gray	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Green, Pa.	Passman	Tuck
Gregory	Pelly	Velde
Gwinn	Phillips	Vursell
Hillings	Powell	Watts
Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty	Williams, Miss.
Hope	Quigley	Winstead
James	Radwan	Younger
Jensen	Reece, Tenn.	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to say, in the first instance, that no one has more actively supported the Small Business Committee than I have. Back in 1938, before we ever had an official Small Business Committee, I appointed a Republican unofficial committee. It is in that spirit that I rise to ask the gentleman from Texas as to the need for this additional money.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 of this year, the Committee on House Administration authorized the sum of $135,000 for the Small Business Committee for the current year. Their request was for $150,000. It seems now that with the activity of 5 subcommittees of the Small Business Committee they feel they will need $35,000 additional for the current year. They came before the subcommittee with a budget, and the subcommittee concluded that the request was reasonable, that it was needed, and the full committee reported out the bill. I understand the committee is taking on some investigations that perhaps were not clearly contemplated at the beginning of the year. I am sure that the author, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], would be able to explain in considerable detail if the gentleman would care to hear him.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman kindly tell me how many were on the staff last year and how many are on the staff this year?

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think the staff is about the same size. It is possible that it is a little larger, because we are more active than we were last year. We have 5 subcommittees this year, and they have all been working very hard. And, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the committee is almost equally divided, unlike standing

committees of the House, where the party in power has more members than the minority party. This committee is divided 6 and 5. So, we have always gotten along together in a nonpartisan way, anyway.

Mr. MARTIN. I have just been informed that last year there were 8 members on the staff.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not surprised, because we were not very active last year.

Mr. MARTIN. And this year you have 15.

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have about 17 including all clerical help. But they are all needed, and they fill a need.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the committee function as a nonpartisan body?

Mr. PATMAN. It has been all the time. You see, the reason—and the gentleman from Massachusetts brought it out awhile ago, at first the Republicans had their own committee and they were holding hearings all over the country, and it looked a little partisan. So we agreed we should have more of a bipartisan approach.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman call it a nonpartisan approach when out of 17 investigators and employees there is just 1 Republican employed. Is that nonpartisan?

Mr. PATMAN. The administration in power appoints the staff members, just like last year we did not have a Democrat, either. They were all Republicans. We expect that, because it is not a standing committee. It is a select committee.

Now may I finish about the creation of the committee? The committee was created one week before Pearl Harbor in 1941. The committee was created by reason of a resolution which I introduced and which was passed 1 week before Pearl Harbor, in 1941. The committee has been in existence ever since. We have worked together faithfully and well. Our committee has spent less than the average committee of this House. It spends much less than the comparable committee of the other body. We have been very saving. We have not been extravagant. I do not believe any of the expenditures we have made can be criticized and we are going to be just as careful in the future as we have been in the past about the expenditure of funds.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I would like to say that when we took over the committee, when I was chairman of the committee, we kept four members of the original staff. We did not dismiss them. We did not ask whether they were Democrats or Republicans. Those members of the staff were there when we turned the committee over to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. They are not on the staff now.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, as the ranking member of the subcommittee, that I have sat on the Committee on House Administration for 6 of the last 7 years. I have fought every year to give the Committee on Small Business what they asked for and what they thought they needed. But I must take issue with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] when he says that it has had less money than any other committee, because I think, if you will examine the figures, you will find that it is right at the top of the list as far as expenditures are concerned.

Certainly, this year, I voted reluctantly I might say for the authorization of money. And if the figures that I have at my fingertips now and that I had in the subcommittee are correct, I would not have voted for this amount $35,000, because this committee has a balance of $87,000, or did the other day. I am rather reluctant to give them any more money and unless they make out a better justification when they come in the first of the year, I shall not vote to give them any more money.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer that?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the figure of $87,000, but I am sure it is not that amount. Besides, there are a lot of bills not paid. One of the largest of the bills is that for reporting services. I think hardly any of those bills have been paid. Other expenses have not been paid. We have projected our work very carefully. This is not an extravagant program. It is one that every Member of this House would approve. We presented it to the Committee on House Administration and they agreed that we needed the full amount. The sum requested is a modest sum, only $35,000. Also, it is so small in comparison with other committees, particularly those of the other body, that I did not think there would be any objection at all. And if we do not need the money, we will not spend it.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman says that it is a modest sum. He realizes that it is in addition to what the committee already has given for one year's functions.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct. We asked for more in the beginning. Let us remember that Congress is not supposed to be in session any more until January. I do not believe the House wants the committee to run out of funds and be unable to carry on the work that I believe every Member of this House will agree should be carried on to help the small concerns of this country.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I am very sorry I have not had time to check with the Committee on Armed Services to ascertain how many employees there are on the professional staff of that committee. I should like to make this guess, however, that the Small Business Committee has more employees on its staff than we have on the staff of the Committee on Armed Services, which has a tremendous and outstandingly important job to do. On top of that I am informed that they have only two professional members on the staff for the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is a member, and 4 assistants—a total of 6 in all. Here we are being requested for additional money which it seems to me is absolutely uncalled for. If the committee would confine itself to the activities which it has carried on in the past, it would not need this additional money now. It appears to me to be a complete waste of unneeded money. We should not approve this additional appropriation at this time.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman talks about confining our activities to those in the past. I know that you cannot help the small-business concerns of America without occasionally stepping on the little toe of a big man. In the last 2 or 3 weeks we have stepped on the toes of some pretty big people in this country and they do not like it. They are running to Members of Congress trying to get us to stop—the big fellows, not the little ones—and to take the side against the little man. We have stepped on the toes of a couple of the big men. I do not think the Members want us to stop that. We cannot help it. You cannot help the little people without displeasing some of the big ones. If you want us never to do anything displeasing to the big man, then we cannot do anything for the little man. We are going to be fair to the big man. We are not going to do anything wrong. We are going to be absolutely fair, but you just necessarily step on some toes.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the Reorganization law limit you to 10 members on the staff?

Mr. PATMAN. Not to my knowledge. Of course, we have always had it that the party in power would select the staff. When the Republicans are in power they select the staff. When the Democrats are in power they select the staff. That is the way we have done it over 14 years of experience. That question should not come in here because of the tradition.

Mr. MARTIN. It is a tradition, of course, that any committee should obey the rules.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman may be assured the rules are obeyed.

Mr. MARTIN. The Small Business Committee several years ago was made a permanent committee of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. No; it has not been made a permanent committee. It is a select committee every Congress. If it were a standing committee the gentleman would probably be correct. I do not know. But it is not a standing committee.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I want to make a statement and ask if the chairman of the House Committee on Administration

will agree with me. The committee looked rather carefully at this request from the Small Business Committee and it was with some reluctance that the subcommittee approved the request and it was with same reluctance that the whole committee voted to report it to the House favorably. It was done finally on the basis of the fact that the members of the Small Business Committee unanimously asked for this appropriation.

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There is no division in the Small Business Committee as to the need for this $35,000.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct. There was a difference of opinion as to the need and as to their activities. There was considerable discussion, but finally it was voted out unanimously, as the gentleman says.

Mr. MARTIN. Can you not get along with what money you have until January?

Mr. PATMAN. No; we cannot. We would like to do it. We tried to do it. I assure the gentleman that if we are asking for too much money it will not be spent, because no Member of this House has ever criticized me for the expenditure of public funds and I am not going to give them an opportunity to do so.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wonder if the chairman of the Small Business Committee could advise the House as to the anticipated activities of that committee during the recess period.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was in the conference where we discussed that, or maybe he was absent. If he was absent, he was the only one. We discussed that recently.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I was present, but I want to know what the anticipated activities will be.

Mr. PATMAN. What we do we are going to do with the consent of a majority of all the members of the committee. For instance, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] has a subcommittee of three members. He is going into the regulatory agencies about the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Next is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] who has to do with the Small Business Administration. This committee earns what the money is appropriated for just on that one score alone, to make sure that the Small Business Administration is doing the proper thing in getting procurement for the small concerns and making loans to small concerns.

Next is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. He is going into the aluminum situation. There were 100 fabricators, representing thousands of people, that were refused supplies. Their supplies were entirely cut off. They have been almost out of business. The Members of this House do not want that to happen. In going into that and making these big three aluminum manufacturers agree to furnish the raw materials to the fabricators as they had done in the past, it was necessary to step on the toes of those big fellows just a little bit. They came screaming to high heaven to Members of Congress, "Stop this Small Business Committee, they are getting on us." They ought not to do that. In addition to that, the rubber companies have to be watched. They have promised to let the little rubber people, the fabricators, have rubber at reasonable prices. Will they do it? We do not know. That is one of the things we are going to have to oversee. If we do not have this money, we will not be able to do that work.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, this money is required so that the activities which the gentleman from Texas has outlined can be carried on during the recess period; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, and also to look into every problem that any Member refers to us. We diligently take care of every problem that is referred to this committee, and we make sure that a Member's constituents get a square deal.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman assure the House that as the subcommittees of your committee go out to carry out these field activities that there will be minority representation both as regards Members on this side of the aisle as well as a Member of the minority staff present at all of these hearings?

Mr. PATMAN. We agreed to that the other day.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I believe the Members of the House ought to have that assurance.

Mr. PATMAN. That is fine.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am a junior minority member of the committee in question. At the very outset, I wish to tell the House that I do not wish to condemn or damn the committee with faint praise because in the past it has done remarkably good work in the interest of small business everywhere. However, I hope that this record will continue as it has in the past, and that the work of the committee in the future will not be dictated in the slightest degree by resentment, revenge, or partisan political considerations, and that there will not be a duplication of the work that has been carried on traditionally by the Committee on the Judiciary. I also hope that this committee in the future will advise both the majority and minority Members with reference to the fields which they are going to go into to explore and investigate in advance of the beginning of such explorations and investigations so that we will be fully informed and so that we will be able to write a record in accordance with the facts on both sides.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to be able to assure the gentleman that that will most certainly be done. The very fact that I was willing to agree to a 6-to-5 ratio, I think is evidence of the fact that I always get along with the minority. That ratio is all right with me.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other subcommittees which I did not mention, and which I must mention. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] has the Aircraft Industries Subcommittee. He is going to get started soon on that. It is going to require field hearings which they have not been able to conduct yet.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has a Subcommittee on Leases and Franchises. The big oil companies have an interest in this thing. They have filling stations all over the country. They lease them to the little fellow. A lot of them are Korean war veterans. They borrowed all the money that they could borrow to set themselves up in business. We find there is a 30-percent turnover in the holders of these lease arrangements with the big oil companies' filling stations. It is a disgraceful situation. It is understood that an investigation is needed. The gentleman from California's committee with the minority members have done a wonderful job. I believe they have come up with legislation which will give these little fellows their day in court, when before they had no place to turn to even present their grievances.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] has made reference to something which I think is a matter of concern. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] referred to the matters which his committee expected to investigate during the summer, and he referred specifically to antitrust investigations and even more specifically to aluminum. I wonder if the gentleman is aware that for many weeks past, and continuing into the future, the standing committee of the Committee on the Judiciary is going to investigate and has been investigating the very matters the gentleman has referred to. The standing committee of the Committee on the Judiciary has called up a great many witnesses and will endeavor to call more witnesses from the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and other witnesses as well. I wonder if the gentleman's proposal is not a further duplication if every committee, standing and select, in the House and in the other body is going to busy themselves investigating the same things? How will the Department of Commerce and its section devoted to small-business matters be able to do anything to help the small-business man, if they are going to spend all of their time repeating themselves before the numerous committees of both bodies on the Hill?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has asked a fair question and I am glad to inform the House that we think we have a good answer to that question. There is no duplication. I often talk with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and he talks with me. We call each other on the telephone. We have never had any duplication in the past and, I assure the gentleman, we are not going to have any duplication in the future.

Mr. SCOTT. I appreciate the gentlemans' answer, but is it not a fact that the gentleman will call certain witnesses from the Department of Commerce, for

instance, to come up to the Hill to testify?

Mr. PATMAN. Not on the same point.

Mr. SCOTT. Will they not return to testify on monopoly power, antitrust? Have we not investigated the aluminum matter in the Committee on the Judiciary? What does the gentleman have in mind? Is he not satisfied with the conduct of the standing committees?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no objection from the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. The staff of his committee works with the staff of our committee. We have never had the slightest duplication. I assure the gentleman we will not have any duplication in the future, because I am just as opposed to it as is the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. When the gentleman speaks of aluminum——

Mr. PATMAN. I know. Aluminum covers a lot of things. We just went into the fabrication part of the aluminum question—where the little fellows were being squeezed out because they could not get raw material.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to correct the gentleman. That is one of the very items which the Committee on the Judiciary is investigating. It is investigating the actions of the four main producers of aluminum. It affects it as the impact on the fabricators and processors and those who supply the basic products.

Mr. PATMAN. We were specifically investigating that one point, about a hundred fabricators being squeezed out. It is written into the resolution that was passed that we could not duplicate the activities of the other committees. We cannot undertake something that is being investigated by another committee. Therefore, if we are examining about that, if it is brought to our attention we would cease and desist, because we have plenty to do. We are not going to duplicate the individual committee's work. We have too many things to do like considering requests by individual Members of this Congress who have serious questions to consider.

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

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not about time that we put the brakes on this investigation business? There are so many of them that it is getting to be more investigation than attending to the business of the House. I think we ought to attend to our business and get it done, and not have so many of these special investigation set-ups.

Mr. BURLESON. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that this is not an authorizing resolution. It provides funds, as do other money bills from the House Administration Committee, based on an authorizing resolution approved by the Rules Committee and this House. I would suggest that the time for opposition to these investigative resolutions be made at that time. The House Administration Committee does not pass on the merits of the investigative resolution but only determines what amount of money is required for such investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 134, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—231

Abbitt	Fulton	Morgan
Abernethy	Garmatz	Morrison
Adair	Gary	Moss
Addonizio	Gathings	Moulder
Albert	Granahan	Multer
Alexander	Grant	Murray, Ill.
Ashley	Gray	Murray, Tenn.
Ashmore	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Aspinall	Griffiths	Norrell
Bailey	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Hagen	O'Hara, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Haley	O'Konski
Baumhart	Harden	O'Neill
Beamer	Hardy	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	Perkins
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Pfost
Blitch	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Boggs	Hays, Ohio	Pilcher
Boland	Hayworth	Poage
Bolling	Hébert	Polk
Bonner	Henderson	Preston
Bowler	Herlong	Price
Boykin	Hill	Priest
Boyle	Hoffman, Mich.	Quigley
Bray	Holifield	Rabaut
Brooks, La.	Holmes	Rains
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Ray
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Reuss
Brownson	Hull	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Ikard	Richards
Burnside	Jarman	Riley
Byrd	Jennings	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Jensen	Roberts
Cannon	Johansen	Robeson, Va.
Carnahan	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Chudoff	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Mass.
Clark	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Tex.
Colmer	Judd	Rooney
Cooley	Karsten	Roosevelt
Cooper	Kee	Rutherford
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Saylor
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Davidson	Keogh	Selden
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Kilgore	Sheppard
Deane	King, Calif.	Sikes
Delaney	Kirwan	Sisk
Dempsey	Klein	Smith, Miss.
Denton	Kluczynski	Spence
Dollinger	Knutson	Staggers
Donohue	Landrum	Steed
Donovan	Lane	Sullivan
Dorn, N. Y.	Lanham	Teague, Tex.
Dorn, S. C.	Lankford	Thomas
Dowdy	LeCompte	Thompson, La.
Doyle	Lesinski	Thompson, N. J.
Durham	Long	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	McCarthy	Thornberry
Elliott	McCormack	Trimble
Engle	McCulloch	Tumulty
Evins	McDowell	Udall
Fallon	McVey	Vanik
Fascell	Machrowicz	Vinson
Feighan	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Fernandez	Madden	Whitten
Fine	Magnuson	Wickersham
Fino	Mahon	Wier
Fisher	Mailliard	Williams, Miss.
Flood	Marshall	Williams, N. J.
Flynt	Matthews	Willis
Fogarty	Metcalf	Wilson, Ind.
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Withrow
Forrester	Mills	Wright
Fountain	Mollohan	Yates
Friedel	Morano	Zablocki

NAYS—134

Alger	Baker	Bolton, Oliver P.
Allen, Calif.	Baldwin	Bosch
Allen, Ill.	Bates	Bow
Andersen, H. Carl	Becker	Brown, Ohio
Andresen, August H.	Belcher	Broyhill
Arends	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Auchincloss	Bentley	Bush
Avery	Berry	Byrnes, Wis.
Ayres	Betts	Canfield
	Bolton, Frances P.	Carlyle
Carrigg	Holt	Rees, Kans.
Cederberg	Hope	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chase	Horan	Sadlak
Chenoweth	Hosmer	St. George
Church	Hyde	Schenck
Cole	Jackson	Scherer
Coon	Jenkins	Schwengel
Cramer	Jones, N. C.	Scott
Cretella	Kean	Scudder
Crumpacker	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	Keating	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mass.	King, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Curtis, Mo.	Knox	Springer
Dague	Laird	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Lipscomb	Talle
Dawson, Utah	Lovre	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	McDonough	Thompson, Mich.
Devereux	McIntire	Thomson, Wyo.
Dixon	McMillan	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.	Utt
Fjare	Martin	Van Pelt
Ford	Meader	Van Zandt
Frelinghuysen	Merrow	Vorys
Gavin	Miller, Md.	Weaver
Gentry	Miller, Nebr.	Westland
George	Miller, N. Y.	Wharton
Gubser	Minshall	Widnall
Hale	Nicholson	Wigglesworth
Hand	O'Hara, Minn.	Williams, N. Y.
Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers	Wilson, Calif.
Harvey	Ostertag	Wolcott
Heselton	Patterson	Wolverton
Hess	Pillion	Young
Hiestand	Poff	
Hinshaw	Prouty	
Hoeven	Reed, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—69

Andrews	Gordon	Powell
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Radwan
Barden	Gregory	Reece, Tenn.
Bass, N. H.	Gwinn	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Halleck	Riehlman
Buchanan	Hillings	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Burdick	James	Sheehan
Chatham	Kearney	Short
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Shuford
Christopher	Krueger	Sieminski
Clevenger	Latham	Siler
Dawson, Ill.	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Dies	McGregor	Smith, Va.
Diggs	Macdonald	Taylor
Dingell	Mason	Tuck
Dodd	Mumma	Velde
Dolliver	Nelson	Vursell
Dondero	Norblad	Wainwright
Eberharter	O'Brien, N. Y.	Watts
Fenton	Passman	Winstead
Frazier	Pelly	Younger
Gamble	Phillips	Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mrs. Buchanan for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Krueger against.

Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Siler against.

Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Christopher for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Velde against.

Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Mason against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Gamble.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bills H. R. 7746 and H. R. 7747 be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 332.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 331, 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OUR CAPITOL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No.13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol," of which 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 200,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 307) authorizing the printing of the report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration as a House document, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the report to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (S. J. Res. 73) to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the American people feel a deep debt of gratitude to Franklin Delano Roosevelt for his leadership in America's struggle for peace, well-being, and human dignity: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the city of Washington, D. C., or in its immediate environs. The Commission shall be composed of 12 Commissioners appointed as follows: 4 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 4 Senators by the President of the Senate, and 4 Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission. The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7746) to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Cannon Foundation which was created on November 17, 1950, by a trust instrument executed by Clarence Cannon and Ida W. Cannon, of Elsberry, Mo., the principal office of which is at Elsberry, Mo., and the management and property of which is vested in and under the direction and control of a board of trustees consisting of the mayor of said city, the superintendent of schools, and others, and the beneficiaries of which consist of five churches situated in said city, and other beneficiaries, shall be deemed to be an organization (a) exempt from tax under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and (b) to which section 3813 (a) of the 1939 code and section 503 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is inapplicable.

SEC. 2. Contributions to the Cannon Foundation, referred to in section 1, shall be considered charitable contributions for purposes of section 23 (o) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 3. Sections 1 and 2 shall be effective for the taxable years beginning after 1949.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 463) to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I simply want to call attention to the fact that this is a changing of policy which has existed for 20 years. In the past, it has been the policy that the Government will not go into the business of manufacturing medals. There are many private concerns engaged in this work and they are unable to meet

Government competition. In view of the fact that such a bill was passed last week, I will not object to this bill. However, we should give consideration to how far we want the Government to continue in the medal business.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin occurring on January 17, 1956, and in connection with the observance and celebration of that event, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to have struck 71 bronze medals of an appropriate design and inscription and to provide for the presentation of 21 such medals to the following-named scientific, educational and welfare societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member: the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia), Philadelphia Society of the Sons of St. George, Accademia di Scienze, Lettre et Arti in Padors (formerly Reale Accademia) (Italy), L'Académie des Sciences, L'Institute de France (formerly Académie Royale), the Royal Society (England), Königliche Geselschaft der Wissenschafter, Gottingen (Germany), the Royal Society of Arts (England), Bataafsch Genootschap der Proefondervindelijke Wijsbegeerte (Netherlands), the Académie de Medicine (France), the Medical Society of London, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Boston), the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Real Academia de la Historia (Spain), Académie Nationale des Sciences, Belle-Lettres et Arts de Lyon (France), Real Accademia delle Science di Torino (Italy), the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society (England), the Societa Patrioca diretta all'avanzamento dell'Agricultura delle Arti e delle Manifatture, Milano (Italy), the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture, the Society of Antiquaries of London, the Société d'Agriculture, Sciences, Belle Lettres et Arts, Orleans (formerly Société Royale) France, and the Library Company of Philadelphia, and for the presentation of 50 medals in cooperation with the 250th anniversary committee of the Franklin Institute to other enterprises, institutions and societies founded or helped in their early development by Benjamin Franklin.

SEC. 2. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2604) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by striking out "$10,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,000,000,000."

SEC. 2. Section 4 (1) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (62 Stat. 1070), as amended, is amended by striking out "$10,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,000,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation and authorize an increase in its borrowing power of $2 billion. We all know that the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized to stabilize the agricultural industry. The support-price program upon which agriculture has depended for a long time would be discontinued unless we give the authority authorized in the bill to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Agriculture is our great basic industry. Not only the farmers will benefit from this, but the cities will benefit as well. If the farming industry is imperiled in any way, the disaster would not only affect them, but affect all of our people including the great centers of population which are the great markets for agricultural products.

I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that we in the Congress have authorized support programs for agricultural commodities. This bill is necessary to effectuate the congressional policy in that respect, which has been of long standing.

It is also expected that, although we have been called upon to continue this borrowing authority for some years, it soon will not be necessary. Last year, you will recall, we increased it from eight and one-half to ten billion, and we were given certain assurances that if the flexible program of the administration was put into operation, then probably there would be no necessity for increasing the authorization further. We have the same reasonable assurance now that the flexible program will shortly be in effect and that there will be no necessity—and we hope this is correct—to continue the authorization beyond this $12 billion figure.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY].

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not frequently take the floor of this House, but we have a problem in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation about which I should like to speak briefly.

In the hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency a few days ago, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation was asked this question by me, and I should like you to hear his answer:

The amount of loss and gains on certain crops.

He said, "On wheat the loss was $279 million. On corn, $221 million; on cotton there was a gain of $126 million. On tobacco a gain of $619,000. Peanuts, a loss of $118 million."

One year ago the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before our committee and asked for an increased authorization from $8½ billion to $10 billion. He said that money was necessary in order to carry out the acts of Congress in connection with the crop for that particular year.

Our committee agreed to this call for an authorization of $10 billion. This year the president of CCC has asked for an additional loan authority in the amount of $2 billion. That makes $12 billion altogether.

We have a problem here which I think the Congress in some way will have to find a solution for. We have storage wheat to the extent of 951 million bushels; corn, 576 million bushels. It is evident that the program we have followed in the past is not the solution to this problem because our surpluses and our losses grow larger and larger. Certain solutions have been presented to us. One was the disposition of our surplus crops on the world market. I do not think we understand just what would be the result of an operation of this kind, but I think the question is worth exploring. It seems to me that if we go on year after year piling up bushel after bushel of our crops we are going to get into a very difficult situation in this country. To be given authority to lend $12 billion is a very great authority and involves a large sum of money.

The 90-percent parity program is not the solution because most of these crops have been accumulated under the 90-percent parity formula. Whether flexible price will prove to be the solution only time can tell, but I want to impress upon the Members of the House that there is a very serious problem here, and it is our duty in some way to try to solve it.

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

Mr. MCVEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the same apply to the purchase of butter and dairy surpluses?

Mr. MCVEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But I understand the dairy problem is or soon will be pretty well cleaned up, that they will soon have no surplus.

When they sell these surpluses, does the money received go into the Treasury to reduce those loans or does it remain there in the eight and one-half, nine, or ten billion dollar amount allowed them for making loans on these crops?

Mr. MCVEY. I do not know that I can answer the question. I think the chairman or ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee would have to do that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand there has been $1,200,000,000 of surplus agricultural products sold last year. Was that $1,200,000,000 reflected in the reduced amount that we will have to put into this program? Or does it go back into the Treasury?

Mr. MCVEY. I wish that gentleman would ask that question of the chairman or ranking minority member of our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. These surplus commodities have been sold. As I understand there has been $1,200,000,000 of surplus agricultural commodities sold.

I would like to find out whether this money goes back into the Treasury or whether it is reflected in reducing the $10 billion or $12 billion authority for loans. Is this a revolving fund or what is it?

Mr. McVEY. I cannot answer the gentleman's question with certainty. As I recall the law provides that there shall be outstanding no more than a certain amount of loans at any one time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then why should we increase from $8.5 million to $10 billion the amount of the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation if we have sold around $2 billion of surplus products? Instead of increasing the borrowing authority why should this return from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities not be reflected in a lessened demand for authority?

Mr. McVEY. I understand it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the action on the bill presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the ranking minority Member what was the loss on dairy products during the past year. Can the gentleman give me those figures?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not have them before me. I believe the chairman has.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the chairman tell us approximately what was the loss on dairy products which were sold during the past year?

Mr. SPENCE. We will endeavor to find it for the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The same gentleman who had the breakdown on profits on cotton is going to be able to give the gentleman an answer to that.

Mr. SPENCE. It is being looked up right now.

Mr. GAVIN. While you are looking up the matter of loss on dairy products I might say I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, that if $1,200,000,000 worth of surplus products were sold this year, why if this money is returned to the Corporation, is it necessary to increase the borrowing capacity by $2 billion? Why could that money not be used rather than this request for an additional $2 billion at this time? It would also be practicable if the committee would develop a plan whereby they would bring in companion tax bills to pay for the losses sustained in sale of these agricultural products. In the highway legislation presented the other day everybody was concerned that the legislation should be on a pay-as-you-go basis. One way to stop these agricultural losses is to bring in a companion tax bill when the legislation is presented to tax the people to pay for the losses sustained. No one would be voting for this $2 billion increase that we are passing here in a few minutes debate today, if there was also a $2 billion tax bill to pay for the losses.

May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency whether his committee has ever considered bringing in companion tax bills on matters of this kind?

Mr. SPENCE. We have no jurisdiction over tax matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the passage of this bill because of the representations made to us by the Department of Agriculture that without this additional authority the price-support program will collapse.

I do not intend to permit the Republican administration to say that this Democratic Congress was responsible for any such happening.

I must, however, take this time to sound this warning.

In my opinion, the Department of Agriculture, under Secretary Benson, is doing its very best to destroy the price-support program, and this is another step in that direction.

Secretary Benson's representatives in charge of the Commodity Credit Corporation's program told our committee that the Corporation now has a deficit in excess of $2 billion.

Under existing law, capital depletions can be made up by new appropriations, providing the Department makes out a case therefor before the Appropriations Committee.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Mr. WHITTEN, attended before our committee during the course of the hearings on this bill and told us that the Department made no request for additional funds to make up any part of this loss and made no attempt to justify any part of the capital impairment of the authorization.

During all of the years that a Democratic administration was in charge of this program, the maximum authorization was $6,750,000,000. During the 20 years of Democratic administration the total loss to the program was slightly in excess of $1 billion.

In one-tenth of that time, during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, the losses are almost one and a half billion dollars.

This is indeed a program that only a Republican administration can boast about.

I am pleased to call our colleagues' attention to the following article, written by our distinguished colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, a real dirt farmer. The figures he sets forth in his article were obtained from Secretary Benson's own department and show the mismanagement of this program by the Republicans. The article appears in the August 1955 edition of the Democratic Digest.

BENSON SETS A RECORD—GOP "TWENTY-TUPLES" FARM PRICE-SUPPORT LOSSES

(By Representative FRED MARSHALL)

Sometimes figures speak for themselves, so I asked the Department of Agriculture for the official figures on net losses from the price-support program since its beginning in 1933 up through the past 2 years of Republican management of the program.

They showed just the opposite of what Secretary Ezra Benson and the President have been saying about the costs of the program. They show that net losses under the price-support program during the 20 years of Democratic administrations amounted to a little more than $1 billion, while losses during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration will amount to well over $1.4 billion. Losses during the Republican year of 1954, alone, will amount to more than half of the total losses for 20 Democratic years, and losses this year are officially estimated to be even larger.

Here are cost figures which President Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture supplied me officially, covering the 20 Democratic years ending June 30, 1953, and for the first two Republican years ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955 (the 1955 figures are official estimates):

The basic commodities (corn, cotton, wheat, peanuts, rice, and tobacco):

20 years	$20,720,931
1954	177,385,983
1955	225,578,209

Dairy products (dried milk, fluid milk, cheese, and butter):

20 years	$136,524,896
1954	130,713,531
1955	342,549,370

Feed grains (barley, oats, and rye):

20 years	$11,600,481
1954	6,302,088
1955	36,275,000

Total price support programs:

20 Democrat years	$1,049,994,726
2 GOP years	1,448,405,610

These clearly disprove the Republican charge that the Democratic farm program was excessively costly, but they also show serious evidence of bad management by the present administration. For instance, costs have been run up by shelving the farmer-elected committees which formerly did so much of the field work on these programs, but which have been replaced by new Federal employees. Several other changes by the administration have increased the cost of storage involved in the price-support program. Here is the Department's official estimate of the average cost of storing a bushel of grain in one of its facilities for each of the past 4 years:

	Cents per bushel
1951	6.6
1952	5.7
1953	6.0
1954	11.3

The contrast between the Democratic and Republican record is bad news for the taxpayers these days.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, giving my full support to H. R. 7541, a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $10 billion to $12 billion.

In view of the adverse financial condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from executive branch application of the sliding-scale farm philosophy, the Congress has no alternative at this time but to increase its borrowing power if the Government is to fulfill its price support commitments to farmers in the year ahead. I believe, however, that it is imperative that we keep the record straight as to what the true reasons are why the sliding-scale administrators had to come to Congress for $2 billion additional borrowing authority.

The administration assertion, in the letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture Morse to the Speaker of the House requesting this legislation, that increased borrowing authority is required because of 90 percent price supports in 1953 and 1954 and limited sliding scale in 1955 is inaccurate, untrue, and the Department of Agriculture has already published all the facts that would lead one to believe that Morse knows his statement to be untrue, that is unless we are to believe that he signed the July 1, 1955 Report of the Crop Reporting Board without reading it or knowing what is in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Morse is a trained economist and statistician and cannot be said to be stupid. Therefore the only conclusion that can be reached is that he has purposely tried to mislead the Banking and Currency Committee and the Congress in making the statement that the $2 billion increase in Commodity Credit Corporation borrowing authority is needed because of 90 percent price supports in effect in the past.

The Department of Agriculture complains about the increased production of feed crops. Secretary Benson, however, has had full authority to set price support levels at any level he wanted to on all the feed crops except corn. He has, in fact, exercised this authority and has flexed these prices downward drastically. The only crops he was prevented from flexing downward in 1953 and 1954 were wool, sugar, and the six basics—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Only these latter six, except tobacco, were on the limited sliding scale in 1955. The production of all these basic crops was drastically reduced from 1952 to 1955 by operation of acreage allotments and marketing quotas, contrary to the implication of Morse's letter to the Speaker. The other crops, the ones with the increased production of which Morse complains, have never had mandatory minimum price support levels set by law, nor have their producers been authorized to make use of marketing quotas as a means of keeping supply in line with demand. It was on these crops that Benson attempted to demonstrate the validity of his sliding scale theory; that reduced price supports rather than marketing quotas are the best way to reduce overproduction of farm commodities. The record shows clearly however that the Republican sliding scale theory of farm economics is fallacious. The increased production of feed grains from 1952 to 1955 demonstrates that lower price support levels do not prevent the production surpluses that Benson has shed so many crocodile tears over.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude my remarks by reading into the RECORD a chart which I have prepared based on official publications and reports from the United States Department of Agriculture:

Crops with 90 percent mandatory supports

Commodity	Support level				Estimated production		
	1952	Percent	1955	Percent	Unit of quantity	1952	1955
Wheat	$2.20	90	$2.06	82	Billion bushels	1.3	0.9
Corn	1.60	90	1.58	87	do	3.3	3.4
Cotton	.31	90	.31	----------	Million bales	15.1	11
Tobacco	----------	90	----------	90	Billion pounds	2.3	2.1
Rice	5.04	90	4.66	85	Million bags	49	47
Peanuts	.12	90	.12	----------	Billion pounds	1.4	1

Crops without mandatory minimum 90 percent supports

Commodity	Support level				Estimated production		
	1952	Percent	1955	Percent	Units of quantity	1952	1955
Milk	----------	90	----------	75	Billion pounds	98	107
Soybeans	$2.56	90	$2.04	70	Million bushels	292	404
Barley	1.22	80	.94	70	do	227	384
Oats	.78	80	.61	70	Billion bushels	1.3	1.5
Rye	1.42	80	1.18	70	Million bushels	15.9	27.2
Sorghum grain	2.38	80	1.78	70	do	83.3	(1)

[1] Up 96 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the figures which I have just read conclusively prove that the Eisenhower administration's theory that flexible price supports will reduce production is erroneous. The Democratic position has consistently been that marketing quotas are the most effective method of bringing about a proper balance between the supply and demand of agricultural products. These figures make it obvious that the Democratic position is 100 percent right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, all America is pleased at the heartwarming bipartisanship which characterized our participation in the summit conference at Geneva. From the very beginning, to the dramatic ending, all political factions worked and prayed with President Eisenhower on this diplomatic expedition into a friendly world.

The great acclamation accorded President Eisenhower's outstanding diplomacy, however, sounded a thunderous discord in the ears of one organization, the ADA.

This organization, through its Chairman, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., damned the Eisenhower accomplishments with faint praise, then viciously unleased one of the most blistering attacks ever directed at the President of our Nation.

The conglomeration of cutting cliches ranged from charges of corruption to accusing the President of wearing a suntan.

We are all aware that this recklessly radical organization which has lobbied vehemently for repeal of the Smith Act. The act which provides for prosecution of those who would overthrow our Government by force or violence—does not represent nor speak for the great Democratic Party. Many Members of the Congress who are responsible and respected Democrats have repudiated this "Americans for damning Americans" organization in no uncertain terms. They, too, have been damned by Mr. Rauh.

However, their bipartisan efforts directed toward strengthening our Nation and discovering a solution to the difficulties of international relations will live long in history after Mr. Rauh's rantings are properly forgotten.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1894) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "International Finance Corporation Act."

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Finance Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"), provided for by the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation deposited in the archives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AND ALTERNATES

SEC. 3. The governor and executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the alternate for each of them, appointed under section 3 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 286a), shall serve as governor, director, and alternates, respectively, of the Corporation.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 286b), shall apply with respect to the Corporation to the same extent as with respect to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Reports with respect to the Corporation under paragraphs 5 and 6 of subsection (b) of section 4 of said act, as amended, shall be included in the first report made thereunder after the establish-

ment of the Corporation and in each succeeding report.

CERTAIN ACTS NOT TO BE TAKEN WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock under article II, section 3, of the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation; (b) accept any amendment under article VII of the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation; (c) make any loan to the Corporation. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, no governor or alternate representing the United States shall vote for an increase of capital stock of the Corporation under article II, section 2 (c) (ii), of the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation.

DEPOSITORIES

SEC. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Corporation shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay the subscription of the United States to the Corporation and for this purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction not to exceed $35,168,000 of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that act are extended to include such purpose. Payment under this subsection of the subscription of the United States to the Corporation and any repayment thereof shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(b) Any payment of dividends made to the United States by the Corporation shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

SEC. 8. For the purpose of any action which may be brought within the United States or its Territories or possessions by or against the Corporation in accordance with the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation, the Corporation shall be deemed to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office in the United States is located, and any such action at law or in equity to which the Corporation shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Corporation is a defendant in any such action, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES

SEC. 9. The provisions of article V, section 5 (d), and article VI, sections 2 to 9, both inclusive, of the Articles of Agreement of the Corporation shall have full force and effect in the United States and its Territories and possessions upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the International Finance Corporation is an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It is provided that the nations who are now members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe to stock in the International Finance Corporation in the same proportion as they subscribed to stock in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The purpose of the bill is to have the nations jointly participate with private capital to make loans to develop undeveloped areas in order that they might be self-supporting. It is essential to the welfare of our country as it is to the world that the undeveloped areas be taught how to produce and that their people have higher standards of living. This bill would encourage private capital to engage in this undertaking. It would be risk capital. None of these loans would be guaranteed by the Government. It certainly is a very much better method than donations to these people.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that it carries out the purposes of point 4 of former President Truman. He had the same objectives. He may have approached it in a little different manner, but the ultimate purpose of this act is to carry out the purposes which he had in mind and the objectives which he desired to achieve.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we already had 4 or 5 technical-assistance programs in operation.

Mr. SPENCE. I think this is one program where technical assistance and where the know-how might be very essential and might produce very fine results. The world is growing smaller. There is an expanding world economy, and we are affected by the conditions of other nations however remote they might be. A spark could fall on a distant land through poverty and the despair of the people, and it ignites the world. We think this is the way to meet a condition by the investment of risk capital. It may result to the benefit of our people. It may cause our Government little expense. It may produce results which we have been trying to accomplish by donations of money without any hope of a return.

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

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Did I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to say that the United States Government is not underwriting any of these private loans?

Mr. SPENCE. I did not say the United States Government was not underwriting them, but private capital takes a risk when it participates in these loans. And, why should we not allow the private capital of America which is investing for profit, to help us in this undertaking? We only have a third interest in this enterprise. The capital will be $100 million, and we only subscribe to a little over $34 million. So, the other nations are engaged in it. It is a joint undertaking in which we will all have a common interest to achieve a purpose which is essential for all of us.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this a separate set-up from the International Bank, or is it part of the International Bank?

Mr. SPENCE. It is an affiliate of the International Bank. It is greatly desired by the administration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1955, the President sent a message to the Congress transmitting the proposed articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation and asked for the consideration of enabling legislation to permit the United States to participate in this subsidiary, as it were, of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In his letter of transmittal, the President brings out the purposes, saying it is intended to increase the flow of United States private investments abroad.

I want to quote directly from this letter of transmittal, as follows:

> Government funds cannot, and should not, be regarded as the basic sources of capital for international investment. The best means is investment by private individuals and enterprises. The major purpose of the new institution, consequently, will be to help channel private capital and experienced and competent private management into productive investment opportunities that would not otherwise be developed. Through the corporation we can cooperate more effectively with other people for mutual prosperity and expanding international trade, thus contributing to the peace and the solidarity of the free world.

The participation by the United States is in the same proportion as our participation in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and I introduced identical bills. I believe that instead of being a burden upon the Government, the passage of this bill would channel more capital into world trade, which will redound to the benefit of our own production without obligation on the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Under this bill, do we in anyway provide for indemnification for expropriation or nationalization?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, not in the least.

Mr. GROSS. What is the amount of money that the United States contributes to this fund?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The United States subscribes about one-third; $35 million in dollars and/or gold.

Mr. GROSS. Dollars or gold?

Mr. WOLCOTT. And/or gold. It is the same proportion we put in the International Bank. We put in about $3,700,000,000 of the total stock of about $10 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think with the billions we are already

spending in foreign countries that we are already doing more than our share?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are not spending any money under this except that we are raising money through subscriptions to the capital of $100 million by which may make it possible to get many times that in American trade back from other countries.

Mr. GROSS. That is, provided the economies of those countries hold up. But does not the gentleman think that the climate for investment in many of these countries is unfavorable?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It must be fairly good, because the danger today is inflation abroad.

Mr. GROSS. So long as we continue to support their economies through the various give-away programs, those economies, I suppose, will stand up. But if Congress some day restores financial sanity; in other words, cuts out the foreign give-away program, then what will happen to the economies of these countries?

Mr. WOLCOTT. This is not a give-away program. Through the adoption of this bill, it will make less necessary any further Treasury grants or loans to foreign countries to stabilize their economies. This should be of material aid in the stabilization of the economies of nations which might participate and make possible for them to buy more of our agricultural and industrial products.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

INTERNATIONAL RFC

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is really an International Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC for the United States was repealed and an agency was set up that has been absolutely worthless, the Small Business Administration. It has been a disgrace. It has caused the applicants who were unsuccessful to spend more money seeking loans than the aggregate amount the few fortunate ones received in loans. It is absolutely a disgrace.

It is rather ironical that we are called upon after defeating the RFC and burying it, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] said, in an unknown and unmarked grave, to come here and ask for an international RFC for foreign countries. It will help foreign countries, yes, and small business in foreign countries will be eligible for loans. The Secretary of the Treasury said the loans will probably be $5 to $10 million, small concerns, but the people in the United States will not be able to get hold of that money. They would not be eligible. There is no setup for the small man in the United States except the SBA that made loans aggregating $11.5 millions in 22 months out of $250 million provided by Congress. That is all the small-business men in this country have to look to.

WETBACKS IN REVERSE

I guess in Texas we would have to have wetbacks in reverse. I guess our businessmen would have to go over into Mexico. Mexico belongs to the World Bank, and being over in Mexico they could make application to this organization for a loan and they would be eligible. They will not be eligible in Texas. They will have to cross the Rio Grande in order to be eligible.

So I do not believe really we should do things like this unless we take care of small business, too. I am not objecting to this. I will go along with it, although it is the third organization we have for the big concerns and for the small concerns abroad only.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The Export-Import Bank has done a wonderful job throughout the years. Many of us on the committee thought that International Finance Corporation might take over some of the activities of the Export-Import Bank. Therefore, I offered an amendment to prevent this. However, in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury and other witnesses said they did not intend to do this, my amendment was placed in the report. It will be found on page 5, the last paragraph.

NEW SBA BILL

Mr. PATMAN. I am going to support this bill, but remember this: We want a good SBA bill. The House committee reported a good bill. It had the unanimous support of the 11 members of the Small Business Committee. We went into it for months. It has the unanimous support of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the only bill that will help small business in this country. The Senate bill is no good. It will just be a continuation of the disgrace we have today. We should not have it. It is only the House bill that is good.

There are three organizations. The World Bank will help big business and little business all over the world. Our money goes into it. It will not help anybody here in little business.

We have the Export-Import Bank. The Federal Government furnishes all the capital, and they can lend billions of dollars to little business and big business all over the world but none in the United States of America is being loaned.

Now we are creating this third great agency, the International Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that will make loans to big business and little business throughout the world. It will help foreign people. That is all right; I am for helping foreign people. But we also ought to help our own, everything being equal. But it will not only help big business and little business in foreign countries, it will help big business in the United States, but it will not help little business in the United States.

I am going along on this proposition to help business all over the world with United States money behind it. I insisted that we have a bill that has something in it that will help the smaller concerns in the United States of America. There is only one hope, and that hope is the bill that was introduced by the House Committee on Banking and Currency and that has the unanimous endorsement of that committee and the unanimous endorsement of the Small Business Committee. We are in opposition to the Senate bill because it is no good.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether any other law would be applicable to provide indemnification for losses sustained by investors abroad?

Mr. PATMAN. This is a big-business bill.

Mr. GROSS. I know.

Mr. PATMAN. You know what happens to big business. I am not opposed to helping big business, I am for big business, too, but I am against discriminating against little business at the same time.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman has recited the three international agencies. I think it is only fair to inform the House Members that in every instance the manufacturing on those loans is to be done by American manufacturers, and the products shipped abroad.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the Export-Import Bank, yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield briefly to the gentleman because you have time on your side.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman realizes that some of the loans which can be obtained under this will go to little business to put them into the export market.

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman's theory. They will get something, yes, but it will just be the crumbs, and that is all. The big man gets this. This is a big man's bill for big business. The little man will get the little crumbs, and very few little crumbs, or the crummy crumbs.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet answered my question: Would these loans be guaranteed by any other law?

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot answer the gentleman specifically on that. I do not think they are, but there are three international agencies sponsored by the money of the taxpayers of the United States Government, and that will help foreign countries both for big business and little business, and for big business in the United States, but not a cent for little business in the United States comes from these three big agencies.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. These loans are not guaranteed. They are not guaranteed by the foreign government. They are not guaranteed at all. Does the gentleman not think that the ultimate purpose of this bill is good to help the people to get a higher standard of living?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to page 15 of the hearings on this bill. On that page you will find, in one short paragraph, a simple and clear statement of the purpose and intent of the bill now under consideration. The Secretary of the Treasury made an excellent statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee with reference to the pending legislation. I call the attention of the House to that paragraph in the Secretary's statement which you will find on page 15, and which I will now read:

> The International Finance Corporation has been proposed as one way of encouraging new foreign private investment.

I read further:

> The International Finance Corporation is to serve as a catalyst in stimulating private investment.

I read further:

> It is not another type of government-to-government aid. Instead, by assisting private ventures on a business basis, the IFC will give concrete expression to the basic American conviction that economic development is best achieved through the growth of private enterprise.

That is the end of the paragraph and which I quoted from Secretary Humphrey's statement. I want to read to you now what I said about that paragraph during the hearing:

> I certainly would like to give my blessings to that statement, and if we do not follow a policy of that sort we will not encourage borrowers to stand on their own feet.

There is one more point which I want to emphasize. Members are invited to turn to page 26 of the hearings. It is pointed out there that the management of this new corporation will be identical with the management of the World Bank. In this connection, may I emphasize that the World Bank has made a profit during every year of its operation except the first one.

Inasmuch as some time was needed for organizing, for getting the bank established, and for getting operations started, no one expected it to make a profit the first year. During every year since the first year the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has made a profit. We are therefore assured of good management. Of course, all of us know that it is the quality of management more than anything else that means success or failure of a business institution.

This bill should be enacted into law.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am referring the attention of my colleagues to page 32 of the hearings of our committee on the pending bill and of the reply of the Secretary of the Treasury to my questioning in which he stated that it was his hope that this new instrumentality of the Federal Government, if authorized, would succeed to the point where it could successfully market its securities as has been the case with the International Bank.

If this bill is passed, as I expect, we will have three financial instrumentalities in the world field; namely, the Export-Import Bank, which is our own bank, and which has done a tremendous job; the International Bank in which a number of nations, ours included, participate; and this new corporation.

The International Bank has a right to market its debentures, which it has been doing on a rather large scale. Of course, most of the sales of such securities are made in this country.

The United States makes the largest contribution to the International Bank, much larger than any other nation. Then when its debentures are sold the actual contribution of the capital of our country is vastly increased in proportion to that of the other participating nations. This is because the great bulk of the debentures of the International Bank are sold in the United States.

As to the new financial corporation contemplated by this bill, I was interested in learning from the Secretary of the Treasury that it was contemplated that the same course would be followed here. That means that with the two international instrumentalities in this field, under international direction and control, and I am referring to the International Bank and the new proposed corporation, first, the largest contribution is made by the United States Government, and, second, further capital will come almost exclusively from private investors in the United States.

I am for this bill. I am for point 4 in all of its aspects and developments. I think it furnishes the only certain path to world peace. But I think I should point out here that extreme caution should be taken against unwarranted issues of debentures so that the investors of our country—who furnish the only real market for such issues—will not through an unexpected collapse in foreign economies suffer disastrous losses somewhat comparable to those in the late twenties, when we had large investments in Latin America, all of which investments went sour.

The Export-Import Bank is our own bank. It has proved a tremendous success. Our committee was very much concerned that this proposed new corporation should not develop into an instrumentality to undermine the Export-Import Bank. I think our committee would have adopted unanimously the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], unless the assurance was given that there was no such intention and that the sole purpose of this legislation is to make available in countries needing development the risk capital that can be furnished neither by the Export-Import Bank nor the International Bank. We were assured that applications for loans would be cleared with the two existing banks.

I hope that the bill will pass and that the new corporation will supplement the good work of the Export-Import Bank and exercise prudence in the issue of debentures.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation, but I do want to commend the committee for one provision which has apparently been written into it. I read from the report, on page 8:

> The officials and employees, including Governors and Directors, will be immune from legal process with respect to their official acts, and will receive the same treatment as comparable employees in the diplomatic service of their own country.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this committee of Congress protecting the constitutional rights of American citizens who may be abroad. This is quite contrary to the infamous Status of Forces Agreement by which American servicemen and their dependents can be tried in the civil courts of foreign countries and incarcerated in foreign prisons. I compliment the committee upon protecting the constitutional rights of American citizens who may be abroad in connection with the administration of this program.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many times during the course of this session I have tried to correct the statements on the floor and in the press which have referred to the forward-looking and progressive program of the Democratic Party as the Eisenhower program. This bill which we are now about to consider is another part of the Democratic program adopted by Mr. Eisenhower and presented to us as his program. We, in the Democratic Party are happy to find the Republicans espousing, supporting, and implementing the Truman point 4 program. If this bill passes and is properly administered, it will be another feather in the cap of the Democratic Party.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House should approve the bill authorizing membership of the United States in the International Finance Corporation. The purpose of this Corporation, as the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency stated, is "to encourage the growth of private enterprise in its member countries, particularly the less developed areas."

Mr. Speaker, the conditions of misery which stalk millions of human beings in the underdeveloped areas of the world should be enough to generate support for this measure on the part of the richest nation on earth. There can be no disagreement that increased investment and development, such as this proposal contemplates, would bring great benefits to people in these areas by raising their standards of living.

Yet this proposal is justified, not only by the instinctive American feeling for

the downtrodden and oppressed, but also by the very tangible advantages, economic and political, which will come to the United States by a stepping-up of investment in these regions. No longer can there be any doubt that a central string on the harp of Communist propaganda in such areas is the economic backwardness which has so long characterized them. In Asia, particularly, the poverty which surrounds human life often combines with the sense of frustration among native leaders to produce fertile soil for dreams of a world freed from "imperialist exploitation." The Communists naturally do not hesitate to paint this dream in bright and glowing colors. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that America should make clear to the people of such areas that political freedom and economic well-being are not mutually exclusive. One of the best ways in which we can encourage these twin goals is by supporting the proposal now before us to provide venture capital for productive activities where member nations do not find it possible to finance their development requirements from their own resources.

Another reason for American participation in the International Finance Corporation is clearly stated in the committee report: "the United States could anticipate increasing consumption of American agricultural and industrial products."

The International Finance Corporation can operate only in collaboration with private investors and for this reason would not be in competition with private investment. At the present time neither the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development nor the Export-Import Bank can adequately meet the need for increased private investment in the economically backward areas. The IFC can supplement the activities of these two organizations by supplying venture capital and can channel experienced management into those fields where it is required.

Three methods of achieving the IFC goal of stimulating private investment in underdeveloped areas are set forth in the committee report as follows:

Investing in productive enterprise, in association with private investors without Government guaranties of repayment where sufficient private capital is not available on reasonable terms;

Serving as a clearinghouse to bring together investment opportunities, private capital, and experienced management;

Creating conditions conducive to and otherwise stimulating the productive investment of private capital.

Mr. Speaker, it is by such practical measures as membership in the International Finance Corporation that we can best help lift the level of human life in the underdeveloped areas of the world and at the same time serve and strengthen the cause of freedom.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWENTY-YEAR AMORTIZED RESIDENTIAL REAL-ESTATE LOANS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1189) to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, 9-month residential-construction loans, and 18-month commercial-construction loans, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 371), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 24. Any national banking association may make real estate loans secured by first liens upon improved real estate, including improved farmland and improved business and residential properties. A loan secured by real estate within the meaning of this section shall be in the form of an obligation or obligations secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other instrument upon real estate, which shall constitute a first lien on real estate in fee simple or, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency, on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable or (2) under a lease having a period of not less than 50 years to run from the date the loan is made or acquired by the national banking association, and any national banking association may purchase any obligation so secured when the entire amount of such obligation is sold to the association. The amount of any such loan hereafter made shall not exceed 50 percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and no such loan shall be made for a longer term than 5 years; except that (1) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than 10 years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize 40 percent or more of the principal of the loan within a period of not more than 10 years, (2) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than 20 years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than 20 years, and (3) the foregoing limitations and restrictions shall not prevent the renewal or extension of loans heretofore made and shall not apply to real estate loans which are insured under the provisions of title II, title VI, title VIII, section 8 of title I, or title IX of the National Housing Act or which are insured by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the act entitled 'An act to promote conservation in the arid and semi-arid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes', approved August 28, 1937, as amended. No such association shall make such loans in an aggregate sum in excess of the amount of the capital stock of such association paid in and unimpaired plus the amount of its unimpaired surplus fund, or in excess of 60 percent of the amount of its time and savings deposits, whichever is the greater. Any such association may continue hereafter as heretofore to receive time and savings deposits and to pay interest on the same, but the rate of interest which such association may pay upon such time deposits or upon savings or other deposits shall not exceed the maximum rate authorized by law to be paid upon such deposits by State banks or trust companies organized under the laws of the State in which such association is located."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of the third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 371), is amended by striking "six" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize national banks to make 20-year amortized mortgage loans, and would authorize them to make 9-month construction loans instead of 6 months as is now provided.

National banks now have the authority to make unamortized mortgage loans for 5 years. They can now make amortized loans maturing in 10 years if 40 percent is required to be paid under their amortization provision. This would only extend the privileges that the national banks have had. It would not enlarge the lines of credit, but it would merely authorize the national banks to make 20-year amortized loans. Almost all lending institutions now have that privilege.

The Senate bill provided for 18-month construction loans on industrial properties. The House committee struck that provision out. National banks are anxious to have the authority given them in the bill. The savings-and-loan associations which have been engaged in the same activities as defined in this bill and are now making amortized mortgage loans having maturities of 20 years and more are not opposed to it.

I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real estate loans, and 9-month residential construction loans."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS ABOVE LAKE ERIE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2552) to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie is hereby modified to provide controlling depths of not less than 27 feet, the work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with plans approved by the Chief of Engineers, in the report submitted in Senate Document No. 71, 84th Congress 1st session.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

House Resolution 319 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the members of the Public Works Committee for their wisdom in reporting H. R. 2552 which will greatly enhance the already great work of opening the heartland of America to the seaports of the world via the St. Lawrence Seaway. I further congratulate the assembled membership that favorably endorsed this legislation for their appreciation of the value that this project will reflect upon our entire national economy.

Of course this action is a sequel to the previous great legislative undertaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway, but nonetheless a most important extension of this project. By this act we favorably expose four additional States to large draft shipping that would otherwise be inaccessible because of their shallow channeling. The products of our great agricultural and dairy States will now have access to foreign markets as well as the highly productive industrial area of Detroit, the center of the world's automotive industry. The economic impetus that will be felt by this region is sure to make itself felt to the entire Nation since directly or indirectly approximately 1 out of 7 people are employed by manufacturers and growers of the products that go into the manufacture of automobiles. This act is sure to appreciably alter the economic complex of this most important area of America's productive and manufactured wealth. For the people of my district who will feel the immediate results of this act I express their gratitude for your confidence in that part of America in which they toil so proudly.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of legislation to deepen the connecting channels of the Great Lakes. The economy of America is vitally interwoven with the free movement of shipping on the Great Lakes. The lifeblood of America travels through many commercial arteries and capillaries, but in perspective, the connecting channels of the Great Lakes serve as an aorta—delivering volume commerce to the heart of industrial production. The hungry blast furnaces of my community demand tremendous tonnage of iron ore and limestone. These tremendous cargoes come to us principally from the upper lakes—but the St. Lawrence Seaway facilities will soon permit them to come from both directions, from the east and abroad as well as from the west.

The Great Lakes channels are therefore an extension of the St. Lawrence Seaway inasmuch as they bring seaway commerce to the upper lakes. When the opportunities of the St. Lawrence Seaway can be extended to these vast reaches of America in deepening the connecting channels, it is an opportunity which America cannot afford to bypass.

The national defense of our Nation demands the deepening of these connecting channels of the Great Lakes. In the event of a national emergency, the ore fields of the upper lakes would remain as the only source of raw materials in steel production. It may well be that survival itself will depend upon the utilization of full-cargo tonnage of the Great Lakes transportation. In order to keep the movement of large Great Lakes cargoes at an efficient level, the cargoes must of necessity be large. They are principally raw material cargoes. The ships must thereby be large and of deep draft. The proposed 27-foot channels will accommodate the full practicable draft of foreseeable shipping.

The deepening of the Great Lakes channels is essential to the progress and development of the industrial heart of America—a region which includes over one-third of the population of America. This improvement work should commence without delay so that it can be completed in time for the St. Lawrence Seaway project to reach Lake Erie. This great work is important not only to Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago, but to the entire Nation as well. We in Cleveland are doing what we can at the local level to prepare for the St. Lawrence Seaway and the improvement of the upper channels of the Great Lakes. Our Cleveland City Council has just passed an $8 million bond issue to provide for lakefront dockage facilities for the commerce we expect to reach our city.

I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to modify the connecting channels between Lakes Superior and Huron, Michigan and Huron, and Huron and Erie. The existing project provides for the downbound connecting channels suitable for vessels drawing 24 feet and for separate upbound channels with depths suitable for vessels drawing 20 feet when lake stages are at their established datum planes.

The Corps of Engineers recommends, first, modification of the existing project to provide for further improving the channels in St. Marys River, Straits of Mackinac, St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River to provide a depth adequate for safe navigation by vessels with drafts of 25.5 feet. With an allowance for squat of vessels, clearance, exposure, and nature of channel bottom varying from 1.5 to 4.5 feet, the proposed project depth ranges from 27 to 30 feet to accommodate vessels with such drafts. The bill before us authorizes the Corps of Engineers to carry out these recommendations. The Corps of Engineers also recommends that a cutoff channel be constructed in Canada at Southeast Bend, St. Clair River, in lieu of further improvement along the existing alinement, if, prior to initiation of construction in this reach, accomplishment of the cutoff is found to be feasible.

The estimated Federal cost for the channel improvement is $110,327,000 for new work and $200,000 annually for maintenance. The cutoff channel at Southeast Bend will result in an additional cost to the United States of $5,491,000 for new work and $10,000 annually for maintenance. Thus, the total cost to the United States is estimated at $115,818,000.

Not too well known is the enormity of the tonnage carried on these channels and across the five Great Lakes. Over 27 percent of all the waterborne commerce of the United States, both seagoing and on inland waterways, is carried on the Great Lakes waters and channels. Duluth, Minn., in my district, lying at the extreme westerly end of this inland waterway, handles more tonnage each year than any inland port in the world, and handles more tonnage than any of our salt water ocean seaports, except New York City. Through the Soo Locks pass in one 8-month period a tonnage greater than the combined shipping going through both the Panama Canal and the Suez over a period of 12 months.

Especially significant is how these tonnages have increased sharply since World War II. During the past 10 years the Soo Locks carried over 1 billion tons of shipping—this is one-fourth of the total tonnage that has gone through those locks in the past 100 years. There are few States in our country which do not have a direct or indirect interest in the waterway system of the Great Lakes.

With the increase in tonnage handled, comes the increase in new, large, fast cargo carriers. Of the 300 cargo vessels of American registry presently engaged in ore trade, over two-thirds are 40 years old or older. They are rapidly being replaced with larger, faster ships with greater loadline drafts. These new ships cannot be loaded to capacity because of the inadequacy of the present channels. Modification of the channels will permit much more efficient use of not only these newer ships, but even some of the older ones which today cannot navigate through the channels with full loads.

The Corps of Engineers confined the estimate of prospective commerce for evaluating the benefits to movements between United States ports on the Great Lakes exclusive of St. Lawrence River commerce. The prospective commerce to be benefited is estimated by the corps to average 88,300,000 tons. The average annual benefit for deepening the channels and relative harbor work is estimated at $9,868,000, of which 77 percent,

or $7,600,000, is allocated to channel work and the remainder to harbor improvement. With the annual changes estimated at $4,250,000, the benefit-cost ratio for the channel work is 1.78.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to preserve and maintain the inherent advantages of one of this Nation's main arteries of transportation. This can be done by deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels. This improvement is required because it is a technological necessity to promote the operating efficiency of Great Lakes shipping so vital to the economy of the Middle West and the Nation.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent is the ninth of Ohio, which consists primarily of the city of Toledo. It may seem strange, in view of Toledo's geographic position, that I should introduce and support legislation calling for the deepening and the improving of the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie.

As you know, Toledo is located on the westerly end of Lake Erie, about 100 miles northwest of Cleveland by water, 55 miles southwest of Detroit, Mich., and roughly 250 miles directly east of Chicago, Ill.

Among ports on the Great Lakes, Toledo ranks only behind Duluth and Chicago in total tonnage and in 1952 Toledo was 10th among all ports of the United States.

With the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway project last year, Toledo found itself in the enviable position of being the westernmost terminus of a seaway route connecting the Midwest with ports in every corner of the world. In effect, the Atlantic Ocean was moved a thousand miles inland, to the very shores of the district which I have the privilege to represent.

Bearing these considerations in mind, it may appear strange to you that I rise in support of legislation which, for all practical purposes, would extend the St. Lawrence Seaway to Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and as far north and west as Duluth, Minn. I know that a number of my constituents find this puzzling and they have expressed their views to me in a manner which has been forthright, to say the least. My position, of course, is that the legislation which we are considering today will prove to be of long-range value, benefit, and advantage to my district as well as to those districts in the States north, south, and west of the great State of Ohio. To be sure, these advantages may not be immediate. But I am convinced that the long-range advantages which will accrue if this legislation is passed will far offset the short-term advantages to the Toledo area if the legislation is not passed.

I think it is well to recall that it was only 125 years ago that the Erie Canal was completed, linking the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the Hudson River and the port of New York. It is a matter of history that this far-sighted project shifted the whole economic balance of the United States. That inland waterway grew gradually to the point it has reached today, with the Sault Ste. Marie handling more business than either the Suez or Panama Canal. Had the western terminus of the Erie Canal been at Buffalo, instead of a thousand miles to the west, there would have been no such shift in our national economic balance, nor would the city of Buffalo have become the great city that it is today.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the St. Lawrence Seaway project is only the first step in another vast undertaking which can have the same kind of dynamic effect on our national economy as the Erie Canal did 125 years ago.

If the oceangoing vessels have access not only to Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, but to Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior as well, a tremendous economic impetus will be given to the industrial heart of our Nation which in turn will benefit citizens from Maine to California.

The potential of the projects which will result if this legislation is passed is unlimited, for instead of merely moving the Atlantic Ocean a thousand miles inland, we will have added nearly 3,000 additional miles to our national coastline.

It was these considerations, Mr. Speaker, which prompted me to introduce a bill providing for the deepening and improving of the Great Lakes channels above Lake Erie and which prompt me to urge favorable consideration of this important measure.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6309) to authorize construction of the Mississippi-gulf outlet.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the existing project for Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, is hereby modified to provide for the Mississippi River-gulf outlet to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document No. 245, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of $88 million: *Provided*, That when economically justified by obsolescence of the existing industrial canal lock, or by increased traffic, replacement of the existing lock or an additional lock with suitable connections is hereby approved to be constructed in the vicinity of Meraux, La., with type, dimensions, and cost estimates to be approved by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That the conditions of local cooperation specified in House Document No. 245, 82d Congress, shall likewise apply to the construction of said lock and connection channels.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

House Resolution 321 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the 2 bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

POLIOMYELITIS VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2501) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until December 31, 1957, such sums as may be necessary for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, applications for grants under this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2, the Secretary shall allot to each State which has an application approved pursuant to section 4—

(1) an amount equal to 25 percent of the number of unvaccinated eligible persons in such State multiplied by the product of (A) the cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine per eligible person, and (B) the State's allotment percentage; and

(2) an additional amount equal to 20 percent of allotments available to the State under paragraph (1) of this subsection, such additional amount to be available for expenditure only in accordance with the provisions of section 6 (b) of this act.

(b) A State's allotment percentage shall be equal to the per capita income of the United States divided by the per capita income of the State. Such percentage shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of information furnished by the Department of Commerce; except that the allotment percentage for Hawaii shall be 100 percent and for Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Canal Zone shall be equal to the allotment percentage determined above for the 1 of the 48 States which has the lowest per capita income.

STATE APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDS

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall approve the application of any State for payments under this act if such application—

(a) provides that all poliomyelitis vaccine purchased with funds paid to the State under this act shall be used for the vaccination of eligible persons pursuant to a plan which sets forth the method or methods by which vaccinations will be made available throughout the State (through public agencies, approved nonprofit organizations, private physicians, or otherwise) and which provides reasonable assurances that all eligible persons in the State (or, if the State determines that vaccinations shall be confined to a certain group or groups of eligible persons throughout the State, all eligible persons in such group or groups) will have an opportunity to be vaccinated against poliomyelitis: *Provided*, That if the plan of the State is limited to such group or groups, the amount paid to such State from that part of its allotment computed in accordance with section 3 (a) (1) of this act may

not exceed the allotment percentage of such State multiplied by the cost of poliomyelitis vaccine for 25 percent of the unvaccinated eligible persons in such group or groups:

(b) provides that in poliomyelitis vaccination programs conducted by public agencies in the State no means test or other discrimination based on financial ability of individuals will be imposed to limit the eligibility of persons to receive vaccination against poliomyelitis;

(c) provides for administration or supervision of administration of the plan included in the application by a single State agency;

(d) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(e) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this act for any period, and shall pay such amount to such State, from the allotment available therefor, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this section) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period under this act was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this act. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

USE OF FUNDS PAID TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Funds paid to a State from that part of its allotment computed in accordance with section 3 (a) (1) of this act may be used solely for the purchase, prior to December 31, 1957, of the poliomyelitis vaccine for use in carrying out the plan set forth in the application of such State approved pursuant to section 4.

(b) Funds paid to a State from that part of its allotment computed in accordance with section 3 (a) (2) of this act may be used prior to December 31, 1957, only for planning poliomyelitis vaccination programs throughout the State and for conducting such programs through public agencies in the State in accordance with the plan set forth in the application of such State approved pursuant to section 4.

(c) Nothing in this act shall limit funds granted to a State under other provisions of Federal legislation from being available to purchase poliomyelitis vaccine or to plan and conduct poliomyelitis vaccination programs in accordance with approved State plans applicable to such grants.

FURNISHING OF VACCINE BY SECRETARY

SEC. 7. At the request of any State the Secretary may use all or any portion of the allotment of such State under this act for the purchase, in accordance with State specifications, of the poliomyelitis vaccine, to be furnished to the State in lieu of such State's allotment (or such portion thereof). Vaccine so furnished shall be subject to the same requirements as to use as vaccine purchased from payments to States pursuant to this act.

DIVERSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

SEC. 8. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the plan included in the application of such State approved under section 4, finds that—

(a) such State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions of this act or the terms and conditions of its approved application; or

(b) any funds paid to such State or supplies of vaccine furnished to it under this act have been diverted from the purposes for which paid or furnished;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made (or no further supplies of vaccine will be furnished) to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such State agency repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended (or for repayment of the cost of the vaccine which has been diverted).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) (1) The term "eligible person" means any individual who has not attained the age of 20 years and any expectant mother.

(2) The number of eligible persons shall be determined by the Secretary, as of June 30, 1955, on the basis of estimates developed after consideration of the latest information furnished by the Department of Commerce or any other department or agency of the United States.

(3) The number of unvaccinated eligible persons means the number of eligible persons, reduced by (A) the number who were vaccinated against poliomyelitis during 1954, and (B) two-thirds of the number who the Secretary estimates will receive vaccination under the current program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

(c) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

(d) The cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of information available to him; and such cost may be determined from time to time or as of a specified date and may be determined to be a single figure for all States or varied in accordance with actual cost.

(e) The term "approved nonprofit organization" means, in the case of any State, a nonprofit organization approved by the State agency responsible for administration or supervision of administration of the State plan.

Amend the title so as to read "To provide grants to assist States to meet the cost of poliomyelitis vaccination programs, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, under the motion which is pending to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill with an amendment, we are now considering H. R. 7126 which is the amendment.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members will fully understand just what has happened. On page 2 of the House bill, subparagraph 2, section 3, has been stricken from the bill by a committee amendment. The other amendments that were offered simply make the remainder of the bill conform.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, I think, as all of us do, that the question of some action by the Government before this session adjourns with reference to the Salk vaccine is tremendously important.

Now, I am not going into a long review of this whole question. I want to say that in order first to determine the question of safety of the vaccine, our committee asked the National Academy of Sciences to assemble for us 15 of the top experts on this subject in the country. They appeared for 2 days before the committee, and following their appearance, while there was a difference of opinion among them, the committee felt that insofar as any killed virus vaccine can be guaranteed to be safe, this vaccine is safe and that it is efficient. As a matter of fact the panel voted 8 to 3 with some not voting to continue the program with this vaccine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had handed to me a day or two ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] who is the ranking member of the subcommittee that dealt with this question, some figures showing that to date there are 439 cases of poliomyelitis in the State of Massachusetts compared to 75 the same date last year. The total for New England was 581 against 184 last year. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, we are in for one of those bad years in polio.

Let me explain very briefly what this bill does. I hope I can explain it very quickly. This bill is in line with the bill sent up by the administration earlier in the year requesting $35 million to be allocated to the States to assist them in this program. It differs rather considerably in some respects. After we had listened to the representative of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association, Dr. Bergma, from the State of New Jersey, we felt rather strongly in the committee that there should be some amendment giving the States a little more latitude; that the bill as originally proposed was too rigid, and that there should be some latitude at the State level. So, we amended the bill to give flexibility to some programs in the States.

The bill would make available sums to the States computed on a formula which is arrived at as follows, and it is not so complicated as it may sound: 25 percent of the unvaccinated eligibles in the State multiplied by the cost of the vaccine, established at $2.33 for 3 cc., multiplied by the State's allotment percentage, and that is arrived at by dividing the per capita income of the State into the national per capita income. On the basis of that formula, these allocations will be made to the States. The original bill called for 20 percent. However, I was advised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that they had no objection to raising the amount to 25 percent.

One change made in this bill after we heard from the State and Territorial Health Officers Association was a 20-percent provision put in this bill that the States may use for administering their programs within the States. We

found, for example, that some legislatures made appropriations before adjourning this year for administrative expenses. Some had made appropriations to buy vaccine but for no administrative expenses. We felt that the 20-percent allowance, if they needed it, should be made, so we made allowance that 20 percent of the funds might be made available for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. When the matter was before the Committee on Rules considerable objection was voiced to that feature of the bill which gave it free to all children irrespective of their financial ability to pay. I understood the committee was taking that out by an amendment.

Mr. PRIEST. When I appeared before the Committee on Rules I understood that there was objection on page 2, paragraph 2, which provided for dollar for dollar matching for everybody subject to the approval of the secretary of a State plan was taken out by a committee amendment. That was the only provision, as I understood it, to which there was any serious objection.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we all know that the matter of the distribution and use of this polio vaccine has been handled in the most unfortunate, if not disgraceful, manner by the administration. The people of the country are disgusted with the manner in which it has been handled. The mothers and fathers of this country have been put into a deplorable state of mind, of fear about their children; not knowing whether they should or should not, wondering, if they did not, what might happen to their children and wondering, if they did, what might happen to their children.

Is the Senate bill broader than the House bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes, the Senate bill is considerably broader than the House bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And in order to get the bill up under suspension and to remove opposition, the gentleman has had to agree to the amendment; is that right?

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman did agree to the amendment to help expedite this proposed legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. And reluctantly so; is that right?

Mr. PRIEST. So far as the gentleman is concerned, reluctantly so; but by direction of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I understand, and I shall support the gentleman. But I hope when the bill goes to conference there will be a better bill come back.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I regret this controversy has developed, but when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said that this polio vaccine has been handled in a most unfortunate if not disgraceful manner, I am compelled to rise to register my vigorous dissent. If there was anything disgraceful about the handling of this program, it was the attempt to play politics with it, the attempt to force a scientific experiment to meet a certain deadline. Nobody—whether politicians or scientists—can control or coerce an operation of that nature.

Speaking as a person who has spent his life in scientific work, I think those in charge have succeeded with extraordinary rapidity and security and effectiveness in perfecting this vaccine. Instead of stones being thrown at them, I think the people who are responsible for the whole program ought to be given medals for the way in which they kept their heads and refused to be stampeded, for the manner in which they kept in mind first the interests of the people, and not the interests of politicians.

On the whole, they got this vaccine to the children who needed it most earlier than it seemed they possibly could, with all proper attention paid to the security factor.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that the blame lay in the politicians, but not the politicians in Congress. It was the politicians in the executive branch of the present administration.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot take that either. The unfortunate aspects of the matter were those handled by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The original getting-off base was not in the executive branch; it was in the organization under whom this was developed, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, in its urge to get publicity.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER.]

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Much has been said in a political way about the Salk vaccine program. The political slant was taken in Congress by men with small scientific minds or no scientific minds at all, who were willing to jump in with all four feet, if they had them, to make politics out of the public-health problems of the people of this country.

Certainly the Public Health Service would have been subject to much criticism if they had not followed the thinking, the best thinking of the minds in the scientific world. The men and women in the Health Foundation or the Polio Foundation were those who were making the decisions. I was amazed to hear on the floor of the House repeatedly comments made by Members on the other side of the aisle, in order to get a little political gain, as they thought, out of the health of the children of this country. It reminded me of some of their attempts to make politics out of the squirrels on the White House lawn, Mamie Eisenhower's health, and the fact that the President was going to church. It was an illustration of the little, mean, petty things that sometimes arise when Members, perhaps on both sides of the aisle, yield to those unattractive animal instincts in human beings. But certainly the Public Health Service in the way they have handled the Salk polio vaccine program are to be commended. They did follow the best advice of the day, not from political minds who are small in scientific ways but from big scientific minds who knew what the score was and knew what would happen if they did not proceed with caution.

With that in mind, I want now to ask the chairman of the committee this question: How much money is involved in this bill?

Mr. PRIEST. The money involved in this program, assuming that every State in the Union submitted an application that was approved by the Secretary, would amount to approximately $45 million. I might add that the appropriation bill, as I understand it, contains an appropriation of $30 million already, which, of course, would limit it to that extent. It is the feeling of our committee that we should pass this legislation and then take another look at the whole picture quickly in January.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have no objection to doing that. Of course, polio is an unknown disease. The things we do not know about we so often fear. But I would remind the gentleman that we also have other diseases, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, and measles, that take a toll of children's lives. Is there a program that furnishes antitoxin or vaccine for diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, and paratyphoid?

Mr. PRIEST. There is authority for such programs under the Public Service Act in grants to States. It was on that basis that the Senate passed this bill, simply by removing the $30 million limitation on appropriations and leaving an open-end appropriation, because it was in that part of the existing law that such authority is granted. Of course, in most instances, however, the States give those vaccines free to schoolchildren.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I note also over the country that the medical profession, the Public Health groups, are going in and, where children in towns are not able to pay for this Salk vaccine, they now have the advantage of getting it. No child, as I understand it, is to be denied the polio vaccine because they cannot pay for it. I note with pride that doctors all over the United States are entering into that program wholeheartedly and with considerable enthusiasm. I feel the program would be carried on without Government spending. I understand this is a part of the President's program. So, I have no objection to appropriating money for it, but we ought not to lose sight of the more prevalent diseases that take a big toll in children's lives. We apparently are focusing our attention on just the one thing, the polio, the dread disease, the unknown thing, which we do fear be-

cause we do not know about it and do not understand the disease.

Mr. PRIEST. May I mention this to the House in order that the Members may have the information. I think the 2-day panel discussion with the 15 top experts in this country contributed one of the finest volumes of scientific data we have perhaps ever assembled on this question. That is volume II of the hearings, in case Members desire to send copies to some of their physicians. I think the doctors throughout the country will find in that one little volume more information than they can find in any other volume at a great price.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have read it. I congratulate the committee for following the advice of experts and not following the ideas of the politicians who really know so little about the scientific aspects of polio.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation to authorize an effective program of vaccination against the dread disease of poliomyelitis is an urgent measure before this House. I support it and urge its passage.

This bill is, like most legislation, not perfect in every respect. In the form in which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today urges its passage it varies slightly from the form which was originally unanimously approved in committee. It is, however, either in its original or present form an effective measure which will permit us to continue and strengthen our fight on poliomyelitis or infantile paralysis or polio or any other name by which this dread disease may be called.

This is the season of the year in which epidemics of tragic proportions often break out in many parts of our Nation. It is my hope, indeed it is the hope of all Members of Congress, that this legislation will be truly an important and effective milestone in the long fight to stamp out polio, just as smallpox and typhoid fever have been virtually eradicated from our Nation. I have seen many of my own friends and children of my friends stricken and either killed or crippled by this horrible disease. I hope that the youth of this generation and of generations which follow may be spared from this crippling disease just as you and I have been during our lifetimes safe and secure from the ravages of once common and prevalent diseases which are now almost nonexistent.

When this legislation is enacted into law, we call upon the people at large, the medical profession, and the various State and Federal agencies of public health to join hands and work together toward a complete stamping out of polio.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing mean or small about anybody on this side of the aisle in their approach to this problem. No one has found fault with the scientific approach to the problem. The fault we found is with the way the executive department has mishandled the entire problem; and we are not solving it by this legislation. This legislation merely appropriates some money so as to make the vaccine available, but it does not control it and no State in the Union has the right to control it under any existing legislation.

Let me read to you from the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican paper:

> The Salk vaccine is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts confirm the vaccine's general efficiency. The demands are far greater than the supply. Every child in America has the right to its protection. The serum can only be and must be controlled nationally.

Mrs. Hobby refused to come before our committee time after time to tell us how that could be done. I hold in my hand the various licenses issued by her departments. Not one of them covers anything except the right to manufacture and the safety, sanitary, and health precautions which must be taken. That is all the licenses cover and nothing else. Once the vaccine is manufactured, it is free to go anywhere and everywhere throughout the country. There is no legislation that will affect that situation.

Denmark and Canada have had a completely successful program. Their inoculation programs have been carried out with not a single loss and with no trouble and with no black market.

Here, where we were trying to get the person charged with the responsibility for this program to come before our committee and tell us how we can cooperate and draw up and pass legislation that is necessary so that this vaccine will not get into the black market and so that every child will be taken care of, we are told that we are mean and small. There is a national program to inoculate and supply serums and antitoxins for cattle, but you do not want to do it for our children. Our children are just as important to us and even more important than the cattle of the country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the program for the polio season and polio does not start in Canada until the end of this month.

Mr. MULTER. It does not matter when it starts. The fact of the matter is that the program was successfully carried out in Denmark and in Canada without a single incident.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. If you read the testimony of Dr. Salk before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce several weeks ago, you will find it very elucidating. That very question was asked about the Canadian experience.

Mr. MULTER. I have read the testimony. It does not say one thing contrary to what I am saying here. Dr. Salk's was the scientific approach. He did not concern himself at all with the bungling in the executive department of our Government.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. You will remember when the news was given to the country and to the world of this great man, Dr. Salk, and his efforts and contributions to this work, that the present administration tried to time the announcement for the purposes of making political capital out of it. Only the other day we passed—my colleagues on the other side seem to disagree with that, but you cannot get away with that because there is a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who resigned partly because of the manner in which she handled this whole matter, and the American people are well aware of what happened, and they know the responsibility rests on the Republican administration.

Mr. MULTER. How Denmark handled the polio situation is very aptly told in the story which appeared in the July 24, 1954, issue of Parade magazine, as follows:

> THE COUNTRY THAT LICKED POLIO—IN ITS OWN QUIET WAY, LITTLE DENMARK HAS PROVED THE SALK VACCINE TO BE BOTH SAFE AND EFFECTIVE
>
> COPENHAGEN.—Denmark, the country of Hans Christian Andersen, cheese, and Victor Borge, is rejoicing. And with good reason.
>
> Danish doctors, using America's new Salk vaccine, are convinced that they have licked polio, which in 1952 and 1953 ran rampant over this little nation (population 4½ million), causing more than 7,200 cases.
>
> Since last April 400,000 Danish children between the ages of 6 and 11 have been inoculated. Each received a second Salk shot 6 weeks later. What makes the Danes so happy is that, as of this writing, not one case of infantile paralysis has developed in the inoculated youngsters. (Canada has had similar good results with its vaccine program.) Thus, doctors here are willing to assure Americans—and anyone else concerned—that the vaccine is safe and effective.
>
> In contrast to the fuss, delay, and debate that characterized the use of Salk vaccine in the United States, the Danish vaccinations were executed with precision, simplicity, and quiet efficiency.
>
> One reason lies in the fact that Denmark is a compact nation, with a small population. In contrast to Denmark's 400,000 inoculations, the United States total stood at more than 6 million by mid-June. Another reason is that the Danes were prepared. They proceeded, and are proceeding, with a single inoculation plan that was worked out in some detail last year.
>
> STOCKPILED IN 1954
>
> Like the United States, Canada and several other countries vitally interested in the course of polio research, Denmark was certain that the Salk polio vaccine would work. In 1954 its state-owned Serum Institute began manufacturing and stockpiling the vaccine. A few months ago, while a rash of United States polio cases followed use of the American-manufactured vaccine, Denmark's medical specialists naturally were shocked.
>
> "At first," one reports, "we couldn't figure it out. Why should the American people have had several failures when we've had such outstanding success? Then we discovered that our method of preparing and testing the polio vaccine was slightly different from that used in America. We had taken more safety precautions."
>
> The Danish doctor who insisted on these precautions and helped work them out is attractive, blue-eyed Herdis von Magnus. At 44, Dr. von Magnus is chief of the virus section, Denmark Serum Institute, and one of

Europe's outstanding virologists. Recently she was flown to Washington to explain to United States Public Health officials the special testing and safety procedures she evolved in the Danish manufacture of the polio vaccine.

Interview-shy and extremely modest, Dr. von Magnus refuses to discuss the details of this overseas mission. All she will say is, "The polio serum now manufactured in America is just as good as ours."

THE NEEDED CHANGES

The key word in Dr. von Magnus' statement is "now." Formerly, United States-manufactured polio vaccine was not as safe as Denmark's, nor, experts here claim, were testing standards as high.

United States doctors, for example, have strong evidence that some live virus slipped through in the early preparation of one batch of vaccine. So, at least, claims Dr. Louis Gebhardt, director of the polio-research lab at the University of Utah. He tested the vaccine and found live virus in it.

We know, too, that following the inoculation of almost 6 million United States children, 142 of the vaccinated youngsters contracted polio by June 3—72 after having been injected with vaccine manufactured by Cutter Laboratories, 42 by Lilly, 12 by Wyeth, 12 by Parke-Davis, and 4 by Pitman-Moore.

Most important, United States authorities themselves said American methods of producing Salk vaccine could stand improvement. Higher standards, some conforming to Denmark's, were laid down late in May by the United States Public Health Service. American manufacturers now must: (1) conduct more tests of larger amounts of vaccine taken from each batch produced, (2) run additional tests during the bottling process and (3) discard any vaccine which contains live virus instead of continuing to recook it over and over again in an effort to kill the disease-producing virus.

In Denmark the vaccine is not injected intramuscularly into the arms of children as in the United States. Each inoculation consists of two intradermal (between the layers of the skin) injections on the forearm; these are little more than pinpricks, similar to a smallpox vaccination.

This method, admittedly slower than that used in the United States, was considered by American experts, but ruled out because it would have been too time-consuming. However, it is practical for little Denmark.

Last April 15 the first series of mass inoculations was begun in Copenhagen by school doctors. All children from 6 to 11 who had been granted parental permission—and fewer than 50 parents in Denmark refused consent—were given vaccination cards bearing their name, the date, and place of vaccination. They were "shot." Practically no harmful side effects were reported. And no cases of polio developed.

Eventually, the rest of Denmark's inhabitants are to be vaccinated in this order: Children from 6 months to 6 years, children from 12 to 18, all pregnant women, all soldiers, and all other adults. Expenses are to be paid by the Government.

IT PAYS TO BE LITTLE

The Danish polio vaccination plan is working smoothly because, as one Government executive says, "there is one central authority behind it. The Government speaks out clearly and forcefully to both doctors and public. We are told what has been worked out by Dr. Jeppe Oerskov, director of the Serum Institute, in collaboration with his staff and our Government. In this way everyone knows what to expect next.

"In your country things are different. The polio program has been started, stalled, revised, and bogged down because there is no overall plan. * * *

"Once in a while it is advantageous to be a small country like Denmark. Not very often, mind you. But once in a while."

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess until 1:30 p. m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not think I was hearing correctly a while ago when the majority leader of this House [Mr. MCCORMACK] made what I charitably describe as a most unfortunate and unfair statement in reference to a former Cabinet officer, a lady who has given a great deal of service to her country, particularly when he insinuated that Mrs. Hobby had resigned because of the handling of the polio situation. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that is untrue, we all know it is untrue. The reason for the resignation of Mrs. Hobby was so that she could give care to her husband who has been very ill. I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] would retract that statement because it is not in accordance with the fact.

He said that people up in the executive branch of our Government had been playing politics with this matter. But who has been playing the politics? Was it not two Members on the Democratic side, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], who openly stated a month ago before a political meeting that they were going to make the polio vaccine an issue in the 1956 campaign? Who started the politics? I can say to these people, and I can say to the Democratic Party, let them bring that issue up in 1956 as a political issue and see where they get. But I suppose that is consistent with the Democratic policy of casting doubt on everything. They cast doubt on the health of the first lady of our land. The Governor of the State of New York cast a doubt on our President's popularity a few days before the Geneva Conference started by stating in London that the President had lost his luster back home.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I never said I would make the Salk vaccine an issue in the campaign. I said that it has been made an issue in the campaign.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Then the gentlelady was incorrectly quoted in the Washington Post and Times Herald—a newspaper known for its general support of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what the facts are. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] said he read the hearings. We had an outstanding group of polio experts before our committee some weeks ago.

Let me quote from page 157 the following:

Mr. SPRINGER—

Asking a question of Dr. Salk, a great man for whom I introduced a resolution to award a medal—

One further point, doctor. It has been pointed out at various times that north of the border, Canada has been having rather a success with its vaccine program. May I ask if the vaccine produced in Canada is made by the identical process used in the United States?

Dr. SALK. Yes, it is.

Mr. SPRINGER. And is it not true that the public health officials in Canada who worked on this program worked directly with all of you people here in this country working out this program?

Dr. SALK. Yes, sir. We are still consulting with each other.

Further on I quote:

Mr. SPRINGER. In Canada, has the same number of expected polio cases developed there that have developed in the United States?

Dr. SALK. I don't know what the figures are. Perhaps Dr. Shannon does, or someone else, as to the number of cases that were expected. I do know this, that one case did occur a day after inoculation in a child who had a minor illness 3 or 4 days before injection. That was the only instance in 900,000 inoculations. But Canada is north of the border and polio begins to occur there much later than it does in this country, and certainly from the seasonal point of view, they were in a far more favorable position to have gotten this kind of effect than were we anyplace in the United States.

And it continues on and on; he stated that we have had excellent success here and that Canada is using the same kind of test that we do. And, he also said this:

I think it has been very unfair to the American pharmaceutical industry to have created the impression that others are doing better than our own people, because figures that Mr. Springer just quoted are perfectly adequate. * * * I can only say on their behalf that they have done a perfectly remarkable job.

Let us keep this thing out of politics. Let us quit scaring the American people, and let us get the American children inoculated.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today after the legislative program is completed, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a footnote to what the gentleman from New York has said. It was mentioned earlier that the Government of Denmark has handled its polio-vaccine program without any complications, the inference being that we should have the same pattern of Government operation and that our officials have been less com-

petent. I think the RECORD here should show that Denmark is not using the same vaccine we are using. They are using a different strain of virus which it has not been agreed is one that produces paralysis. So, if an epidemic should develop over there, there is no reason to believe those vaccinated will have the immunity that the Salk injection gives. Inoculations with a nonparalytic virus naturally do not produce paralysis. That does not prove the program to be better handled. One can also give injections of normal salt solution without paralysis. It is safe, but useless.

There are several strains of polio virus. It is believed that most of us, by the time we reach 30 or 40 years of age, have had polio in some form that was not recognized because it was not paralytic. Our scientists were faced with the problem of making a virulent paralysis-producing virus sufficiently innocuous so that it might give the same immunity as the disease would, but without the symptoms of the disease, especially the paralysis. The problem was to grow the virus, and then attenuate it to the point where it would give immunity without giving the disease. The scientists and the producers demonstrated they could do this with small quantities of the vaccine. Some of them wanted more tests to be absolutely sure. But there were people who wanted to press ahead and get it released on a certain date in April, before the polio season began, and, I understand, before all of the tests on vaccine produced in large quantities had been completed.

I commend Mrs. Hobby and the others working with her, because they had the fortitude to stand up against all sorts of charges and smears and do the thing that was right, namely, to suspend use of the vaccine even when millions were clamoring for it, until they were sure all of the vaccine was in a condition where it would not give people polio and would give them immunity. Contrary to the aspersions that have been cast, she is, in my opinion, entitled to the greatest honor and credit for the remarkable job she and her associates have done under gross misrepresentation designed to create a hostile public opinion. Events have proved her right and her detractors wrong. I salute her, and our people increasingly do the same.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the gentleman from New York might talk, the fact remains that the American people are aware of the situation. You cannot talk that down. The American people have been alarmed at the manner in which this administration has handled this important question. The bringing in of Dr. Salk has no pertinency to any discussion today, because only the other day, a resolution was passed that would properly recognize him, to which the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership both agreed when it was brought up by unanimous consent.

Every mother and father has been in a difficult situation to decide whether they should have their child inoculated or not. They were worried about their children. They did not know whether they should or should not. One thing is certain: We know that vaccine was produced by a company, injected into children, and polio resulted therefrom. Everyone knows, the evidence clearly disclosed, that that company was negligent. There was negligent supervision on the part of the Government officials in permitting that vaccine to be sold and to be used. There are many children today throughout the United States who, as a result of that negligence, are afflicted with polio.

So, apologize all you want, you cannot talk the facts away. The American people are aware of the fact.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman. The gentleman from Minnesota's remarks were on a different plane from those of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Probably the gentleman will not quite agree with what I intend to say now. The thing that has been regrettable in this whole matter was the speedup forced in the release of this vaccine to hit a certain anniversary date.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who was responsible for that?

Mr. JUDD. You cannot make scientific experiments, or viruses, meet an arbitrary deadline. So, as the gentleman said, while they thought at the time of release last April that the supervisory processes were adequate, some of them wanted to have 6 more weeks in order to be completely sure. The bad results which developed proved that the supervision was not adequate. But that happens with respect to many new inventions. When the DC–6 was put into operation, it was believed safe. Then two of them caught fire. But we did not quit flying or abandon the development of that plane. We just grounded the DC–6's until what was wrong could be fixed.

What happened with polio vaccine which proved too virulent was not disgraceful. It would have been a disgrace if the Public Health Service had not taken the necessary steps to withdraw the vaccine until they could find and correct what was wrong.

I think the American people are aware of all this. They are sorry about it, as are all of us. But the blame must be placed on those who, in order to build publicity for glorification of a man who is dead, in my opinion took unnecessary and reckless chances with the sound limbs and health of children who are alive. I think what was done was unworthy of that man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who did that?

Mr. JUDD. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is blaming them, is he?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; they are the ones who sponsored and developed the vaccine; they are the ones who gave the grants to the various laboratories.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who put out the publicity to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. JUDD. The National Foundation. For weeks suspense was built up for the release of the vaccine at Ann Arbor on April 12. It was announced in regular Hollywood premiere style, with nationwide TV. The publicity went throughout the country and gave the impression to the people that this vaccine was perfectly safe and in its final form.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where did the Public Health Service come into the picture in this connection?

Mr. JUDD. If they erred it was in yielding to the pressures to have the announcement made at Ann Arbor on that date, April the 12th.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that his statements completely confirm everything I have said and are a denial of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] just said.

Mr. JUDD. I think it was unworthy of the memory of the great man that in order to have the polio vaccine released on the anniversary of his death, the matter was handled in the way they handled it. I am certain he would never have wanted the life or limbs of any single child jeopardized in order to have the announcement come on that particular date.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I sat in the committee and listened to the evidence. I merely want to take this occasion to say that politics never should have entered into this important subject. I want to read a telegram from the largest manufacturer of Salk vaccine:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *July 11, 1955.*

JOHN V. BEAMER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Since Eli Lilly & Co. is a major producer of Salk vaccine, we believe it proper to inform members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of our views regarding the need for Federal vaccine legislation.

Eli Lilly & Co. is naturally interested in facilitating the inoculation of all persons desiring Salk vaccine protection against paralytic poliomyelitis. We have made great efforts to produce a safe, effective vaccine in large quantities. Evidence that we are meeting this responsibility is established in the fact that Lilly vaccine was used in approximately one-half of the more than 400,000 children vaccinated during 1954 field trials, and in the fact that more than 4 million doses of our vaccine have to date in 1955 been approved for release by the Surgeon General and used in 24 States. Statistics compiled by United States Public Health Service attest to both the safety and effectiveness of Lilly vaccine.

While we consider our primary responsibility to be large-scale production of safe, effective vaccine, we also have an interest in helping to distribute the vaccine so that all who are eligible to obtain it are able to do so as speedily as possible. It is our considered judgment that distribution can best be accomplished through normal channels by the medical and pharmaceutical professions under the voluntary allocation plan of the National Vaccine Advisory Committee.

Furthermore, we believe that no individuals desiring vaccination will be denied the opportunity even if no Federal legislation is enacted—assuming vaccine is released by the Public Health Service in increasing amounts. Acceptable means of providing medicines for

the needy already exist and have been demonstrated to operate effectively. Thus, with reference to H. R. 7126, Eli Lilly & Co. sincerely doubts the need for allocation of any Federal funds for the purchase of poliomyelitis vaccine. If the view of your committee is otherwise, we strongly recommend that the allocation of funds be no more than that necessary to provide vaccine for children in critical age groups who are unable to pay.

We are pledged to bend every effort to translate Dr. Salk's great scientific discovery into supplies of safe and effective vaccine for millions of people. Toward this end we offer our full cooperation to members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

EUGENE N. BEESLEY,
President, Eli Lilly & Co.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I included the entire telegram, because I think it points out a very significant thing. That is the fact that when you get the Federal Government mixed up in these matters, you are going to have more trouble than if you permit them to be handled through the normal channels. If we keep the Government out of this vaccine program we can have an excellent program, and we shall not have all this difficulty we have had trying to get some politics in it. I deplore it, and I think all people on both sides of the aisle should deplore the fact that politics was mentioned, because we had at stake the lives of children, the lives of mothers, and all of the attendant heartaches.

That is the reason it is important. I suggest to you that, even if we do not pass this bill today, we still are going to have the numerous associations and organizations throughout the country distributing this great boon to mankind.

I suggest to you that it is very vital that we get down to brass tacks. It matters little whether or not you pass the bill; because, as stated previously, normal channels will continue to do a good job. In fact, I did not support it in the committee. I felt it was a step towards socialized medicine, at least a back-door approach to it and we must oppose any socialistic approach. So I am suggesting that the House pay careful attention to the possible results of the conference committee that may be appointed to resolve the bill that was passed by the other body.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of the first session of the 84th Congress at hand, the final decision on legislation concerning the Salk vaccine for poliomyelitis is being made. It is a weighty decision which will set many precedents. Some 30 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate, ranging from what could be described by their proponents as reasonably practical measures to provide assistance to the States in furnishing vaccine for some of those unable to pay for it, to out and out socialistic and paternalistic bills which would set a destructive precedent for Federal seizure of any important commodity.

H. R. 7126, as amended within the past few days at the suggestion of the Rules Committee, will make Federal funds available to the States on a limited basis to provide Salk vaccine for approximately 25 percent of the children under the ages of 20. The supplemental appropriation bill passed last week, coincides reasonably closely with this program.

It cannot be denied that, traditionally, the primary responsibility for the care, medical, and otherwise, of the indigent rests primarily in State and local governments. However, because most State legislatures are not in session at this time and many will have only brief sessions next year, undoubtedly a case can be made for taking action in Congress now in order to provide limited Federal funds to States without delay. It should be, and must be, recognized that this action is not a precedent for similar steps in the future. The particular political and emotional circumstances surrounding the polio vaccine, such as the carefully calculated timing of the announcement, the great public interest in the situation, and the concern of parents about the disease, make this a unique problem which must be not regarded as a pattern for future activity.

Much has happened in the polio-vaccine picture since the summary which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1955. However, the questions which were asked then still apply. For example, "Would Federal control of the Salk vaccine advance by even 1 day the date at which any American child would receive his shot?" "Would it produce 1 extra cubic centimeter of vaccine?" "Did the proponents of control legislation wish to register a lack of confidence in the medical profession, in the drug manufacturers, in the pharmacists of the Nation?"

The legislation now before the House represents a reasonably moderate approach, without imposing Federal controls upon doctors, pharmacists, and ethical manufacturers. The legislation is concerned with the authorization for use of Federal Government money, on a limited basis, and is not concerned with control of the private practice of medicine or the private distribution of a prescription drug.

At this time it might be desirable to review happenings in this field since my brief statement of May 3.

During late April and early May, it became apparent to Surg. Gen. Leonard A. Scheele and his associates that the tests and standards for the vaccine should be reviewed by eminent virologists, and therefore approval of material being manufactured was discontinued. A technical committee met a number of times during that month and afterward. Revised tests and standards were agreed upon by the manufacturers and the Public Health Service on May 27. Only relatively small quantities of polio vaccine have been released until the past few weeks when increased supplies have become available and approved for shipment.

In the meantime, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through a special advisory committee, has worked out a program for voluntary allocation of the vaccine to insure its equitable distribution. Shipments of vaccine to the States are made by the manufacturers in accordance with instructions of the advisory committee. So far, all available vaccine has gone to fill contracts of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, inoculating children in the first and second grades of school. On or about August 1 it is expected the needs of the national foundation will have been filled. Shortly thereafter commercial shipments of polio vaccine will be made under allocation instructions of the HEW advisory committee.

While it is unfortunate and, in my opinion, unnecessary that any governmental interference in the ordinary distribution of a commercial product be instituted, there is some need for the voluntary allocation procedure in this case. Even supervised voluntary allocation, fortunately, presents a minimum of interference and a minimum of coercion. If allowed to operate properly, this voluntary procedure would permit ordinary commercial and professional distribution of the polio vaccine in a relatively short time.

The needs of the National Foundation for vaccine to inoculate first and second graders are almost filled at this date. It may be pointed out here that about seven-eighths of the total quantity supplied to the foundation after April 12 have come from Eli Lilly & Co., of Indianapolis, in my district. Pitman Moore, also in my district, has supplied significant amounts of the vaccine.

Little has been said on Capitol Hill about the important potential role of the physicians of the United States, individually and through their organizations, in this great program. Other than carrying out the arduous professional duties of performing the actual vaccinations, the physicians have not been given as much opportunity to work closely with the organizations developing and controlling the Salk vaccine as many would have expected. This is brought out clearly in Status Report on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, in the Journal of the American Medical Association for May 28, 1955:

STATUS REPORT ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE BY AMA BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Many months ago we informally asked a member of the medical advisory committee to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis if the foundation would like to have the association appoint a committee to make an evaluation to the utilization of the Salk vaccine, in addition to any evaluation the foundation might make. The association was told that this was not necessary.

On January 10, 1955, the National Foundation called a conference of representatives of several organizations, including the AMA. This conference was to consider nationwide administrative policies for the 1955 poliomyelitis vaccine program and dealt primarily with children in the first and second grades and in the 1954 field trial groups who did not receive the vaccine.

Although scientific articles appeared in The Journal relative to the vaccine, nothing

more was heard until February 14, 1955, when the association was approached with a proposal that it cosponsor a closed-circuit television program on the Salk vaccine at some future date. We then inquired from the National Foundation as to when this program would be produced, but the date was not firm; it was thought to be in early April. We suggested that before the results of the trials conducted in the spring of 1954 were announced the association be authorized to examine them and sit in with the representatives of the foundation who were evaluating them, in order that the association might have firsthand knowledge of what type of television program it was cosponsoring. This was agreed to, and representatives were appointed.

Under date of March 23 the association was informed that there would be no preview of the material to be presented on April 12, 1955. We notified the AMA representatives, who had already been appointed, of this fact and withdrew any cosponsorship of the television program, as we had no knowledge at that time of what the results of the evaluation or the data providing the basis of the announcement would be.

Invitations were issued to representatives of the association to attend the announcement in Ann Arbor on April 12, and Drs. Elmer Hess, D. H. Murray, E. B. Howard, and Austin Smith were present. Since then we have had no communications from the National Foundation. The Francis report presented on this date was the first information that we had relative to the results of the field trials.

In view of the rapid developments within the past few days with respect to the promulgation of minimum standards for the licensing of manufacturers producing the Salk antipoliomyelitis vaccine, and the extent of production under these circumstances, we are unable to furnish any detailed factual information to the profession at this time. As soon as additional information becomes available, it will be published in The Journal.

In spite of the fact that the American Medical Association was not brought closely into the polio-vaccine picture during its early days, the medical profession has, and, I am sure, will cooperate heartily in seeing that the vaccine is used and distributed properly. The following statement appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association for June 11, 1955. Mr. Speaker, due to the importance of the content of Dr. Martin's statement and the essence of time involved in reading this, I would appreciate these remarks being included in my speech.

STATEMENT ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE BY DR. WALTER B. MARTIN

Dr. Walter B. Martin, president of the American Medical Association, has publicly assured the cooperation of the medical profession in trying to work out any technical problems related to the use of poliomyelitis vaccine. In a statement released through AMA headquarters Dr. Martin said:

"The rechecking of manufacturing procedures and laboratory data following the outbreak of poliomyelitis in a few vaccinated children has caused unavoidable delay. In the midst of such tension the Eisenhower administration is to be commended for conducting a careful and scientific review of the entire situation before permitting continuance of the program.

"In behalf of myself and the AMA board of trustees, I have assured President Eisenhower that the Nation's physicians will cooperate in limiting poliomyelitis vaccination to children from 5 through 9 until the vaccine is available in larger supply. Children in this age group who do not receive the vaccine during the current program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for first and second graders will be vaccinated after its completion.

"The American Medical Association is asking all physicians to administer vaccine only to children in the priority age group of 5 through 9 until further notice. This will assure that the vaccine will be used first for those most susceptible to the disease.

"Physicians are all being asked to keep a record on each child vaccinated. This will include the name and age, the date of vaccination, the site, the manufacturer of the vaccine used, and the lot number.

"This voluntary priority vaccination plan follows the recommendation of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccination approved by Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby and contained in her report to the President on May 16."

With the continued cooperation of the medical and pharmacy professions, the proper implementation of the voluntary allocation program, and the financial assistance given to States by H. R. 7126 in its present form, everything which any sound legislator would consider is being done to make Salk polio vaccine available to every child in the United States. This has been accomplished in H. R. 7126 but with more Federal intervention than I believe necessary without passing legislation which would socialize the vaccine, or the doctors. Some of the extreme bills proposed, however, would have resulted in socialistic procedures. Had I the time, I would read in their entirety two editorials from Drug Trade News which describe the legislative situation very accurately. The editor of this publication is Dr. Robert L. Swain, who is also chairman of the board of trustees of the United States Pharmacopoeia, and offical compendium of drug standards. In these closing hours, time is so short that I shall quote only a few brief sentences and ask that the whole editorial be printed with this speech in the RECORD:

[From the Drug Trade News of June 20, 1955]

While there seems reason to feel that the Salk polio vaccine program now faces the green light, the strange happenings leading up to this happy development merit the most thoughtful study of the drug industry, the medical and pharmaceutical professions, and the public at large.

First of all, it should be well noted that the Government has lost none of its superability to mess up any nongovernmental situation when it seeks to take over.

The production of the vaccine was, and will ever be, an exacting scientific operation. The drug industry has been making biologicals for decades, and it alone has the know-how inherent in the most expertly qualified personnel, the complicated facilities and the experience covering many years of labor in the field.

The manufacture, administration, and distribution of the vaccine are matters best left to those accusomed to these tasks—a truth which has finally been accepted in Washington.

And, let's not kid ourselves that the socialization urge has been exterminated from the Washington air. A shift in political administration would bring the socialization gang out in force with little change in their fuzzy "thinking" and twisted outlook.

While the President, Mrs. Hobby, Dr. Jonas E. Salk, and others were insistent that the program be entrusted to experienced industrial and professional hands, many in and out of Congress began yelling for controls, even before the ink on the Francis Report had begun to dry.

Indeed, a control obsession seemed to engulf much of the Washington scene. Controls merely for the sake of controls became the order of the day.

No one seemed to bother whether controls were needed, how they were to be imposed, or what good they would accomplish. One bright-eyed Member of Congress actually proposed that the Government buy up all the vaccine and make it free to one and all with no questions asked.

The thing to remember is that the socialization gang has not disbanded—it is merely being held in check by an administration which believes in free competitive enterprise and is devoted to its welfare.

[From the Drug Trade News of July 18, 1955]

The polio controversy has about subsided. The heat and fury have about burned themselves out. The socialization gang in Congress, always on the alert for an excuse for more handouts of public funds have, for the time being, taken a licking. The violent, reckless, partisan charges of some political "experts" were based on things of which the most vocal knew less than nothing.

All of which leads us to hope that the following statement by Surgeon General Scheele, made to Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, with respect to the vaccine situation, may be read with understanding and appreciation:

"Our most fundamental objective is to promote the health and safety of the American people. We are therefore concerned with an effective vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis, and we are concerned with a safe vaccine.

"As in all scientific and medical endeavor, we must weigh potential benefits against possible hazards. This we have done in dealing with the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine.

"We have every belief that this vaccine will fulfill its bright promise as a major advance in the prevention and control of a disease that has shadowed the lives of children and young adults for many generations."

The calm, thoughtful attitudes which this statement manifests is in sharp and intelligent contrast with the senseless yapping with which the know-it-alls in and out of Congress greeted the Salk medical triumph over polio.

Above all, it is important to keep in mind that the polio vaccine embodies a scientific and medical problem. It should be handled primarily by the scientists and physicians of the United States. With research constantly going on in the drug-manufacturing laboratories, the vaccine will be improved. It is a good vaccine now, but will surely be made even better. The development of all new drugs in the past demonstrates this point.

What has taken place on Capitol Hill since the polio vaccine announcement on April 12 shows once again that politics and medicine do not mix. They should be kept separate for all time.

My original position was that the Biological Control Act of 1902 gave to the Federal Government ample authority to police the manufacture, distribution, and use of Salk vaccine. I was frank in my criticism of officials of the Department, of Health, Education, and Welfare for their desire to "get in on the act" at the time of the sensational announcement of the findings of the Francis evaluation.

Today, I deplore the precedent set—a precedent, new to our Government which has never financed countrywide mass innoculations for typhoid, smallpox, or other diseases which have at their height killed or affected the health of much greater segments of our population than polio.

I would point out, too, that the indigent and needy are not without medical attention throughout the United States today. Surely this vaccine could flow to the needy through the channel by which these same families receive medical attention and medication to meet other urgent requirements.

There is not a State or city in these United States that is not in a relatively better position financially than the Federal Government.

On the other hand, this bill is probably the least objectionable of those considered by either the House or the Senate. If it comes back from conference with one whit more Federal aid or Federal control, I shall vote and work against it. As it is, I accept it most reluctantly as the lesser of many evils and, as I vote for it, worry about the dangerous precedent it may set, but support it only in the hopes that as it speeds action, already slowed by Hollywood sensationalism and politics, that it may save one child's life, somewhere, that might otherwise be lost.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, something has been said here today about socialism in this bill. I think that certainly when this great Government of ours can spend millions of dollars every year in stamping out such things as the hoof-and-mouth disease in cattle, disease in hogs, and plant parasites, we can afford to do no less than what we are attempting to do in this bill.

The committee had full hearings following the panel discussion that was held on June 22 and 23. That panel was made up of the finest experts in this field that we have in this country. The decision to report out this bill was made because of the conclusions reached after hearing this distinguished panel of physicians and scientists.

The bill that was reported out by the full committee is a bill that was beamed to the action which we feel will be taken by practically every State in the Union to the end that the States will supply as much of this money as they are able to. That is the reason the date of this bill has been set up until December of 1957. Many of the State legislatures are out of session without having met this problem or attempting to do their part. We felt that giving that additional time would allow for the necessary State action in this field. Some of the States have tried to meet the problem. I believe the State of Florida has made an appropriation. But the Priest bill is a flexible bill and has in it one provision which will allow some of the funds to be used for State administrative expense, which certainly will occur. You are going to have the problem of transportation and of setting up the proper programs under the public health departments of the various States. This bill also recognizes the important part that has been played in this whole picture by many nonprofit organizations. I speak, of course, of the National Foundation and such organizations as the Crippled Children's Society and various other civic nonprofit organizations, which have made an important contribution in this field. This bill will allow them to dovetail their plans into a State plan, which must, of course, be approved by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of inserting their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, legislation now before Congress seeks funds to assist the States in the purchase of a new vaccine against poliomyelitis.

This legislation has strong bipartisan support. Congress has always responded affirmatively when it has an opportunity to improve the health and well-being of the American people. This vaccine represents one more advance in medicine and public health by providing a weapon which will lead to the prevention and ultimate eradication of this tragic disease which kills and cripples so many of our children and young adults.

Like most Americans, I have been extremely concerned with the events that have taken place since the Public Health Service released the first polio vaccine for general use on April 12. I was disturbed as a parent, and as the elected representative of many thousands of parents, over questions that were raised concerning the safety of the vaccine. But I was confident that those who were studying the problems and trying to find the answers were people of great scientific and professional stature. They were the outstanding experts in the country, including key staff from a Government agency that has an unparalleled record of public service for more than 150 years. I knew that we could rely on their judgment and should follow their recommendations.

The several hearings on the polio vaccine situation conducted during the last several months by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives provide a splendid illustration of thoughtful and objective inquiry. Congressman PRIEST and his colleagues on that committee have a distinguished record of service and are a credit to the Congress because it is in this vein that they approach all of the issues that come before them. They heard and evaluated all of the facts and opinions on the Salk vaccine. Then they reported out a bill to assist in its widespread distribution and use. By so doing, they indicated their confidence in the Public Health Service and its advisers, who have certified to the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine.

Yet there remains an apparently widespread opinion that the Government, notably the Public Health Service, has bungled the polio vaccine program. I would like to correct this impression, or at least put it in perspective.

In connection with this vaccine, two problems, totally unrelated in principle, have emerged. These are, first, the question of allocation and distribution of vaccine, and, second, the purely technical problems concerning the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine.

At the outset, I concede that the problem of how available supplies of vaccine should be distributed is one with which legislative and administrative branches of Federal, State, and local governments legitimately concern themselves. Honest differences of opinion may exist regarding this question, and such differences of opinion may tend to divide along partisan lines.

The development of the Salk vaccine represents the application and extension of knowledge which has been gained over a period of decades by research workers throughout the world. This specific vaccine itself was developed, tested, and evaluated by competent medical and other scientific men outside the Federal Government, largely without Federal financial support. This has been true of many of the most important achievements of medical science, and it will continue to be true of many developments in the future, although during recent years research workers and research establishments, supported in whole or in part by Federal appropriations, have contributed increasingly to the total intensive research attack on the cause, prevention, and cure of all kinds of physical and mental disorders.

The United States Public Health Service and its scientific and research facilities necessarily have participated in the immediate events leading to the beginning of this year's nationwide poliomyelitis-immunization program, as well as in events since the program got underway. The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and the Director of the National Institutes of Health, who happens to be retiring today after 30 years of service, are career public servants; they and their scientific colleagues are concerned with matters of public health, not politics. In their response to the problems that have arisen in connection with the polio vaccine there is every reason to believe that they have acted with courage and integrity.

It would be tragic indeed if the time ever arrived when medical and scientific workers in this country would find it necessary to make their decisions on the basis of any factors other than the medical and scientific facts that are available.

It is important for us to make a calm, objective appraisal of what has been going on in this country with respect to poliomyelitis. The broad program seeking to protect large numbers of children against this disease, as it has advanced, has encountered serious obstacles, delays, and disappointments. But these reverses have not invalidated the program, nor do they preclude its ultimate

success. Such difficulties as have been encountered are inherent in the early phases of any optimistic nationwide health program. Briefly, this is what has happened.

More than 400,000 children received poliomyelitis vaccine last year, and the results indicated that the Salk vaccine used was both effective and safe.

Millions of children have been vaccinated this year. As yet, there have been fewer cases of poliomyelitis than in a normal year. The only cloud has been that early in the program an unusual number of children who had received certain lots of the product of a single laboratory were stricken with paralytic poliomyelitis.

The unexpected development of these cases caused a suspension of the product of that laboratory and a review of the manufacturing and testing procedures in the production of the vaccine by all companies. This study revealed that modified technical procedures might increase the safety of all poliomyelitis vaccine.

The Public Health Service recommended that further vaccinations be held up pending the reappraisal of existing vaccine in the light of this new knowledge, and the standards for production and testing of the vaccine were revised. This suspension of immunization resulted in a delay which was obviously necessary and warranted to assure the utmost of safety on the basis of existing knowledge.

The vaccination program was resumed, using vaccine which met the revised criteria. As manufacturers were progressively better able to produce under these criteria, the volume of available vaccine increased.

It is predictable that there will be enough vaccine available in the next 12 months to vaccinate a large part of the most susceptible age group. In the meantime, further improvements in the vaccine are being sought through research, and when they are found, they too, will be applied.

It is much easier to summarize these developments after they have occurred. It was not so easy to state them at the time they were happening. This, indeed, seems to be one of the principal points raised by those who have chosen to be critical of the Government's handling of the polio vaccine problem this year. Why, they ask, did the Public Health Service not state the facts? Why did they withhold information which properly should have been given to the American public? A corollary point of attack by critics is on the point of seeming vacillation on the part of the Public Health Service. Why, they ask, did not someone make up his mind? Was the vaccine safe, or was it not?

I am a Congressman, not a scientist. I have not heard, nor could I state, the technical answers to these questions. But I have followed the situation very closely. I have asked the Public Health Service some questions that have arisen in my mind. And I have concluded that—much as it has been misunderstood and misinterpreted—the Public Health Service has once again demonstrated its capacity for strong and affirmative action on matters affecting the health of our people. Let me tell you how I have reached that conclusion.

The Public Health Service had strong evidence that the Salk vaccine is a good vaccine—not a perfect one, perhaps, and certainly not one that could not be improved—but good in the sense that it could be made safe enough and effective enough so that its use was fully warranted. Thus, even when there was temporary trouble with it, the Public Health Service—in the absence of cold scientific evidence of a basic rather than a temporary defect—had an obligation to sustain instead of destroy public confidence in the vaccine. This fact must be kept in mind when one looks at the other parts of the problem. As the Nation's official health agency, it was confident that use of the vaccine would prevent many cases of paralytic polio that otherwise would occur. Yet—still believing this—the Public Health Service was forced to suspend the vaccination program and establish more stringent safety requirements. This posed an awkward seeming contradiction; the vaccine was known to be good on the basis of 1954 trials, but it could now be tested to give greater assurance of safety, and so the program should mark time until changes could be made.

Why did this happen? Who was at fault? The Public Health Service has freely stated its role and documented its actions, leaving it for others to assess the blame. It is possible to see this matter so much more clearly in retrospect.

The deceptively simple fact is this: The assumption had been, based on earlier experience, that all live virus particles in the vaccine would be inactivated by treatment with formaldehyde under certain conditions. After a careful and detailed inquiry this spring, this turned out to be in error; instead, it appeared that even with the best of manufacturing processes, a few virus particles could and often did resist treatment with formaldehyde. This imposed an unexpected burden on the safety tests. The evidence was that they were not adequate to establish with certainty the absence of live virus in trace amounts. So the safety tests had to be strengthened. They have been, and now the whole program is back in gear.

There was a period of many weeks, then, when the Public Health Service and its talented group of advisers simply did not know what had gone wrong with the inactivation process in large-scale manufacture and what needed to be done to correct this unexpected development. Yet answers were demanded on an almost hourly basis. The demand for action reached hysterical proportions. And, because there was no action, there was widespread criticism.

In truth, there was plenty of action. The Nation's outstanding scientific experts on immunization and poliomyelitis, and representatives of all companies manufacturing poliomyelitis vaccine, were literally working night and day trying to find an explanation for the relationship between the vaccine and the occurrence of the cases of poliomyelitis. Even today, the full meaning of this is not understood. The subject remains under study, but it may be months or even years before every factor is completely understood. No amount of insistence or clamor is going to hasten that understanding.

In the meantime, it is well to remember that mechanized, pushbutton medicine and public health can never be attained. The very nature of every being in the biological world precludes this—and this includes man, as well as the micro-organisms that cause many of man's diseases.

Throughout the history of medicine and public health, every great advance has been accomplished a step at a time, with each new and unforeseen obstacle overcome as it has been encountered. This has always involved a certain amount of trial, error, discovery of new knowledge, correction of error, and continued movement forward. This process will characterize the ultimate control of poliomyelitis as it has characterized all other great achievements in medicine and public health.

It would be wonderful, indeed, if there were available unlimited quantities of an absolutely effective, absolutely safe vaccine to provide absolutely assured immunity against poliomyelitis for every person in the United States—or throughout the world, for that matter. The fact is, however, that with existing knowledge it is not possible to produce unlimited quantities of an ideal product with infinite speed.

The history of the present immunization program reveals that competent, conscientious workers have labored earnestly, diligently, and as rapidly as they could to achieve effective, safe immunization of a maximum number of people. They are to be praised rather than censured for their work.

The United States Public Health Service is concerned primarily with the prevention and control of disease. The action the Service has taken with respect to poliomyelitis vaccine, and the action that it will take in the future stems only from its purpose to serve the people well.

It would be tragic indeed if the Public Health Service programs or the individuals who direct them should suffer because of their intelligent, conscientious, and—it now proves—successful efforts to sustain the Salk vaccine during this critical period.

My work as chairman and member of the appropriations subcommittee dealing in part with the Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health, has kept me in close touch with their work and their leaders for nearly 10 years. Theirs is a vital, complex function of the Federal Government. As might be expected, they sometimes make mistakes which are discernible in retrospect, and thus become fair game for the second-guessers. But—to my knowledge—they have never made a serious one, and never made one which stemmed from an improper motive.

In the polio matter, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr.

Leonard A. Scheele, has come under special attack, although he has a distinguished record of nearly 25 years of public service, the last 8 as the Nation's senior health officer. His record demonstrates, and all those who work with him and for him know, that he is diligent, conscientious, alert, and capable. He seeks out the best advice he can get on critical issues, since matters of health are rarely matters of pure logic. Then, with this advice, he makes his decision—and stands by it as his, instead of running away from his responsibilities.

He had the courage to take an unpopular course of action in connection with the Salk vaccine. He took this action having first secured the advice and judgment of everyone who could possibly have anything of substance to contribute—the scientists of the Nation (including those who had been critics of the Salk vaccine even before it was licensed); those who were intimately connected with the development of the vaccine, including Salk himself; the highly competent representatives of the vaccine manufacturers; and his own scientific and professional staff at the National Institutes of Health.

Then—given all the facts—he decided to stop the immunization program temporarily, to change the production and testing procedures, and to delay the availability of vaccine in quantity.

He of course knew he would be attacked for this course of action. But—instead of indulging in the popular pastime of name-calling and excoriating bungling bureaucrat—the American people should thank this man who kept the polio program alive when a single wrong decision or a single false move might have destroyed the program altogther and set back polio prevention by many years.

I want to speak, too, of the wisdom and competence and dedication of the scientists and scientific administrators at the National Institutes of Health, where the medical and scientific part of the polio vaccine problem has been centered.

Dr. William H. Sebrell, Jr., who has just retired as Director of that great research institution, and Dr. James A. Shannon, his successor, have appeared before our committee on literally dozens of occasions. Dr. Sebrell has directed the building of the Institutes into an organization of which we as a Nation can well be proud. This is not a matter of size or dollars, nor even merely a matter of scope and direction. The unique quality Dr. Sebrell has contributed to this institution is leadership to give emphasis to quality and research substance and results. Dr. Sebrell and his colleagues have given the Congress and the American people confidence that disease can be conquered by research brought to practical application—in much the same way, strangely enough, as polio seems about to be conquered. It would be ironic indeed if the fine institution they represent should suffer in public and professional esteem because of their work to sustain the Salk vaccine in the face of the difficulties met by industry in producing it consistently on a large scale in accordance with the theorectical and experimental calculations that had been the basis for its licensing. And it would be tragic if their larger research mission should be clouded by irresponsible attack based on misunderstanding of their role in one phase in the evolution of a vaccine against poliomyelitis.

The National Institutes of Health does polio research as one function of one of its institutes, and it licenses and releases polio vaccine as one among hundreds of biological products produced by industry and regulated by government to protect the interests of the American public. We must not forget that the broad mission of the National Institutes of Health covers all of medical research. Cancer, heart disease, mental illness, arthritis, diabetes, cerebral palsy, elipepsy, blindness—these and all the other major diseases which kill and maim the American people are studied in an intensive research attack that represents the Government's primary effort to find a way to achieve better health for more Americans. The program supports a large part of the research that is conducted in the Nation's medical schools and universities, and it gives special attention to providing training opportunities for young medical scientists so that progress will not be impeded by a shortage of trained research workers. The National Institutes of Health has been the subject of special congressional interest since World War II. It has been built upon a solid basis, to take advantage of research opportunity and to meet the needs of medical science. It has already produced results of great consequence to the public health. We who have watched the Institutes carefully and participated in their development have full confidence in their programs and in the caliber and integrity of their leaders.

Dr. Shannon particularly, as Associate Director of the National Institutes of Health responsible for activities at Bethesda, had a direct, personal role in each step that was taken after the difficulty with polio vaccine first arose. The scientific decisions that affected Dr. Scheele's administrative decisions were primarily his, based upon advice received from a committee of technical experts. Together, they achieved an understanding of the partial failure of what was presumed to be total virus inactivation, leading the the development of new testing procedures and the establishment of criteria to govern resumption of the polio vaccine program. The Nation is fortunate, indeed, to have a man of such professional and administrative stature to head this, one of the most important of the governmental programs.

I am informed that the polio vaccine problems are pretty well over. There will be further improvements in the vaccine as the result of developmental research that is now in progress. It may be that ultimately there will be a different vaccine to replace the one which now bears the name of the gifted scientist from the University of Pittsburgh. But the end of polio as a major public health problem in this country is in sight. In the meantime, a safe and effective vaccine is being made available in ever-increasing amounts. The completion of most of the generous immunization program under the auspices of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is at hand. We go now into a period of broad use of the vaccine through federally aided State programs, and finally into a period of routine availability through private channels.

Medicine and public health have made a tangible advance against another disease, and have learned a great deal in the process.

Let us, too, view the health of the Nation in perspective. Let us be grateful for the progress that has been made—and let us, without expecting the impossible, give thoughtful and consistent support to those programs whose dedication is to a bright future for the health and well-being of all Americans.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of grave importance to the people of America. It has a special significance with reference to the welfare of our children. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made a very complete study of the subject which is reflected by its splendid report.

The bill would provide for the making of grants to the several States to assist them in carrying out poliomyelitis vaccination programs.

A grant would be made only if the State submits an application which is approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as being in compliance with certain conditions specified in the bill.

Poliomyelitis as a disease has been known for thousands of years. However, the cause of the disease, which is sometimes accompanied by paralysis and so has been called infantile paralysis, was not at all understood until the latter part of the 19th century. Then, scientists working on diseases of the nervous system for the first time demonstrated that the cause of the paralysis lies in damage to the central nervous system and results from the destruction of those nerve cells which interlace the muscles.

With the entry of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis into the research field, numerous scientists were brought into this field who had never before done research on poliomyelitis. A great deal of new information was assembled over a comparatively brief span of time.

These discoveries formed the basis for attempts at prevention and control of poliomyelitis.

It has been particularly disturbing that during the last 20 years, the trend of the annual case rate of the disease has been upward. Particularly during the last decade, a marked increase has occurred. The death rate has shown a slight but definite increase. In 1952, for the Nation, both the case rate and the estimated death rate were the highest since the 1916 polio epidemic.

In recent years, roughly 35,000 to 50,000 cases have been reported. For a population of about 160 million, that comes to about 25 reported cases for 100,000 population. However, this figure is deceptive, since it is an average for the entire country and for all age groups. It has been found that in some parts of the

country, the rate may be as low as 2 or 3 per 100,000 but in other parts of the country it may be as high as 200 or 300 per 100,000. It has further been found that many age groups seem relatively immune, while other age groups are particularly prone to becoming infected with poliomyelitis.

It may be said that perhaps one-half of the approximately 40,000 cases per year are paralytic. Many of these patients recover, but many remain permanently paralyzed.

It is particularly important to be aware of the fact that the number of patients who remain paralyzed and who require continuing care is cumulative. In January 1952 the Nation had 45,000 patients requiring continuing care, and in January 1953, 60,000. In January 1954, this number rose to 67,000, and in January 1955 reached the figure of 71,000.

Quite apart, however, from these facts, the degree of public awareness which exists of the disease as a dread disease, in the truest meaning of this term, has greatly stimulated efforts to control the disease. Now, for the first time, control of the disease appears within reach.

Dr. Jonas Salk developed a vaccine based on his early studies in Pittsburgh. It was demonstrated as being both safe for use and effective in the production of antibodies, though the number of vaccinated individuals studies was small.

Because of the need for studies on a large scale, announcement was made in the autumn of 1953 by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis of its decision to conduct a large-scale field trial with the vaccine develcped by Dr. Salk. This plan was reported to this committee in hearings on the subject of poliomyelitis held in October 1953. The results of the field trial of 1954 were announced on April 12, 1955. On the basis of this report, the National Foundation, the Public Health Service, and the manufacturers felt that the Salk vaccine was both safe and effective against paralytic poliomyelitis. Thereupon, under the biologics-control law—section 351 of the Public Health Service Act—licenses were issued to six manufacturers to produce and distribute the vaccine.

Shortly after the licensing of the vaccine, President Eisenhower promised the American people that he would recommend a program which would assure that no child would be denied poliomyelitis vaccine because of inability to pay for it. The administration's program proposed grants-in-aid in the amount of $28 million to States for purchase of vaccine sufficient to vaccinate approximately 22 percent of the unvaccinated children in the country under 20 years of age. Legislation to effectuate this program was introduced in both Houses of Congress. Other vaccine problems, as for example the fair division of the vaccine among the States during the initial period of short supply and the establishment of priority groups depending on the degree of susceptibility, were dealt with in a so-called voluntary program prepared by the administration.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce opened its hearings on poliomyelitis vaccination assistance legislation on May 25, 1955, and held hearings on the legislation sponsored by the administration, H. R. 6286. This proposed legislation, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, authorized appropriation of $28 million to be made available to the States for the purchase of vaccine. These funds were believed by the administration to be adequate to pay the cost of vaccine for children through age 19 in low-income families. The money would be paid to States upon assurance by the State that no children within the priority age groups established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be denied vaccinations by reason of the child's inability to pay the cost thereof.

After 2 days of testimony by administrative witnesses on the administration's bill and facts relating to the safety testing of the Salk vaccine, the hearings were concluded.

The committee felt that so many conflicting statements had been made by public officials, private groups, and individuals connected with the production, safety, testing, distribution, and application of the vaccine that it was necessary to obtain independent scientific advice, primarily with respect to the safety of the vaccine, before taking action on any legislation providing for Federal funds for the purchase of the vaccine. Therefore, on June 14, 1955, the chairman of the committee asked Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences, to assist the committee in selecting a representative panel of experts qualified to discuss the scientific problems involved in the legislation and to suggest an impartial chairman who would preside over the panel discussion. Dr. Bronk graciously consented to cooperate with the committee in this undertaking.

Dr. Bronk selected Dr. John R. Paul, of the Yale University School of Medicine, to act as impartial chairman and Dr. Paul accepted the invitation. The panel of scientists invited by Dr. Bronk included some of the most outstanding experts in the field of virology, immunization, epidemiology, and other related fields of medical science and public health.

The panel, under Dr. Paul's chairmanship, made its presentation on June 22 and 23. The panel presentation made it clear that the use of the Salk vaccine involved certain risks. However, on the basis of the panel presentation, the committee believes that the experts, on the whole, feel the risks involved are small in comparison with the benefits which they expect can be derived from the application of the vaccine. Furthermore, there is a distinct possibility, according to the testimony, that the vaccine will be made still safer by substituting a less virulent strain of the virus for one of the strains now used in the production of the vaccine.

The committee agreed unanimously that the bill, as amended, contains the best of all the features which have been suggested in the different bills and programs which had been submitted to this committee.

First. The bill, as amended, provides an adequate formula grant to assure minimum vaccination programs for all States.

Second. The bill, as amended, leaves the greatest possible flexibility to the States in developing vaccination programs suitable to their needs and flexible enough to meet the needs of different geographical areas and communities within the States.

Third. The bill, as amended, provides adequate funds to the States to be used for the planning of vaccination programs and the conducting of such programs by public agencies within the States.

Fourth. The bill, as amended, provides that in programs conducted by public agencies within the States no means test or other discrimination based on financial ability of individuals will be imposed.

Fifth. Finally, the bill provides a sufficiently long period of time within which funds authorized to be appropriated under the bill, as amended, will be available, and during which the States may use the funds allotted to them for the purchase of vaccine and the planning and conducting of vaccination programs.

The bill passed by the Senate differs in some respects to the bill our committee reported. It will therefore be a subject of conference between the Senate and the House conferees if adopted by the House.

It is my opinion that this bill which has the President's approval should be adopted.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with unusual personal interest to the discussion here today. Mine is the intense interest that is shared by every father and mother in this country who, for the past weeks and months, have worried and concerned themselves about the polio situation and who are, even now, seeking divine guidance to direct them to reach the right decision on whether or not they should have their children inoculated with the Salk antipolio vaccine.

As I have listened to the debate, I have been forced to come to the reluctant conclusion that I must be one of those unfortunate people whom the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] would describe as having a small scientific mind. I will say this—if it takes a big, scientific mind to understand the rationalization I have been listening to on the other side of the aisle, I obviously do not have such a mentality. I confess that it is beyond my intellectual capability to grasp how any one can convert Mrs. Hobby's big blunder into a beautiful job, well done. The administration's handling of the polio vaccine program may have been a successful operation; but unfortunately, it was one of those successful operations where too many of the patients died.

If the Lord did not bless me with a scientific mind, he has blessed me with a fine, healthy family of five growing children and, like millions of fathers and mothers, I am presently struggling with the problem of whether or not I should have these children inoculated against this dread disease. I regret that for all the high-sounding phrases—for all the praise heaped high—and for all the talk

about medals being in order, none of the gentlemen across the way has said anything which will help me in coming to the right decision on this very difficult question.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, has so emphatically said, you can talk all you want to, but you cannot change the facts. And the facts are that fumbling politics in the executive branch of our Government has resulted in such an inadequate and inept job of handling this miracle which the men of science made available, that millions of American mothers and fathers now find themselves in the difficult and uncomfortable position in which I am in this afternoon.

If it is politics for me to protest against the gross mishandling of the whole polio vaccine question by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; if it is politics for me to publicly point my finger to the place where the blame lies—then politics it is.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in spite of certain misgivings, I will support this important legislation which provides for making grants to assist the several States in carrying out the polio vaccination program.

The unfortunate Cutter incident has undoubtedly alerted the Department of Public Health, Education, and Welfare as well as the Surgeon General of the United States as to responsibility with respect to biological control. It is to be expected that no vaccine or other biological will be released unless and until it has been thoroughly analyzed and tested so that it is safe and qualified to serve the purpose which it purports to serve. This must be particularly true when a vaccine is intended for mass inoculations. When the health of our young people is involved, there can be no compromise with safety.

In testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 13, 1955, it was admitted by the Surgeon General that all batches of the vaccine were not tested prior to release for mass inoculation. The Surgeon General of the United States provided the following report of tests which were made on lots of polio vaccine released on or after April 12, 1955:

Cutter: Lot No. 19460.
Lilly: None.
Parke-Davis: Lot No. 1015.
Pitman Moore: Lot No. 175006.
Wyeth: Lots Nos. 325, 325, 328.
Sharp & Dohme: None.

Thirty-five other lots were released on protocol without complete tissue and monkey tests at the National Institutes of Health. In 24 of these lots, tissue-culture tests had been completed at the National Institutes of Health before release (p. 85 of the committee report of hearings on the Salk vaccine).

It appears, therefore, that large quantities of the vaccine were released on protocol and without complete tissue and monkey tests.

On page 87 of the committee hearings, I asked the following questions and received the indicated answers on the question as to whether or not the Federal Government should have a greater control of a mass-inoculation program:

Mr. VANIK. Let me get to this next point. As a matter of law, shouldn't the Federal Government have a greater control of a mass-inoculation program than was afforded in this instance?

Dr. SCHEELE. I personally don't believe so.

Mr. VANIK. You think then it is safe and wise, as a matter of governmental policy, to permit a private organization, or someone outside of the Government, to decide whether or not millions of our youngsters should be inoculated, regardless of what the vaccine is?

Dr. SCHEELE. Well, this is not a matter in which I think we should have Federal control or State control or county or city control. The final responsibility rests on the individual doctor who gives the individual injection, for making the determination of whether it will be done or not.

I believe that the Surgeon General of the United States and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have changed their concepts about the responsibility of the Federal Government with respect to a new biological or vaccine, particularly when a mass inoculation is involved. The public health authorities of the various States and the cities and doctors throughout America rely upon the judgment of the public health authorities of America on the safety of a vaccine and the public health authorities of America must be right.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee in the hope that I may get one particular phase cleared up. As I am one who, just as does every Member of the House, worries considerably about the health and welfare of our constituents, I want to do everything I can toward alleviation of polio. Nonetheless, I am disturbed about the precedent that this may make in the field of the Federal Government getting into the field of medicine. Referring, if I may, to page 7 of the committee report, I notice the phrase, for instance, "most of the States provide free vaccines and other antigens to local health departments, and through them to local physicians."

Inasmuch as the polio problem cannot at the moment, at least, be referred to as a national epidemic, I am wondering why the committee recommended this action of Federal contribution and did not recommend it for other specific things such as tetanus and other diseases where vaccines are required.

Mr. PRIEST. May I reply to the gentleman in stating that under the existing public health and service law, under the basic act, there is authority for assistance to the States. As a matter of fact, Under Secretary Perkins, in a conversation with me, suggested on one occasion that it was the opinion of the Department that they did not need to have new authorizing legislation, but that they thought it wise in this case to do so. It was his feeling at the time that it could be handled under the broad authority of existing law. Actually, as a matter of fact, that is what the other body did.

They struck out a limitation of $30 million in the existing law in that program for the States, and left an open-end appropriation in that particular section. Now, with that authority already existing, the committee felt that in this particular situation, with the foundation carrying on a program of first and second graders for two shots only during the coming few months, it was the feeling of our committee in studying this matter for many, many weeks that this legislation was important to give the greatest opportunity to American children to receive this vaccine, which we considered to be as safe and as efficient as a vaccine of this nature can be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand, then, that it is your feeling that this does not change existing legislation and would set no precedent in other cases for the Federal Government to provide vaccine or other medicines?

Mr. PRIEST. It does not change the basic legislation. A formula for allocations and a few technical matters are not in existing law. But there is a formula in existing law, in the basic law, for allocations to States to do particular vaccinations. That is especially true in case of an epidemic, but the authority is there.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in all the hearings we had on the matter this bill was considered to be nonpartisan legislation. The chairman was able to provide an excellent panel. We had some good hearings on the matter by some of the outstanding men in the world in this field. After those hearings were completed, and that was before the subcommittee of which I happen to be a member, as is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], we decided to come forward with this kind of a bill. We believe it is based on the evidence we heard at these hearings. It follows the law previously adhered to by this Congress in allocations to the States in this kind of legislation. It is a good bill and it is in the best interests of all the country. I believe it is especially needed at this time when there is considerable confusion as to how all these children are going to receive these vaccinations. This, in my estimation, provides an orderly procedure for undertaking the entire programs.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I favor making polio vaccine available to every child in the United States at public expense if that help is needed; but I oppose suspension of the rule, because I believe that this measure is important enough to be entitled to full consideration. It should also be open to amendment, and under the present procedure that is not possible, and the Members are asked to pass on this issue on the basis of "take it or leave it."

Polio is such a dread disease and the chance of combatting it with vaccine is such a momentous forward step, that it seems almost sordid to bring up the question of how the costs of this program should be apportioned. But, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to draw up legislation even on such an important and emotional subject as this in a manner that will be fair.

Although the bill now before us does not carry an appropriation, it should be noted that the supplemental appropriation for 1956—H. R. 7278—has already made appropriation for this program as set forth in the Conference Report which was approved by this House only last Saturday and which has since been approved by the Senate:

For grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955, $60 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 7126 or S. 2501, 84th Congress.

Amended to $30 million.

Mr. Speaker, despite what the chairman of the committee has just said in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio, this bill brings forward what is essentially a new Federal-aid project. What the Federal-aid system really amounts to, is that money is taken from some States and distributed to others.

Massachusetts has already passed legislation to provide polio vaccine at the State's expense for every child in need of this assistance. Why should not other States do the same? If it is said that some States cannot afford it, let legislation be brought forward frankly drafted to meet such a situation. This bill, however, goes far beyond that.

Massachusetts has not fared well in Federal-aid programs. To put it another way, I might say that the taxpayers of Massachusetts have been very generous to other sections of the country in the proportionate amount which they have furnished to the Federal Government for expenditure in other States. May I give just one example, taken from the Federal-aid program for highways? The Federal 2-cent a gallon gasoline tax produced in 1954 approximately $3 million from Massachusetts, and seven-hundred-odd thousand dollars from Alabama. During the same year, Federal highway aid was paid to Alabama in the amount of $15 million, and to Massachusetts in the amount of about $9,250,000. It is easy to understand why the senior Senator from Alabama is so interested in the pending measure, which is likely to produce a somewhat similar result.

The Federal-aid system should not be expanded unless the need is clear. The recent report from the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations said at page 123:

Consequently, where the activity is one normally considered the primary responsibility of State and local governments, substantial evidence should be required that national participation is necessary in order to protect or to promote the national interest.

Care of local medical needs has long been the primary responsibility of State and local governmental action.

The same report quotes Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, as follows at page 130:

A grant-in-aid program should be the exception rather than the rule. Federal grants are not cloaked in magic. They derive their support from the same taxpayers that provide the wherewithal for all levels of government. If grants should become a part of every governmental activity, there is good reason to believe we would lose some of the substance of our present republican form of government and Federal system. President Andrew Jackson foresaw this result in 1833, when he stated that Congress should not be the tax gatherer and paymaster for State governments. "It appears to me," he said, "that a more direct road to consolidation cannot be devised."

The question of a fair apportionment of the costs of furnishing vaccine should not be confused with the other issues which have been mentioned in debate, such as the obligation of the Federal Government to supervise the production of such a critical material as vaccine, or to assure a fair distribution of a needed medicine which is in short supply. After all, the Federal Government inspects and passes on meat, but it does not provide that meat at Federal expense for the States or their inhabitants.

There is one amendment to this bill which I believe is entitled to fair consideration, and which cannot be considered under the procedure under which this measure is being brought before the House. That amendment is to change the terminal date of this program from December 31, 1957 to December 31, 1956. That would make this bill truly an emergency measure, and the Congress would have an opportunity next January to give the important principle involved in this legislation due consideration, rather than having it rushed through on the last day of the session under this procedure which makes full consideration impossible. For example, although this is a matter in which I believe the interests of the State of which I represent a part are heavily involved, I could receive but a few short minutes in which to try to defend its interests before this body.

The committee report on this bill refers to a prior bill on the same subject—H. R. 6286—as a bill sponsored by the administration. This bill provided a terminal date for the program of December 31, 1956. The bill now before the House, H. R. 7126, which is in effect being substituted for the Senate bill, originally contained a terminal date of December 31, 1956, but a committee amendment proposes to change that date to December 31, 1957.

To retain the date originally provided of December 31, 1956, would improve this legislation, make it truly emergency legislation, and make possible mature consideration of the subject next year when the emotional impacts of this new discovery, and the serious difficulties which have arisen in connection with it, are not so strong. This bill should not be considered under the procedure here suggested. I am not suggesting that this bill be defeated, but merely that a procedure be adopted which will permit more full, fair and orderly consideration.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state that the administration is in favor of this legislation and believes it is a much better bill than the one passed in the other body and would like to see it enacted into law.

If I might inquire of the chairman, I understand he has offered an amendment which cleared up the only doubt which existed in the mind of the administration.

Mr. PRIEST. That amendment is included in the bill that is now under consideration.

May I add, if the gentleman will yield further, that I hope we might pass this bill at this time with a good majority. We will have to go to conference, because the other bill is quite different in its approach to this subject. I believe we have developed a piece of legislation that will meet any emergency situation that may come between now and January, and give us a second look at this whole subject in January.

Mr. MARTIN. I join in urging the passage of the legislation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes, and I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that this bill was brought in as an emergency measure with a termination date of December 31, 1956?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. And is it not a fact that the gentleman's committee extended it another year to December 31, 1957?

Mr. PRIEST. Yes; that was explained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] a few minutes ago. Most State legislatures were in adjournment and will not meet again until early in 1957, when they could make their own appropriations. We felt that the date should be extended until the State legislatures may convene once more.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I submit that on a measure of this importance we should have an opportunity to present amendments and for full discussion. I therefore oppose the suspending of the rules.

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

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I think it might be well to point out that I am going to vote for the measure, not because I like the bill as written, for I think it is lacking in a number of parts. I hope, however, if it is passed, that the conferees will stand fast on this approach rather than the overall blanket approach provided by the other body. And there is one thing I hope we will always be conscious of: Do not forget you are providing free vaccine. The children who can afford it will come and get it, and many deserving children will not get it because they have not the means to go down first

and get it. I merely call that to your attention. However, I hope something can be done for this worthy cause.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill, H. R. 7126, and House Resolution 330 were laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment to S. 2501 and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRIEST, CARLYLE, ROBERTS, WOLVERTON, and HESELTON.

STRENGTHENING THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2237) to amend the act of May 26, 1949, to strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U. S. C. 151 (a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There shall be in the Department of State in addition to the Secretary of State an Under Secretary of State, 3 Deputy Under Secretaries of State, and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of said act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of State and the officers referred to in section 1 of this act, as amended, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Counselor of the Department of State and the Legal Adviser who are required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall rank equally with and shall receive the same salary as the Assistant Secretaries of State. Any such officer holding office at the time the provisions of this act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this act, as amended. Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State."

SEC. 3. The President may initially fill two of the Deputy Under Secretary positions established in section 1 of this act by appointing, without further advice and consent of the Senate, the 2 Deputy Under Secretaries of State who, on the date of the enactment of this act, held that designation pursuant to authority contained in section 2 of the act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111).

SEC. 4. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended (hereinafter referred to as "such act"), is amended by striking the first sentence of said section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There shall be eight classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be the same as that for an Assistant Secretary of State.".

SEC. 5. Section 501 (a) of such act is amended by adding the phrase "career ambassadors and" immediately following the word "including".

SEC. 6. Section 502 (a) of such act is amended by inserting the phrase "class of career ambassador and" immediately following the phrase "qualified for appointment to the", and by adding the following sentence at the end of said subsection: "No person shall be appointed into the class of career ambassador who has not (1) served for at least 15 years in a position of responsibility in a Government agency, or agencies, including at least 3 years as a career minister; (2) rendered exceptionally distinguished service to the Government; and (3) met such other requirements as the Secretary shall prescribe.".

SEC. 7. Section 518 of such act is amended by inserting the words "career ambassador or" immediately following the phrase "to the class of".

SEC. 8. Section 631 of such act is amended by inserting the words "a career ambassador or" immediately after the words "who is".

SEC. 9. Section 632 of such act is amended by inserting the words "a career ambassador or" immediately following the words "who is not".

SEC. 10. (a) Section 811 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "811. (a)" and inserting "811." in lieu thereof and by striking out the phrase "of all participants" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "received by each participant".

(b) Section 811 (b) of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. Section 821 (a) of such act is amended by striking the phrase ", not exceeding $13,500 per annum," and "five years next preceding the date of his retirement" and inserting the phrase "highest 5 consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the fund," immediately preceding the phrase "multiplied by."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, we have in the State Department now a Secretary of State, an Under Secretary of State, and 10 Assistant Secretaries of State. Two of those ten Assistant Secretaries are designated as Deputy Under Secretaries of State.

This bill creates an additional Deputy Under Secretary of State and gives statutory position to the Assistant Secretaries of State who are designated as Deputy Under Secretaries of State. Thus, there will be three positions of Deputy Under Secretary.

The bill further provides for advancing the Director of the Policy Planning Staff and the Controller, both now listed as GS–18's, to fill the places of the two Assistant Secretaries of State who have been designated by this bill as Deputy Under Secretaries of State.

When the Senate bill came to us it provided for increased salaries for these individuals. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs struck that out, because we did not think a bill of this kind should provide for salary increases. It was our thought that such a matter should be handled by basic legislation covering all executive departments.

The bill will cost the taxpayers of the United States $15,000 for the additional Deputy Under Secretary of State. It will cost $200 each, or the difference between $14,800 and $15,000, for the 2 men who are raised from GS–18 to Assistant Secretaries of State. It will also cost $200 to raise the legal adviser from his present salary, which is $14,800, to a rate equal to that of an Assistant Secretary, that is, $15,000. The total authorization in this bill under present salary scales is $15,600.

The bill is supported by the administration. It has passed the Senate, and was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I hope there will not be any opposition to the bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House before the conclusion of this session that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has held hearings on the Status of Forces Agreement as he said he would during debate on the Reserve bill. We have had 4 or 5 days of hearings, but, unfortunately, we were not able to conclude them, nor were we able to offer rebuttal to some of the testimony of the executive department. The chairman has suggested, however, that the hearings will continue in January, at which time we will have more material to submit.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that this session is concluding without having taken final action to protect our servicemen from the jeopardy of trial and imprisonment in foreign lands. I had hoped that our efforts to bring about modifications of the Status of Forces Treaty would be successful this year. I am heartened, however, by the feeling that a great deal has been accomplished in the 60 days since the subject was first considered in the House and I am hopeful that the awakening interest of the membership and the growing public interest will bring action as soon as we reconvene in January. At this time it seems to me appropriate to review our action with regard to the Status of Forces Treaty since May 18.

Previous to May 18 I believe the only congressional action with regard to the status of forces had been the introduction of two sense resolutions and a review of operations under the treaty by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body.

On May 18 during debate on H. R. 5297, the first Reserve plan, the House adopted by a vote of 174 to 56 my amendment providing that no men inducted,

enlisted, or called to active duty after the date of the act could be sent to any foreign installation where they would be subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the foreign nation.

I consider that vote tremendously significant. It was the first expression of the House of Representatives on the Status of Forces Agreement. It indicated the overwhelming feeling of the membership, which is I believe an accurate reflection of sentiment nationally, that the Constitution of the United States should follow the flag and that the defenders of that Constitution, no matter where they were sent, should be entitled to all of the protections and guaranties that it confers upon freeborn Americans.

Unfortunately, H. R. 5297 was not adopted with my amendment, and it remains the unfinished business of the House.

During debate on May 18 several Members suggested that while they deplored the Status of Forces Agreement, they did not believe it proper to treat the subject as an amendment to other legislation.

Accordingly, on the same day, I introduced House Joint Resolution 309, directing the President to seek modification or elimination of article VII of that agreement or, failing in that effort, to denounce it at the earliest possible date. House Joint Resolution 309 is a proper, legal method for expressing the will of the Congress on this subject.

On June 30 during debate on the Mutual Security Act, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] took up the fight for modification of the agreement with an amendment which required the waiver of the right of criminal jurisdiction as a condition to receiving aid and assistance from the United States. This, too, is a proper and constitutional method of handling the problem, being a limitation upon an appropriation.

Once again many Members indicated sympathy with our objective but stated they did not believe the subject should be treated as an amendment to any other bill.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] agreed that the Foreign Affairs Committee would conduct hearings on House Joint Resolution 309 and the identical resolutions introduced by others, and the amendment by the gentleman from Idaho was defeated.

At this point let me say that the gentleman from Idaho did not propose any reopening of treaties or denunciation of agreements. His amendment would not have required any new negotiations. It provided simply that any foreign nation that wanted our financial assistance would waive criminal jurisdiction over our men, and that any nation that refused to waive jurisdiction would not get our aid. Members said that no foreign nation would submit to such conditions and that it would ruin the foreign aid and mutual defense assistance programs. Unfortunately, we did not not know at the time that Greece had already voluntarily waived its rights to criminal jurisdiction over our men, thus indicating that other nations would be willing to do the same. Had that fact been known to us, I believe the Budge amendment might now be part of the law of the land.

Be that as it may, the offer to conduct open hearings on House Joint Resolution 309 prompted those of us who are interested in this matter to withhold amendment of H. R. 7000, the second Reserve bill. We felt that we should go along with the suggestion of so many Members that the matter should be considered as a separate legislative problem.

Parenthetically, may I say that the junior Senator from Indiana proposed a status of forces amendment to H. R. 7000 during debate in the other body, and that our experience in this body was repeated with regard to his amendment. Many Senators expressed their sympathetic interest, the Senator from Georgia said he would vote for a resolution to denounce, modify, or eliminate the agreement, and several stated that the problem should be considered separately. The Senator from Idaho has now introduced in the other body a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 309 which will give the other body the opportunity to act.

With this legislative history, let me say that I believe we should expect action early in January. The proponents of House Joint Resolution 309 and all who urge modification or denunciation of the Status of Forces Agreement have complied religiously with the desire of others to have the subject considered separately. I believe we have reason to expect their support in our effort. If we do not get it, there will be no alternative but to go ahead next year with the proper amendments to other legislation and I am confident that we will be successful.

The hearings in the Foreign Affairs Committee took several days. A great number of statements were introduced by Members and by such organizations as the American Legion, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Defenders of the Constitution, and the American Coalition. At this point I should like to include the text of my opening statement to the committee:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK T. BOW RE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 309, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JULY 13, 1955

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and present the case in support of House Joint Resolution 309, which I introduced on May 18, 1955, and the number of similar resolutions offered by my colleagues.

This resolution seeks the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement so that foreign countries, which are parties to this agreement will not continue to have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

The Status of Forces Agreement, more properly designated as a "treaty," was signed at London on June 19, 1951, after being under negotiation since early in 1950. It was ratified by the President of the United States on July 24, 1953, under advice of the Senate given on July 15, 1953.

The countries now bound by this agreement are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom, Turkey, and the United States.

On September 28, 1953, an agreement was signed in Tokyo covering the status of United States forces in Japan, which agreement contains the same provisions as the original Status of Forces Agreement with the preceding countries. This agreement was made in compliance with the terms of the security treaty with Japan which had been ratified earlier in 1952.

In due course Germany will be added to this list.

House Joint Resolution 309 refers particularly to article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement, which gives criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel stationed within the respective countries. I assume that all of you are familiar with this article VII, but I am submitting the full text as part of the record of this hearing.

I call your attention to section 2b of article VII, which provides that the authority of the receiving state shall have the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over members of our forces or civilian components and their dependents with respect to offenses punishable by the law of the receiving state but not by the law of the sending state; and that under section 3b the authorities of the receiving state have the primary right to prosecute our soldiers for offenses which may be punishable under the laws of our country as well as the laws of the receiving country.

These provisions abrogate the basic constitutional rights of our American soldiers serving on foreign soil.

RULE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

This treaty repudiates one of America's oldest and finest traditions—that the American flag and the American Constitution follow our soldiers wherever they go. It repudiates the principles of international law, which were universally recognized before our Chief Justice Marshall so clearly enunciated them in 1811, in the case of *The Schooner "Exchange"* v. *McFaddon* (11 U. S. 116). The Supreme Court held in this case that the *Exchange*, as a public armed vessel of a friendly power, entered a port of our country upon an implied promise of exemption from the justice of the local courts. The Chief Justice likened the armed public vessel to a public armed force entering the territory of another nation with the latter's permission, and said, in effect, that the armed forces of a friendly nation stationed within the territory of another, with the latter's permission, are not subject to the local laws of the host country, but are subject only to the laws of their own country. The fact that Chief Justice Marshall had ample precedent for his statement of international law has been generally ignored in discussions of this subject.

Two other cases decided by the Supreme Court, after the Civil War, followed this decision with approval. In *Coleman* v. *Tennessee* (97 U. S. 509), the Court said:

"It is well settled that a foreign army, permitted to march through a friendly country or to be stationed in it by permission of its government or sovereign, has exemption from the civil and criminal justice of the place."

The same dicta is found in *Dow* v. *Johnson* (100 U. S. 158). In *Tucker* v. *Alexandroff* (183 U. S. 424), decided partly upon the authority of a treaty between this country and Russia, the Court discussed the case of The Exchange at length, and with approval.

In *Chung Chi Cheung* v. *The King* (1939 A. C. 160), Lord Atkin, speaking for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, called Chief Justice Marshall's opinion, in the case of the Exchange, "a judgment which has illumined the jurisprudence of the world" and concurred fully in the general principle that the armed forces of one power, allowed by another to enter its territory, enjoyed an

immunity from the local courts, although he held in the case before him that the Chinese Government had waived that immunity.

In the Casablanca case the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague (1909), recognized the exclusive jurisdiction of the officers and military tribunal of a nation over its own troops in a friendly foreign country.

Many authoritative writers on International Law have enunciated the same doctrine as laid down by Chief Justice Marshall, including several English writers, French, Dutch and Latin American authorities.

These cases I have mentioned did not depend on any treaty or exchange of diplomatic notes, but upon the theory that the exemption of friendly foreign troops from the jurisdiction of the courts of the nation in which they were, was a principle of the "unwritten law of nations."

It is, therefore, inexplicable that our State Department should abandon such principles when considering the status of our own forces abroad.

POWERS OF CONGRESS

One of the arguments advanced by representatives of the State Department in favor of the ratification of the agreement, in hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was that the rights of our soldiers had already been surrendered to foreign powers by a number of secret executive agreements, and that the provisions of this treaty were an improvement over such existing agreements. (P. 27 of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) Thus was disclosed a violation of the constitutional law of our land which vests in Congress the sole power "to make rules for the government and regulation of our land and naval forces," which apply outside as well as inside the limits of continental United States. This provision of the Constitution has never been changed and the execution of such secret agreements is a usurpation by the State Department of the power of Congress.

These various agreements were claimed to be classified so their terms are not a part of the hearings, but if it is conceded that the present treaty was an improvement, then consider how callously the rights of our servicemen must have been treated in these secret agreements. It is not disclosed how the treaty is better, but even if an improvement, it is still wrong. A lesser wrong does not make a right.

Under its constitutional power the Congress established a Uniform Code of Military Justice and included a uniform code of procedure for the trial of military personnel, both at home and abroad, which is still in full force and effect

Every enlisted man takes an oath that he will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over him according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The United States Manual of Courts Martial of 1951, which is still in effect, and a copy of which may be purchased from the Government Printing Office, states in paragraph 12, as follows:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed force is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

Thus we have our men obligating themselves to abide by the regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice, particularly exemplified by this Manual on Courts Martial, containing a paragraph which, although stating a correct rule of international law, yet has been flaunted and superseded by the Status of Forces Treaty and sundry secret agreements.

I might add here that there are in effect today secret executive agreements with countries not a party to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, entered into in violation of this constitutional provision, and of the terms of which we are kept in ignorance. Under these agreements our soldiers all over the world have been surrendered to the criminal jurisdiction of other countries without regard to whether or not such jurisdiction will be exercised in accordance with the constitutional rights which our soldiers should have.

The speculation is not pertinent to the resolution before us, but one may wonder if Russia or Communist China, in their disregard for the rights of our American soldiers, enjoy the protection of some secret agreement.

STATISTICAL APOLOGIES

Department of Defense statistics relative to the exercise of criminal jurisdiction by foreign tribunals over persons subject to the United States military law for the period of January 1, 1954, through November 30, 1954, show that 7,416 members of our Armed Forces had been subjected to foreign jurisdiction throughout the world, of which 3,720 cases were within the jurisdiction of NATO countries, so that there were almost as many men, during that period, prosecuted under the agreement with Japan and various secret agreements, as were prosecuted under the Status of Forces Treaty. I have sought to have this information brought up to date, but at the time of preparing this statement had not yet received the report from the Defense Department which this committee may now have.

All statistics and statements emanating from the Defense Department seeking to minimize the overall effect of the Status of Forces Treaty, will never justify the execution of this treaty or sundry secret agreements consenting to the abandonment of the constitutional rights of members of our Armed Forces. If the surrender of such rights had been proper or had been necessary it would not now be so important to try to excuse it by throwing the dust of statistics into the eyes of Congress. I believe the Defense Department has actually been placed in a false position. After having this treaty and sundry agreements imposed upon it by the State Department, the Defense Department is left with the unhappy task of supporting and justifying the action.

It has occurred to me that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not have all the facts properly presented to it in the hearings regarding this treaty, and that some of the Government witnesses, in turn, had been misled or misinformed by others who were in the State Department or Defense Department when these agreements were worked out—in an effort to vindicate their actions or to cover up and ratify the prior secret agreements. The committee was also confronted with the argument of fait accompli, which has become a working tool of bureaucracy.

I call your attention to the exclusive jurisdiction given a foreign country for offenses relating to the security of that state which is defined as "treason or sabotage, espionage or violation of any law relating to official secrets relating to the national defense of that state." If a foreign state has a law making it a security offense to make a public statement critical of the government of that country, any uninhibited American boy drafted into our armed services and ordered to that country, accustomed to the rights of free speech as we have them, might readily find himself punishable for some innocent remark under the laws of that foreign country. In fact, there may be many acts in countries throughout the world defined as offenses under their laws which are not offenses in our country. Particularly, such offenses which might seem to be somewhat political, or offenses against the government of that country.

BILL OF RIGHTS NULLIFIED

Whoever in the State Department negotiated this treaty ignored completely all of the provisions of our Bill of Rights. It is true that in section 9 of article VII you will find a list of seven things which presumably protect the member of the Armed Forces, or civilian components or dependents who happen to be under prosecution. If you read them rapidly you might think that protection has been given to our people, but you will find no provision requiring an indictment, or trial by jury, or public trial. No right to bail. No protection against double jeopardy. No protection against self-incrimination. No right of appeal. No prohibition of excessive fines or cruel or inhuman punishments. The accused does not have the protection of a presumption of innocence. He might be found guilty by less than a preponderance of the evidence. A confession procured by any means, however irregular, including force and duress, may be used against him.

Our diplomats, snug and smug within their cloak of diplomatic immunity, did not mind sacrificing our American soldiers in this way. The high brass of our Armed Forces would probably never be arrested, prosecuted, or imprisoned by a foreign court, so they accept the recommendations of those diplomats. The provisions of that treaty will never reach any Member of the United States Senate who, by reason of misinformation, misrepresentation or ignorance on the part of the Government witnesses advising them, voted to advise the President to ratify the treaty. But, the provisions of the treaty have reached and affected Richard Keefe and Anthony Scaletti, of whim you have no doubt already heard; and the loss of the constitutional safeguards which I have mentioned before has practically convicted Jose E. Montijo of the charge of murder—even before he is tried.

I do not believe the Defense Department has ever been happy with the Status of Forces Agreement. On March 29, 1955, General Hickman, appearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Forces of the United States Senate said:

"It is the position of the Department of Defense that the jurisdictional arrangements prescribed by the NATO Status of Forces Agreement is to be considered only as an acceptable minimum. We would like to try them all, keep them all within the military conclave. Accordingly, the United States authorities have, wherever possible, sought to extend their jurisdiction over persons subject to United States military law in the NATO countries by bilateral understandings or agreements. Pursuant to such agreements and understandings the United States military authorities now exercise an exclusive criminal jurisdiction over all persons subject to United States military law (except nationals or residents of Greece) who are stationed in Greece, which is a country that has ratified the Status of Forces Agreement."

The general indicated that there were other bilateral agreements under negotiation. Another representative of the Department of Defense also said:

"As a matter of policy, the executive branch has undertaken to obtain additional safeguards over and above those provided under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement wherever possible, either by supplementary agreements or by working out practical operating arrangements between the commanders in the field and the local authorities.

"We have conducted and still are conducting extensive negotiations to attain these policy objectives."

This would indicate a desire for revision on the part of the Department of Defense and a recognition that a request for revision is proper. House Joint Resolution 309 asks the President to seek this revision from all

NATO countries simultaneously, and not separately.

FRENCH JUSTICE

It has been difficult to secure information concerning the Montijo case because originally the Chief of the Allied Air Forces in Europe imposed a rigid censorship, and such information as was given seeped out through a public-relations officer of Great Britain. It appears now that Montijo and two other members of the Air Force became involved in an altercation with a young Frenchman by the name of Mallet, over the attention paid by Mallet to a French girl who Montijo proposed to marry. One version of this case is that Mallet and his friends attacked Montijo and that in the fight that ensued, in order to defend himself, Montijo inflicted wounds from which Mallet subsequently died. I do not condone this killing in any respect. But, if it is true that Montijo acted in self-defense he should have an opportunity to prove it as part of his defense, and I feel confident that in this case, under the procedure in French courts, he will never have this opportunity. He has already been tried and is being tried publicly by an extensive newspaper campaign, and it is entirely possible he will have assigned to him, as his attorney, a Frenchman who is a Communist or a Red sympathizer. Also, he may be tried before a judge with similar connections.

If you think my opinion of French justice is unwarranted, I would like to have you consider the article appearing in Time magazine on February 14, 1955, which I am sure was not written with the Status of Forces Treaty in mind. It described what happens to Frenchmen in French courts. With the hostility there is against America, why expect different or better treatment? The article, entitled "Justice on Trial," is submitted as part of the record herein because it so graphically described the actual procedure, rather than theoretical practice. The article quotes one French expert as saying, "We run our courts to convict the guilty, not to acquit the innocent."

It has been claimed as a virtue of this treaty that the provisions thereof are reciprocal and we, of course, have secured the right to try members of the Armed Forces of other nations party to the agreement, stationed in our country. What is the effect of this reciprocity?

In America any spy, subversive, or criminal of whatever kind, which, of course, would include members of Armed Forces, is guaranteed a fair jury trial in open court. He can invoke the fifth amendment, and refuse to testify, and heap abuse upon official representatives of our Government. All of the protections of our Constitution are afforded, but an American soldier who is drafted and forced to serve abroad can now be arrested on trumped-up charges by foreign police officers, or upon the accusation of a Communist conspirator or sympathizer; be questioned by any methods they care to use; held in prison for an indefinite period awaiting trial; tried in secret without a jury, without the safeguard of a presumption of innocence; sentenced and punished possibly by some cruel and inhuman punishment. It is possible that no representative of our Government would be present at his trial since he is only entitled to such a representative when the rules of the court so permit.

You must remember that we have the same kind of an agreement with Japan as with the NATO countries respecting the status of our troops. Also, please remember, after the last war Japan was not an ally, but in the position of a conquered country. In spite of our occupying the position of conquerers who should have been able to insist on their troops enjoying at least the same privileges as they would have in their own country, we tossed those rights and privileges away and have placed our soldiers at the mercy of a hostile, conquered people. It is well known that as soon as the peace treaty with Japan was signed the country was flooded with derogatory, defamatory, and hostile literature and propaganda, including many motion pictures, carrying the communistic anti-American line. What type of justice do you expect to be meted out to our soldiers under these conditions? The whole procedure is analogous to setting up a court of prisoners to try their guards for such offenses as their whims may dictate.

NO BARGAIN FOR THE UNITED STATES

As to the idea that our diplomatic representatives drove a hard bargain in securing the right to try members of the armed forces of other nations in this country in exchange for turning our soldiers loose at the mercy of those foreign countries, what measure of reciprocity is there in subjecting hundreds of thousands of our soldiers to the forms of justice which may be meted out to them, when, at the most, there are no more than 12,000 soldiers of all the foreign nations in this country during a year, and possibly no more than 4,000 at any one time.

It is conceded by the Defense Department that most of the members of foreign armies in this country are here for training purposes and are, therefore, not members of a military component and do not come under the terms of this treaty. Furthermore, this country has never objected, and did not object prior to the enactment of this treaty, to any foreign country keeping and enforcing criminal jurisdiction over members of its armed forces.

On June 30, 1944, we adopted a law entitled "An Act to Implement the Jurisdiction of Service Courts of Friendly Foreign Sovereigns within the United States," which act was solely for the purpose of assisting foreign nations in maintaining their criminal jurisdiction and implied the existence of such jurisdiction without legislation or treaty. We have never been interested in prosecuting soldiers of foreign nations. We do not have the hostile feeling toward our allies or the nations we hope to call our friends that would dictate the urge to prosecute.

Our Defense Department is hard put at times to minimize the actual effect of this treaty upon our soldiers abroad, and to try to make everything look good and fair and just and reasonable. The Department will furnish statistics showing a large number of offenses committed throughout the world since January 1, 1954, stressing the fact that foreign courts waived their jurisdiction in many of these cases, and that where foreign courts retained jurisdiction, what seems to be a comparatively small number were sentenced to confinement. They also say that some of these sentences were suspended. It is admitted that as of February 10, 1955, there were 58 American soldiers imprisoned throughout the world. I do not care if this number seems to be only a few of those who were first arrested and charged with offense. As long as only 1 American soldier can be subjected to the criminal jurisdiction of a foreign court, without the constitutional safeguards which he is told by the United States Courts Martial Manual go with him, then this treaty is wrong and should be modified.

DEPARTMENTAL EXCUSES

The public was reassured on June 9, 1955, by Defense Secretary Wilson as to the results of this treaty, when he reported to an Armed Services Committee of this Congress that only one American soldier, thus far, has been given an unfair trial by a friendly country. It would seem either that Mr. Wilson had been misinformed or the report of his statement is incorrect.

The case which he reported was that of a private in France who was fined $36 by a court at Orleans, France, for allegedly pushing a Frenchman off a bicycle. It was stated in his report that the case was carried to the French Ministry of Justice, and that a correction had been made of the errors committed by the French court and his fine refunded. Isn't it rather absurd to say that this 1 case is the only 1 in which a miscarriage of justice might have occurred, particularly when you consider the procedure in French courts which was reported in Time magazine?

The Defense Department apparently has ignored the thousands of cases where Americans perhaps paid fines in minor cases, under the impression that it was the best thing they could do under the circumstances, since they had no protection from our Government as to their constitutional rights; and have ignored other cases where the accused or convicted did not complain because he feared such complaint would only result in increasing the animosity of a court and the severity of his sentence.

The report of the Secretary also stated that American servicemen tried in foreign courts are provided with legal aid to make sure their rights are protected, but the report did not state that the only rights left to be protected were such as the foreign court might deign to recognize that the legal aid was not American legal aid, but would be some local attorney appointed by that court, and in many cases subservient to the court. The report further claimed that Americans convicted and sentenced to jail are also given the protection of the United States Government—an obvious misstatement, since there is no protection left to a United States soldier who has been tried and convicted under this treaty.

PRISON CONDITIONS

American officials are said to inspect foreign prisons and determine that Americans are receiving the food, medical aid, clothing, and health and comfort provisions they would receive in this country. When you consider that the housing conditions generally in many European countries are not comparable to ours, how can you expect the prisons to be comparable to ours? Or, how can you force any foreign government to provide the same facilities?

In Japan, for instance, the system of heating in prisons is very inadequate. Some of the factories in which the prisoners are made to work long hours, are heated in winter. However, no heating is provided in the prison cells. A justice of the supreme court of Japan, in writing about prison conditions there, said that the ordinary Japanese house is very poorly heated and the people are not accustomed to much heat in their homes, but that the prison cells, built in European style, are colder than the average Japanese houses. He also said that this fact might explain why Japanese prisoners do not complain about the excessive long hours which they are obliged to work. (Perhaps they preferred a little heat to no heat.)

The persons who negotiated this treaty obviously were not concerned with the provisions of foreign laws as to punishment or the conditions of penitentiaries or jails where our men might be serving sentences. You might be interested in this translation from a French work on prisons written in 1945. Speaking of sanitary installations, the report said:

"These installations are, generally speaking, inadequate. Thus, in the majority of our institutions, there are no cesspools, and the deplorable system of mobile waste tanks still prevails.

"It is unnecessary to dwell on the undesirability of this state of affairs. With such conditions prevailing, it is absurd to speak of prison hygiene.

"Disinfection of the premises and fight against parasites (vermin) have often been

recommended and applied more or less successfully."

Another translation of a work written in 1951 on French prisons has this to say concerning food given to inmates:

"They get three meals: breakfast, consisting of a quart of coffee and the bread ration for the day; luncheon, and dinner, each with a soup, made of vegetables, plus trimmings (such as fish, pickles, etc.)

* * * * *

"It is normal for convicts to receive only subsistence rations, but, since they are obliged to work, they have a chance, with the produce of their work, to make purchases in the canteen to improve their regular food."

The correctness of this report is shown by the report of a visit made by a representative of the United States Consular Service and an Army officer to Privates Scaletti and Keefe on March 11, 1955, after they had served over 16 months of their sentence. The report of this visit I have attached to my statement to be a part of this record.

Privates Scaletti and Keefe at that time disclosed that the dormitories in which they slept were unheated, the food bad, and the medical care not considered good. Private Keefe indicated that he received a package that contained canned goods, but was obliged to pay duty thereon and, therefore, hesitated to ask his mother to send him further packages.

With these indications of conditions as they exist in France and Japan, we can only speculate as to what some of the dungeons may be like in other countries with which we have secret agreements, giving them criminal jurisdiction over our men.

Since the extension of the Status of Forces Agreement to Germany is a current subject, I wish to call your attention to a brief statement of procedure in German courts, made by Mr. Worth B. McCauley, a lawyer of Bristow, Okla., in the December 1954 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. He was formerly chief attorney for the courts of the Allied High Commission in Western Germany. He says:

"One must visit a German courtroom to understand how different their procedure is from ours. The state's attorney sits at the bench with the three judges while the defense attorney has little participation except to take notes of the proceedings for possible appeal. All questioning is done by the judges who have before them the police dossier of investigation and interrogation. This in itself is a predetermination of guilt by a police magistrate. There is no right against self-incrimination and hearsay evidence is admissible. It is much easier to convict in a German court than in an American because of the difference in procedure and theory which boils down to a presupposition of guilt rather than innocence."

The men who negotiated this treaty seem to have forgotten that our troops were abroad to protect the soil of other nations from aggression because those nations were not able or willing to defend themselves. Our diplomats must have shuddered at the thought that these other nations would consider us a favored group if we asserted our rights in any way, or demanded an observance of the international law which would insure our country keeping jurisdiction over its own citizens in its Armed Forces.

Wherever our troops have gone, throughout the world, we have taken our civilization to other countries and shared the fruits of our industry and knowledge with that other nation. Why should we abandon our standards of living, our constitutional rights and guaranties merely to appease and seek favor of our allies? We are told there is a feeling of hostility toward us in many countries with whom we have these agreements, public and secret, and we know this to be true. Then, why should we force our men into foreign courts to be tried in a hostile atmosphere, before hostile courts, without the humane rules of procedure set forth in our Constitution and laws?

REVISION OF THE TREATY

By the terms of the treaty its provisions can be denounced at the expiration of a period of 4 years from the date on which it became effective, which period would expire on July 24, 1957. It is for this reason that House Joint Resolution 309 directs the President to request the North Atlantic Council for a revision of article VII of the agreement, acting under the provision of article XXII thereof; and as an alternative, if such revision cannot be brought about, that the President shall then denounce such agreement at the earliest date permitted.

There are several methods by which action by the President to secure revision of article VII of the treaty might be directed and there is ample precedent to support a joint resolution as one of the methods. It is conceivable that supporters of the Status of Forces Agreement may contend that action by the House is not necessary, and also a possibility that the President may seek to ignore the resolution even though adopted; but in spite of these contingencies we owe it to our Armed Forces to let the world know that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of this country is against depriving our forces of the protection of our Constitution.

Certainly we have every right to initiate a request for revocation forthwith of all secret agreements made by the executive department which gives criminal jurisdiction over our soldiers to foreign powers.

SUMMATION

In summation, let me say that the NATO Status of Forces Agreement was a tragic abdication of sovereignty that should be repudiated at the earliest possible date.

Constitutional, moral, and practical considerations dictate that the United States should never surrender to any foreign sovereign its right to protect and control the personnel of our Armed Forces.

At least 58 servicemen, deprived of their constitutional rights as Americans, sentenced and convicted under foreign laws, are now confined virtually incommunicado in filthy, unheated foreign prisons without proper food or medical care. They are martyrs to internationalism.

The Congress has the power under the Constitution to regulate and govern the Armed Forces. The Congress has the responsibility to protect the constitutional rights of men in the Armed Forces. The sentiment of the American people on this issue is clear and plain. I strongly urge the committee to delve deeply into this subject, uncover the facts, and take appropriate action at the earliest possible date.

The witnesses of the executive branch who appeared in opposition to House Joint Resolution 309 were Robert Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State; J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General; and Wilber Brucker, counsel of the Department of Defense who during the proceedings was appointed as Secretary of the Army.

I regret to state that these gentlemen presented an inconsistent and incomplete discussion of the subject, indicating either an ignorance of the facts, an unwillingness to disclose the facts, or an effort to confuse the committee.

Repeatedly the principal witnesses avoided direct answers so that members had to consume long periods of time pressing and rephrasing questions, and on several occasions outright misstatements of fact had to be corrected either by committee members or by members of the large staff of aides and assistants who accompanied these men to the hearings. I think it was a shameful attitude for high Government officials to adopt, and I was sincerely distressed by their unwillingness to be frank or to cooperate with the purpose of the hearing.

The committee invited me to appear following the Department witnesses but time prevented my doing so. I regret this deeply, but have filed my prepared remarks with the committee and under leave I include them as part of my statement here today:

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK T. BOW RE EXECUTIVE TESTIMONY ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 309, HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JULY 26, 1955

Mr. Chairman, may I express my deep appreciation for the opportunity given me to again appear before this committee. I feel the invitation is evidence of the sincere effort that you and the committee are making to determine all the facts on this most important and intricate problem.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I do not consider this a contest between myself, joined by the other of my colleagues who have introduced similar resolutions, and the State, Defense, and Justice Departments. I regret to say, however, that I have been forced to the conclusion that the advocates of the Status of Forces Agreement have assumed the role of champions defending a position which once taken must be protected regardless of right.

I have done my level best, with the limited staff and facilities available to an individual Member of Congress, to present to you every possible fact and argument on this subject. I do not, of course, have the facilities of the 3 sub-Cabinet officers who presented their arguments to you and whose entourage of 20 to 30 officers and assistants was only a small representation of the staff that has been working on this subject in the 3 Departments. However, I hope that my activity directed toward uncovering and producing information for you, as limited as it has necessarily been, has given you a better understanding than the much greater departmental activity which appears to have been directed largely toward maintaining the status quo.

I am deeply concerned, Mr. Chairman, over what seems to be either a reckless disregard of known facts or utter ignorance of facts which should be known to those who have heavy responsibilities and must depend on associates and subordinates for details.

Again I say, I do not view this as a contest between those appearing here. My earnest plea to you and the committee is—consider not who is right, but what is right?

Upon that premise I shall now discuss the testimony and evidence presented by the Departments of State, Defense, and Justice.

I am critical of the statements of the executive department witnesses for two principal reasons:

1. With the exception of Governor Brucker, the executive's witnesses expressed complacency or satisfaction with the existing Status of Forces Agreement and a pessimistic or defeatist attitude toward our desire to modify it in favor of greater protection for our men.

2. Either these witnesses lack information or they failed to reveal to the committee all of the information which should have been in their possession.

For instance, we have Mr. Murphy stating, in referring to servicemen sentenced to jail:

"In not one of these cases do we believe that an innocent man has gone to jail."

* * * * *

"There was not a single case in which there was a basis for the United States to protest that the safeguards assured by the Status of Forces Agreement for a fair trial were not met, or that there was any other unfairness."

And we have Governor Brucker, referring to a $36 fine in France, stating:

"Only one case has arisen where it has been necessary to report to the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses of Congress a violation of the rights of an accused serviceman abroad."

Yet, it is brought out on examination here that in at least one other case in Japan, the official observers of the United States stated in their report that in their opinion the accused were not afforded a fair trial.

Except for such inconsistencies as this, you will note that there is great similarity in the statements in their approval or use of the same arguments which have been advanced time and again by the State Department. It appears that some of the personnel of the State Department have forgotten they are representatives of the United States and not of some foreign country—that they are employed to further the interests of the United States and not to deprecate or belittle the standards of life for which our forefathers fought, and for which, apparently, we must still fight. I, for one, am a bit tired of the repeated theme that our troops abroad are there for our benefit, entirely ignoring the advantages which have accrued to the countries in which they are stationed and making no effort to impress foreign countries with the fact that they are mighty lucky to have our support, even though Mr. Murphy admits our forces "represent a body of trained and skilled manpower for which no substitution from European sources is yet practical."

Mr. Murphy opened his statement by expressing his regret that "our efforts to inform the American people on the very important matter with which this committee is concerned have apparently been less successful than we had hoped." Certainly the effort, if made, was a depressing failure. The American people as a whole first became aware of the effects of this agreement when the first reports of trial and imprisonment of soldiers under its terms trickled back to this country. That is when the demand for change was born. I say it will grow and grow—unless this committee acts favorably, or the executive branch will act to secure more favorable treatment for our men.

Repeatedly in his testimony and in answer to questions, Mr. Murphy stated that there were emotional considerations that made it impossible for other nations to give our servicemen any better treatment than is provided in the NATO treaty. In passing, let me say that I am fearful the same emotional considerations under the present situation may make it impossible for an American to get a fair trial. Let me say, also, that there are emotional considerations right here in America and that it behooves the State Department to take cognizance of them—at least to the degree that Mr. Murphy is concerned about the emotions of allied people.

Several times in answer to questions concerning Saudi-Arabia and its possible inhuman punishments, Mr. Murphy stated that these punishments were only intended for Moslems and that there was no history of any one of the thousands of employees of foreign corporations or foreign oil companies operating there, receiving such penalties. There is a good reason for his statement. The Saudi-Arabian Government and foreign corporations have an understanding that any employee who has apparently committed a serious offense shall be immediately removed from the country so that the jurisdiction of Saudi-Arabian courts will not apply to him. Unfortunately there is no such protection afforded to an American serviceman if he should stray out of the limited area in which, by agreement, our Government retains jurisdiction, and while outside of such area commit some offense. I might add that the Saudi-Arabian Government built a special jail for incarceration of employees of foreign corporations who might be minor offenders and that in this jail there is special treatment afforded such offenders.

In questioning before this committee it became obvious that Mr. Murphy could not have been a party to the early negotiation of the Status of Forces Agreement, inasmuch as he could not answer questions as to the origin of the plan or the theory which was developed to surrender criminal jurisdiction of our troops abroad. Repeatedly he was asked to name any nation that had demanded jurisdiction and unfailingly he refused or could not make a direct reply.

Mr. Murphy suggests that without the Status of Forces Agreement the Communist parties in Europe might carry on propaganda campaigns to stir up trouble calling our troops occupation forces. What he really means to say is that we should continue to placate these Communist parties and Red elements in foreign countries by giving the criminal jurisdiction over our troops to the civil authorities of these countries which are frequently represented by the same Communist elements. Mr. Murphy did admit that he knew of no case where any Communist soldier had been prosecuted in any satellite country, but that such troops would no doubt be occupation forces. It would appear, therefore, that if Russian troops stationed in satellite countries are considered occupation forces, then the term has lost its sting as propaganda.

Mr. Murphy's statement that most of the sentences have been very short and that the maximum sentence thus far imposed in NATO countries is 5 years is somewhat misleading, in that much longer sentences have been imposed in Japan, where the majority of cases have arisen.

Governor Brucker, in his statement, admitted there had been sentences of confinement for more than 5 years imposed in 3 cases, and the charts offered by General Hickman show that 7 of our men are currently serving sentences of over 5 years. As a matter of fact, the maximum sentence so far imposed is really 15 years. This occurred in Japan.

With reference to these charts, may I point out that they indicate a remarkable increase in the number of cases in which the foreign nations have refused to waive jurisdiction. The executive branch has referred repeatedly to the expectation or hope that our requests for waiver of jurisdiction would meet with sympathetic attention. The record of the period from December to May of this year, as compared with the period January to November last year, shows that the sympathy with which our requests are received is diminishing rapidly—so rapidly that one might question whether sympathetic is any longer the proper term to use.

I can readily understand that Governor Brucker was testifying, as he said, as a pinch-hitter in the absence of two men whom he considered qualified for the task, and further that he was involved in the closing of his office as Counsel of the Defense Department and the assumption of new responsibilities as the Secretary of the Army. We certainly wish him all success in the new undertaking, and I am hopeful that as Secretary he may get a closer experience of how these treaties actually work and the effect they have upon the military commanders and the men themselves. It is obvious that he had little to do with the subject prior to his appearance here.

In this regard, I should like first to question the Secretary's statement that there has been gross distortion of a few cases such as the Keefe case. Governor Brucker did not point out any distortion in my statement nor did he specify how or where any of the cases have been distorted. To the best of my knowledge, all that has been published about Keefe—the facts that have aroused so much indignation in the hearts of the American people—has been factual and straightforward. There is no need to embroider, exaggerate, or distort the circumstances of these men.

You may recall Governor Brucker was asked by a member of this committee as to whether the Status of Forces Agreement covered dependents of servicemen and he replied emphatically that it did not. After coaching from the backfield he was obliged to admit his error. This is just one indication that Governor Brucker appeared to testify concerning an agreement which he had not the time to consider fully.

During the questioning Governor Brucker also evidenced lack of knowledge of the system of having an observer at the trial of an American serviceman, when he insisted that these observers were present from the very beginning and through all the preliminary proceedings. The actual statements of observers show that this is not true and in fact that the agreement itself only provides for an observer to be present at the trial and not to participate or observe any preliminary investigation or proceedings. I have received reports from two of the services of proceedings in several cases which indicate clearly the observer appeared in the case at the trial only.

Since Governor Brucker, after the case of the three marines was brought to his attention by a member of this committee, suggested that he did not wish to make the report public, I will refrain from giving any of the details of this particular case here, but will give you the conclusion of the observers. I quote:

"7. Conclusion: After careful consideration, taking into account the ramifications involved in a trial under foreign laws, and cognizant of the fact that the court, not the representatives of the United States, are the judges of credibility of witnesses and weight of the evidence, the United States representatives are of the opinion that the three accused were not afforded a fair trial. We are of the opinion further that the accused stand unjustly convicted. In addition to the observations set forth in paragraph 6 above, we cannot in conscience overlook the paucity of evidence upon which the convictions were based. While sufficient to establish a prima facie case, if believed, the testimony of Morikawa is not only preposterous and fantastic, it is in some respects patently impossible. Without the testimony of Morikawa, the case for the prosecution would, of course, collapse. Even a cursory examination of her testimony reveals the following discrepancies.

* * * * *

"The United States representatives feel that the conviction of these three men, based upon the evidence adduced at this trial, is manifestly unwarranted and unfair no matter under what rules of law the court is operating."

This trial was not only not fair—it was not speedy, covering a period from October 26, 1954, to January 17, 1955, although apparently taking 6 days.

In connection with Governor Brucker's statement that monthly visits are made by representatives of the armed services to every man in prison, I wish to call to your attention his prepared statement that periodic visits are required by Directive No. 5510.4 of the Department of Defense, dated October 19, 1954. I believe later this directive was made a part of the record of this hearing. Since this treaty was ratified by the United States on July 24, 1953, it would seem that almost 15 months elapsed before the Department of Defense saw fit to use this right to visit our men in prisons.

His statement that the Department has no report of any irregularities in the prison

treatment of American servicemen is subject to further study. Our men have suffered from the bare fact that prison conditions abroad are in no respect comparable to prison conditions in this country. You cannot very well expect them to arouse the ire of their jailers by complaining to official inspectors.

I do not mean to be critical of Governor Brucker. His position here has been most difficult, flanked on one side by a representative of the State Department and on the other by a representative of the Justice Department, with each of these Departments having perhaps participated in the preparation of his statement or the statement of the Defense Department. Even though the armed services have never been in favor of surrendering criminal jurisdiction of their men to foreign courts, and the Defense Department is not satisfied with the present situation, Mr. Brucker is not able to actually say so here. Any protestation that on the whole the treaty has been working out satisfactorily is denied by the remark which found its way into his prepared statement, as follows:

"As is well known, the Department of Defense has never regarded the Status of Forces Agreement, or, in fact, the related agreements which we have in other countries, as embracing the optimum advantages for the United States. On the other hand, we have always stated that the NATO Status of Forces Agreement provided an acceptable minimum. As a matter of policy, the executive branch has undertaken to obtain in each new negotiation additional safeguards over and above those provided under the NATO Status of Forces Agreement wherever possible, either by supplementary agreements or by working out practical operating arrangements between the commanders in the field and the local authorities."

Governor Brucker's own suggestion, which he states he has recommended to the Bureau of the Budget for legislation to be enacted by Congress, authorizing the Secretary of Defense to provide—at Government expense—free local counsel for the protection of American servicemen abroad, is a further indication that the Defense Department is not wholly satisfied with at least this feature of the present agreement, or happy about the inability of accused servicemen to be released on bail. Governor Brucker states that the opposition of the Department of Defense to House Joint Resolution 309 is not based on unwillingness to have exclusive jurisdiction over its own people abroad. He states every military commander would, for disciplinary reasons, prefer to have such exclusive jurisdiction. He states:

"We have no reason to believe that foreign countries now operating under the Status of Forces Agreement would be willing to concede exclusive jurisdiction such as we had in wartime in many areas; on the contrary, all evidence points the other way."

I call your attention to the fact that there is no evidence before the committee pointing the other way. That, in fact, there is evidence that the Defense Department has been able to secure an additional bilateral agreement with Greece, a member of NATO, conferring such exclusive jurisdiction, and has obtained modifications by other countries through other bilateral agreements.

In the light of the facts, I do not see how these men can justify the defeatist complex apparent in all of the statements made by the three departments: "We don't think it can be done"; "we are afraid to try it"; "they might not like us"; "we must be friends." I am not quoting words but an attitude.

Coming now to the statement made by Mr. Rankin, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, we must remember that Mr. Rankin was exercising the lawyer's prerogative of endeavoring to justify an action already taken by selecting such references to decided cases, or statements out of context from such cases, which might appear to support his position. He was not furnishing an unbiased opinion as the basis for some future action.

Attorney General Brownell, in testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953 at hearings which led to the ratification of this treaty, found himself in the same position. He was obliged to find some authority somewhere which would excuse the surrender of criminal jurisdiction over our servicemen to foreign countries, and so he roved far afield in the opinion which Mr. Rankin has referred to, but he neglected to account for the fact that the United States Manual of Courts-Martial contained a very clear statement of what this country actually believed was the true rule of international law.

Just as Mr. Rankin has also ignored this statement.

Just as the Defense Department has failed to account for the fact that the statement still appears in their manual and has not been changed or amended or modified in any way—even though they know they have surrendered the rights which it should guarantee to our servicemen. I quote this paragraph again, from section 12, page 16, of the Manual for Courts-Martial of the United States, 1951:

"Under international law, jurisdiction over members of the Armed Forces of the United States or other sovereign who commit offenses in the territory of a friendly foreign state in which the visiting armed forces is by consent quartered or in passage remains in the visiting sovereign."

We have in the world systems of law such as the "common law," "civil law," "canon law," but it remains for our Attorney General to devise a new system which has the approval of all three of the gentlemen who have appeared before you on behalf of the three departments, namely, "civilized standards of justice."

It is unfortunate that these worthy and esteemed gentlemen and the Attorney General of the United States should now be willing to substitute this so-called civilized law for America's constitutional guaranties.

I find that Mr. Rankin, in his zeal to make a case, has been a little less than frank with you. He has said there is no indication that the court's decision in the case of the master of the German war vessel interned in Philadelphia was influenced by the fact that the vessel was interned at the time, yet we know that friendly foreign warships are not interned.

At another point Mr. Rankin referred to a case before the Canadian Supreme Court in 1943, as being in support of his present position. He said:

"The majority of the court held that there was no rule of international law conferring absolute immunity on United States forces stationed in Canada."

Now this is only a small part of the story. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court of Canada was not in agreement on this matter. Only two justices took this attitude.

Justice Taschereau had this to say:

"There seems to be a strong preponderance of authority in favor of the view that there exists a rule of international law amongst the civilized nations of the world, granting immunity to organized forces visiting a country with the consent of the receiving government."

Justice Kerwin had this to say:

"The Government of Canada having invited into the Dominion the military and naval troops of the United States of America as a part of the scheme of defense of the north half of the Western Hemisphere and, thereore, not merely for the benefit of the United States but for that of both parties and, in fact, for the benefit of all the allied nations in the present conflict, the invitation must be taken to have been extended and accepted on the basis that complete immunity of prosecution in Canadian criminal courts would be extended to members of the United States forces.

"A member of a military or a naval force stationed here is immune whether he be absent from his unit or ship on duty or on leave. The immunity would extend to any member of the forces, whether attached to a unit stationed, or a ship present, in Canada, or not, so long as his presence in Canada is in pursuance of the invitation and consent of our Government. Because of the nature of the services that he is sent here to perform, such a member must be subject only to the laws of his country. The immunity does not extend to a member of the United States forces coming to Canada on his own business or pleasure as he would not be here for the purpose of military operations."

Justice Rand had this to say:

"1. The members of United States forces are exempt from criminal proceedings in Canadian courts for offenses under local law committed in their camps or on their warships, except against persons not subject to United States service law, or their property, or for offenses under local law wherever committed, against other members of those forces, their property and the property of their Government, but the exemption is only to the extent that United States courts exercise jurisdiction over such offenses."

Thus two justices believed that international law required the Dominion of Canada or any other nation to grant exclusive jurisdiction to the friendly visiting force, and a third agreed in part.

I believe that any additional authority which might be offered to you as to whether or not the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in the Schooner *Exchange* case was a correct statement of international law is totally unnecessary.

I find that one of the things which Mr. Rankin neglected to tell you is that in this Canadian case the United States of America filed an extensive brief alleging that under the rules of international law American Armed Forces would be entitled to immunity in Canadian courts.

The brief was submitted with this statement by the chargé d'affaires:

"Sir: Under instructions of my Government and in compliance with the informal request of the Canadian Government, I have the honor to enclose, for such use as you may care to make of it, a memorandum which sets forth the views of the United States Government on the right under international law of members of the Armed Forces of the United States on Canadian territory with the consent of the Canadian Government to immunity from the local jurisdiction in criminal matters."

I quote the summation from this brief:

"To summarize, it will have been seen from what has been said above that by the almost unanimous opinion of writers on international law, and jurists who have dealt with the subject, members of the armed forces of a state on foreign territory with the consent of the territorial sovereign are immune from the local jurisdiction in criminal matters. These views are based on and supported by international practice as well as reason.

"Some writers, while admitting this right to immunity of foreign forces, have sought to limit its application to certain times and places. The views expressed by them are decidedly against the weight of authority and are not supported in practice. There is no precise formulation of the limitations thought to be imposed, such as would seem to be necessary in any pretended rule of law. Indeed, there is no agreement on what the limitations are. Those suggesting limitations do not indicate by what process of reasoning their conclusions were arrived at.

"Reason is the foundation of the law, and the weakness of the views of these writers

when examined in the light of the principles laid down by Marshall and others is apparent.

"It is appreciated that under even the most favorable conditions the presence of troops of a foreign state may be a disturbing element in the normal life of a community. It is assumed, however, that the inconveniences and departures from normal procedures made necessary by their presence are regarded by the state which admits foreign troops as less important than the purpose for which they are admitted. It must, therefore, be concluded that the nation which consents to the presence of foreign troops on its territory cannot thereafter assert jurisdiction over them because the exercise of such jurisdiction would be inconsistent not only with the jurisdiction of their own sovereign but would derogate from the complete control and discipline which their sovereign must necessarily exercise in order to accomplish the purpose for which they were sent to foreign territory."

The attorney general of Canada also supported this contention in his brief.

I have a copy of these briefs which I wish to submit with my statement. I commend them to your attention, and challenge Mr. Rankin or the Attorney General himself to account for their apparent change of heart in now telling you that Marshall's opinion did not and does not properly state the rule of international law.

Incidentally, the Canadian case offers some light on the subject of military "tourists"—soldiers who enter another country on leave. The attorney general of Canada in his brief submitted the belief that the rule of international law did not apply to members of the Armed Forces who entered Canada "on their own," not as representatives of the Armed Forces but as tourists or casual visitors.

Justice Kirwan agreed with this viewpoint, and I believe it was established policy in Canada during the late war. However, it had little application inasmuch as members of our Armed Forces stationed in this country seldom if ever received permission to enjoy vacations in Canada.

Mr. Rankin also drew an erroneous conclusion with regard to the Senate debate at the time of adoption of the Friendly Foreign Forces Act of 1944. He cited to you the Senate's refusal of an amendment which would have stated the right of visiting forces to exercise jurisdiction over their men while in our country—specifically British forces. Mr. Rankin said the Senate did not want to confer such jurisdiction. Actually, Senator Revercomb, the author of the amendment, was simply trying to state in the act what he already believed to be a rule on international law, and he explained it as follows:

"The amendment is merely declaratory by the Congress of law which we are advised by the State Department exists, and which under the decisions of the Supreme Court of this country, we know to exist, with reference to a friendly army quartered in this country or while passing through it. Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment is merely an expression of the rule as the Government of this country has recognized it to exist under international law."

The Senators who argued against the amendment did so on the grounds that the recognized rule of international law made it unnecessary. Senator Connally, long-time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said: "Mr. President, is not the whole question one of permission to the foreign force to be here? We can exclude them if we desire to do so, but does not our consent to their being here carry with it incidentals, and is not one of these incidentals that the force may exercise its discipline and its control, and punish infractions on the part of its members. That being the case, why is it necessary for us specifically to provide that they can exercise their jurisdiction here? It goes back to the fundamental question of whether we shall let them be here at all. We do not have to admit them. If we permit foreign troops and foreign naval officers and naval organizations to be within the United States, the implication and the natural inference is that they can exercise their normal functions."

In the light of a careful reading of the debate, I believe Mr. Rankin erred in citing this Senate action as a precedent for his position.

Much has been said also concerning the vote of 72 to 12 by which the Senate ratified the Status of Forces Treaty 2 years ago. I do not think that this established any criterion to guide the actions of the committee. The Senators voted on a new agreement. They did not know what would happen under the agreement. We do know now. We have had 2 years of experience. And, if any vote is to be taken as an expression of present opinion and sentiment on the subject, I call your attention to the vote in the House on May 18, on my amendment on this subject to the first Reserve bill, when our colleagues voted 174 to 56 in favor of restricting use of troops in status of forces nations. That vote is to me the real guide to the thinking of the people of America at this time.

The Brussels agreement, covering the status of forces of its signatories, has been pointed to by both Mr. Murphy and Mr. Rankin as the possible origin of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. This prompts a review of the origin of the Brussels agreement itself.

You may recall that this country recognized the necessity of restoring in Europe stable economic conditions and encouraging the nations of Western Europe to cooperate in the effort to establish sound economic conditions and relations. The Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, for instance, undertook to assist countries of Europe by furnishing material and financial assistance to participating countries in such a manner as to aid them through their own individual and concerted efforts to become independent of outside economic assistance. This was to be accomplished by promoting industrial and agricultural production, restoring the soundness of European currency and finances, and facilitating and stimulating growth of international trade of participating countries. A "participating country" was defined as any country which signed the report of the Committee of European Economic Cooperation at Paris on September 22, 1947, and any other country which would adhere to a joint program for European recovery. By this act we were giving encouragement to the formation of groups of countries who might be banded together for the purpose of qualifying as recipients of our aid and assistance.

It is unfortunate, I think, that Mr. Rankin's statement would lead one to think that the United States was a signatory to the Brussels Treaty. Actually, the signatories were the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

On April 5, 1949, these powers addressed a request to the United States Government for assistance, stating that they had reached the conclusion that if their defense program was to be effective, the material assistance of the United States Government was essential. Their request contained no suggestion that the United States should furnish men, but did say that there was urgent need for United States material and financial assistance.

On April 6, 1949, the Government of the United States replied that a recommendation from the executive branch of the United States would be made to Congress to provide assistance to such countries to meet the materiel requirements of their defense program, such assistance to be in the form of military equipment and the provision of some financial assistance. Each of the signatory powers immediately followed with individual requests for aid.

I can understand very well why the signatory powers to the Brussels Treaty, with their long history of jealousy and distrust of each other, might have found it necessary to adopt the provisions of the agreement which they made concerning the status of members of their armed forces when situated in the territory of another. It was not contemplated that the United States would be a party to this agreement and it does not establish a precedent for our relinquishing any part of the criminal jurisdiction of our soldiers.

The requests for aid and assistance established very definitely that they needed military supplies and materiel and financial assistance, but there was never any suggestion that troops would be needed.

We could scarcely be accused of any motive of aggression—and the national feeling which one European country might have against another would not have applied to us. Furthermore, we were in a strong bargaining position. If our representatives had insisted on keeping complete criminal jurisdiction, I think it would have been granted. Just as I believe that if our representatives would today make an aggressive effort to insist upon a modification of article VII, it could be secured.

The theme runs through the three statements that because of this agreement American servicemen have gained substantial advantages that it was impossible to secure more and, specifically, impossible to retain all criminal jurisdiction of our troops. No instance is offered of any refusal of any one country to permit us to retain this jurisdiction. When it is stated that this agreement is better than what we had before, comparison is made between this agreement and executive agreements which had previously been concluded. The comparison is not between the Status of Forces Agreement and the Rule of International Law which has frequently been propounded here in this hearing, although denied at this time by the Justice Department.

To support their contention that we have gained something it is now said that we have exclusive jurisdiction of offenses committed by servicemen while on duty. All of the witnesses ignore the fact that the Status of Forces Agreement does not make any provision as to who shall determine the question of when a man is on duty, and have made no mention to you here of the fact that in some countries the authorities now claim by reason of this agreement that the determination of when a man is on duty is a prerogative of their courts and not of the military authorities of the United States.

General Hickman admitted this in his testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee.

The worthy gentlemen representing these three departments all conclude their statements with the assumption that the only effect of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 309 would be the withdrawal of American troops from abroad.

They ignore the full text of the resolution.

Let me clarify a bit. First, the President is directed to request the NATO for a modification of article VII. Then, in the event a modification is impossible to secure, the treaty is to be denounced at the earliest possible date. This would mean that such denunciation could not formally be made before July 24, 1957, or become effective before July 23, 1958.

There is no desire or intention to weaken our own security or disturb the system of collective defense, but there is the desire to restore to our servicemen, engaged in such defense—and who may be called upon to protect our security abroad—all the rights granted them by our Constitution. By which I mean the American system of procedure

under our Uniform Code of Military Justice, and not the State Department version of justice which our Attorney General has been pleased to call civilized.

If we are not to rely upon the Rule of International Law as stated by Judge Marshall then the request for such modification should include the specific request to restore to our servicemen all of the elements of procedure and justice necessary to be replaced or restored to put them on a par with American servicemen serving in this country. Let us do away with a double standard of protection for our military forces, where men who have the good fortune to serve their enlistment in the United States or countries where we have retained full jurisdiction enjoy all the rights which we can give them under our Constitution, but those upon whom fortune frowns by sending them elsewhere have so much less.

I understand that some concern has been expressed here by certain members of this committee as to whether or not the adoption of House Joint Resolution 309 is the proper way to secure the result—or more particularly, does this body have the right to direct the President to proceed as stated therein. I wish to say that there is ample precedent for just this procedure, and I will elaborate on these precedents later.

The resolution itself fully complies with the provisions of the Status of Forces Agreement, which, in article XVII provides that any contracting party may at any time request the revision of any article of this agreement, which request shall be addressed to the North Atlantic Council. Article XIX provides that the agreement may be denied after the expiration of a period of 4 years after the date on which the agreement comes into force. Thus the procedures requested of the President are within the terms of the treaty.

Now, if the resolution is passed by both Houses of Congress the President, of course, has a constitutional right to veto the same. If he approves the measure it may be assumed he intends to carry out its provisions. If he vetoes, Congress in its turn has the right to pass the resolution over his veto.

It is only in this case that a question could arise as to whether or not he would comply with the direction of Congress. A member of this committee has already stated—on the first day of the hearing—that he did not believe the President would refuse to comply. I, myself, believe that if House Joint Resolution 309 became the law of the land in the manner indicated that the President in the fulfillment of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, would follow its direction.

I base this belief not only upon my faith in President Eisenhower, but also upon the precedents that exist in our history.

In 1846 Congress, by joint resolution, on April 27, authorized the President, at his discretion, to notify the British Government of the abrogation of the convention of August 6, 1827, relative to the joint occupation of the Oregon Territory. President Polk had requested the resolution, thus supporting the theory that international conventions to which the United States is a party, even those terminable on notice, are terminable only by act of Congress.

In 1883 Congress, by a joint resolution, directed the President to give notice to Great Britain of the termination of articles 18 to 25 inclusive of the Treaty of Washington of May 8, 1871. The resolution was in these terms:

"*Resolved*, That in the judgment of Congress the provisions of articles 18 to 25, inclusive, and article 30 of the treaty * * * ought to be terminated at the earliest possible time * * * and to this end the President be, and he hereby is, directed to give notice to (Britain) that the provisions of the articles aforesaid will terminate and be of no force on the expiration of 2 years next after the time of giving such notice.

"2. That the President be, and hereby is, directed to give and communicate such notice of termination on July 1, 1883 or as soon thereafter as may be."

This resolution was limited entirely to the direction to the President to give the notice terminating the provisions in the treaty relating to Canadian fisheries and to coastal trading privileges. It was approved by President Chester A. Arthur, March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 641), and on July 2, 1883, he gave the required notice.

Instances of instruction by legislation are contained in the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909 (36 Stat. 33) which contained this direction to terminate certain commercial agreements:

"4. The President shall have power and it shall be his duty to give notice, within 10 days after the passage of this act, to all foreign countries with which commercial agreements have been negotiated * * * of the intention of the United States to terminate such agreements at a time specified in such notice, which time shall in no case * * * be longer than the period of time specified in such agreements respectively for notice for their termination."

When the French Government protested the receipt of a notice of termination from our Secretary of State, the following reply was forwarded:

"As you are aware, the President of the United States, in giving the formal notice on August 7, 1909, has been obliged to follow implicitly the prescriptions of the new tariff act of the United States."

(Foreign Relations of UA, 1909, pp. 46, 284, 270, 288, 389; John Mabry Mathews, American Foreign Relations (1938), p. 598; Green H. Hackworth, Digest of International Law (1943) (V:429–30.)

In the Seaman's Act of 1915 (38 Stat. 1164) Congress directed the President to terminate treaty provisions in conflict therewith:

"16. In the judgment of Congress articles in treaties * * * insofar as they provide for the arrest and imprisonment of seamen deserting * * * merchant vessels of the United States in foreign countries * * * and other treaty provisions * * * in conflict with this act * * * ought to be terminated, and to this end the President * * * is hereby requested and directed, within 90 days after passage of this act, to give notice to the several governments, respectively, that so much * * * of all such treaties * * * will terminate on the expiration of such periods after notices have been given as may be required in such treaties."

President Wilson gave the required notice. (Samuel B. Crandall. Treaties: Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed. 1916, p. 460.)

A direction to the President, contained in the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1007) to terminate treaties restricting the right of the United States to impose documentary customs duties was not complied with by President Wilson because he stated that "the treaties contained no provisions for their termination in the manner contemplated by Congress." The point was made that the direction sought to terminate only so much of the treaty as imposed any restriction on the United States as to customs duties and tonnage dues and did not comprehend abrogation of the treaties in their entirety. The Solicitor for the State Department at the time wrote:

"Congress may pass an act violative of a treaty. It may express its sense that a treaty should be terminated. But it cannot in effect undertake legally to modify a treaty no matter what methods it may employ. In doing that it, in effect, attempts to conduct diplomatic negotiations and to encroach on the treatymaking power composed of the President and the Senate."

Earlier, in 1879, Congress enacted a bill forbidding any ship from bringing more than 15 Chinese immigrants to the United States on any one trip. President Hayes vetoed the bill on March 1, 1879, because the legislation would mean virtual exclusion of all Chinese and accordingly be in conflict with the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 which accorded the privilege of unlimited entry of Chinese. In his veto, President Hayes said:

"The authority of Congress to terminate a treaty with a foreign power by expressing the will if the Nation no longer to adhere to it is as free from controversy under our Constitution as is the further proposition that the power of making new treaties or modifying existing treaties is not lodged by the Constitution in Congress, but in the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

I wish to call your attention at this point to the fact that the Status of Forces Agreement contains provisions as to the means by which it may be modified or abrogated, and that House Joint Resolution 309 conforms strictly to the provisions of the agreement as to either right. It is not an enactment of a law of itself to modify or terminate an agreement. There is considerable authority for participation by the House in a resolution of this kind.

As early as 1856, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a report sustaining the validity of a Senate resolution authorizing transmission of a notice of termination, to be adopted in fulfillment of a Presidential request addressed to the Senate alone, explicitly acknowledged that other procedures, such as one involving adoption of an authorizing resolution by both Houses, would be equally appropriate. Similarly, the Supreme Court, which in a dictum set forth in an early decision, had intimated that the power to terminate was vested in the President, more recently has also acknowledged that no constitutional inadequacy attaches to denunciation of treaty provisions by Presidential notice of termination issued pursuant to direction contained in the Seamen's Act of 1915. Perhaps the strongest claim of constitutional competence on behalf of participation by the House has been made by Edward S. Corwin who once asserted that "legislative precedent, which moreover is generally supported by the attitude of the executive, sanctions the proposition that the power of terminating the international compacts to which the United States is party belongs, as a prerogative of sovereignty, to Congress alone." Concurring, though less emphatically, John Bassett Moore also observed that notice of termination "when given by the President * * * usually * * * has been given under the authority of a joint resolution of Congress."

From these precedents and assertions perhaps the only conclusion that safely may be drawn is that "history shows that treaties and executive agreements have been modified or abrogated as a result of various procedures which emphatically assert that alternative methods are even more characteristic of the unmaking of international acts than of their making," and that, perhaps, "the choice of method would seem to depend either upon the importance of the international question or upon the preference of the Executive."

(*Charlton* v. *Kelly* ((1913) 229 U. S. 447, 476); *Van der Weyde* v. *Ocean Co.* ((1936) 297 U. S. 114, 117–118); Mr. Justice Iredall, in his concurring opinion in *Warve* v. *Hylton* ((1796) 3 Dall. 199, 256, 260), also acknowledged the validity of joint action by the two Houses of Congress.)

Senate Report 97, 34th Congress, first session, as reproduced in Senate Document 231, 56th Congress, second session, part 8, pages 107–109 111–112; see also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 14:2333.

Edward S. Corwin, the President's Control of Foreign Relations (1917), page 115; Hackworth, in the work cited, page 319; Wallace M. McClure, International Executive Agree-

ments (1941), page 16; Mathews, in the work cited, page 616; Moore, in the work cited, page 322.

Before concluding let me digress a bit to say that my mail shows an increasing interest in this subject from all sections of the country, and other Members have informed me that they are having the same experience. These letters are not written by irresponsible, unthinking people, swayed only by misconception, as Mr. Murphy suggested. Many of them show surprising knowledge of the principles involved. And many of them are from men in the Armed Forces who have given this great thought and consideration, even to the point that one young man in France tells me his fellows hesitate to take a pass for fear they will be taunted and attacked by French Communist thugs and thrown into French jails for defending themselves. A very thoughtful letter has come to me from an Air Force captain in France, whose name I have decided should be classified information. He writes:

"This is to inform you that I, along with thousands of other servicemen serving overseas, am opposed to this so-called Status of Forces Agreement which deprives us of our basic constitutional rights as American citizens.

"We serve, some because we must, others because they feel it their duty, but all of us without exception serve because we feel that the American way of life is the best way of life. We serve to protect that way of life; not to see it torn down right before our eyes by agreements of this type.

"My wife, who incidentally is a former German national nicely converted to the American way of life, states that an agreement such as that made behind closed doors, without the knowledge of the citizenry of the United States, is something that she would have expected out of Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia but never from the United States. What can you say to a statement like that?

"Having spent the last 2 years in France, I know that there are a considerable number of French judiciary who are either outright Communists or are of Communist leanings. What sort of treatment do you imagine one of these betrayers of humanity would deal out to any serviceman who either accidentally or on purpose was ordered to appear before him?

"I sincerely hope that you and the other Representatives will continue to fight for cancellation of this unconstitutional agreement. Remember, this is no two-way street. We have hundreds of thousands of American citizen servicemen in foreign countries while these same foreign countries have very few servicemen in ours. Great Britain during her numerous occupations of foreign countries never made such agreements with those countries. Why should we? Remember this too, please. To deprive one segment of our society of its constitutional rights makes it that much easier to deprive all segments of that society of the same rights."

I commend this closing thought to you. Where is our State Department leading us?

Mr. Chairman, I cannot feel that it is at all unreasonable for this committee and the Congress to express itself on the Status of Forces Treaty, and I regret that anyone should construe my efforts as a criticism of the President or an effort to embarrass him.

I think it is perfectly natural for this Government to strive all of the time to improve the situation of our servicemen. Perhaps in entering into this agreement, the President may feel that his predecessor closed the door on further negotiations. Certainly it is to be regretted that the State Department witness seems to feel that way and to be content simply to defend the status quo.

Perhaps this resolution is precisely what the President needs to justify a request that the terms of the treaty be opened for new discussion. The section of the resolution which requires him to denounce the treaty if it is not modified is intended and certainly should strengthen his hand in such discussions.

I trust he will view it in this light.

Let me tell you why I believe that other nations will be and in fact probably are now willing to reopen the Status of Forces agreements.

First, we have agreements in effect right now that give us exclusive jurisdiction. Such an agreement is in effect with Ethiopia. Very likely some of the secret agreements contain similar provisions. If any nation is willing to give us exclusive jurisdiction, is that not a compelling reason to strive for the same thing from other nations?

Second. At least one NATO nation on whom we have conferred exclusive jurisdiction has voluntarily agreed to waive such rights. General Hickman testified concerning this agreement with Greece. In other words, we have accomplished with one nation what my colleague, Representative BUDGE, hoped to accomplish with regard to others when he presented his amendment to the Mutual Security authorization. If it can be done with one, it can be done with others.

Third. The nations of the world with which we are allied are deeply indebted to us for economic and technical assistance. This calls to mind the situation that existed in Great Britain in 1942 when that nation enacted legislation to give us exclusive jurisdiction. It was a new situation to the British because they had seldom in history had foreign troops on their soil—usually it was the opposite. But Lord Actin said: "It is a proposal unique in the constitutional history of this country, but the Government of the United States have been so ungrudging in the aid given to this country that if they expressed a desire for such legislation, no one would hesitate to grant it. This statement and a similar one by Anthony Eden are quoted in the Canadian case to which we have referred.

Let me say that Lord Actin's attitude in 1942 should certainly be reflected by British statesmen now, for we have given them generous aid and assistance through all of the intervening years, and our total aid to this and other allies since the war's end is measured at more than $64 billions.

Fourth. My fourth point is closely related to the above. I believe that most of these nations actually recognize that our troops are stationed there largely for their benefit. As a matter of fact, they have urged it upon us because they want us to stop aggression where it begins rather than liberate them after they have been occupied, as we have done in the past. This point should be stressed strongly in all negotiations and I think it is a compelling argument, any benefits to our own security notwithstanding.

In summary, we know that we have had exclusive jurisdiction in the past. We have it in some countries today. Greece has waived her claims to it. We know that some treaties are more favorable than others, such as the Libyan agreements which guarantee a presumption of innocence and protection against self-incrimination.

Knowing all of these things, is it unreasonable to direct the President to press for further advantages for our men? I think not. I hope that the State Department, even in the absence of congressional action, will recognize the sentiment of America and proceed with all of its ability to secure more favorable agreements. I hope that the Justice Department will reexamine its position and the precedents which it has formerly relied upon but lately denied. It can support the State Department by so doing. I am confident the Defense Department would welcome such action by the other two, for I am certain that our military commanders and the men themselves are by no means happy with nor satisfied with article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement and the related treaties and arrangements.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include statements made before the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the creation of new under secretaries, assistant secretaries and all other kinds of secretaries. I have opposed them consistently since I became a Member of Congress. I opposed the creation of these new, top-level jobs under the Truman administration, and I oppose them under the Eisenhower administration. We are already topheavy with secretaries, under secretaries, deputy under secretaries, assistant secretaries and all kinds of secretaries.

In 1953 one of the first bills passed by the House created an assistant secretary or under secretary—I have forgotten the designation—in the State Department for a 2-year term. That was supposedly to reduce personnel in the State Department. Will someone rise on the floor of the House and give me some figures showing reductions in the personnel of the State Department under that gentleman or his successor, both of whom were paid substantial salaries by the taxpayers of this country? Does anyone care to get up and tell me how many people were eliminated, how much personnel was reduced in the State Department under these gentlemen who were there for the purpose of cutting down personnel?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Knowing that the gentleman is more familiar with this Department than I happen to be, I was rather confused at the definitions given by the gentleman of the various assistants, deputy assistants, assistant assistants, and 4 or 5 other kinds of assistants. How does the gentleman define all these secretaries that they want to juggle around in the Department? May I say that I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman's position, I am also opposed to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I did not define them. Apparently the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the State Department defines them. I guess it is collaboration between the two that defines these various and sundry secretaries. I have not been able to figure out this deal. I am just doing my best to put a stop to this thing because somewhere along the line we are going to have to cut spending in Government, we are going to have to stop this empire

building within Government, and I hope we can start right here.

The gentleman from South Carolina says that this new Under Secretary is going to cost $15,000. Well, now, I think the gentleman from South Carolina knows very well that this House late Saturday afternoon passed a bill that is going to increase the salaries of Under Secretaries of the State Department by $5,000 a year; from $15,000 to $20,000 a year. The gentleman is aware of that, I am sure. He says "We do not bring in this bill to provide a pay increase for them." They already have a pay increase.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Would the gentleman have preferred that we leave these pay raises in as passed by the Senate?

Mr. GROSS. Well, there was a difference of only $500, as I recall it, in the salary increases for Under Secretaries as provided for in the Senate bill and as compared with the Executive Pay Act which passed the House Saturday.

Mr. RICHARDS. Oh, no. That is not correct. The Secretary of State draws $22,500; the Under Secretary draws $17,500; and the Assistant Secretary of State draws $15,000. There are no increases for them in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No; there are not in this bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, I do not know what is provided in some other bill. This bill stands on its own hind legs.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows the House passed an executive pay-raise bill late Saturday afternoon; the gentleman knows that. He must know that each Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of State is being raised from his present salary of $15,000. You are dealing here, are you not, with an under secretary? Each Deputy Under Secretary of State you are dealing with is presently paid $15,000, according to this schedule, and will be paid under the bill you passed here Saturday afternoon—and to which I was opposed, and I guess the only one who spoke against it—will be increased to $20,000. I just got through saying you are establishing here an office that will cost $20,000 plus a retinue of secretaries, stenographers, and so on and so forth.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say for the information of the House that this bill was reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ready for action long before the other bill that the gentleman is talking about came before the House. For that matter, that bill is not law yet.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think there is any question that it will not become law?

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman is here at the time it comes up, there certainly will be some question.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman flatters me.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentleman had the power to prevent it, wouuld he allow anybody working for the State Department to put his feet in his business in Iowa? Would the gentleman ever agree to such a thing?

Mr. GROSS. Sure. We let the Russian commissars come in. I imagine that the striped-pants State Department crowd know as much about agriculture as the Russian political commissars do.

You know, I had the privilege of attending some hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs not so long ago with reference to the resolutions that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and I have introduced to knock out the infamous Status of Forces Treaties and secret agreements. At these hearings I heard one of the Sectaries of State—I believe he was an Under Secretary—I cannot keep track of all of them—a man by the name of Murphy, testify before the committee that the United States has exclusive jurisdiction over American servicemen in Saudi-Arabia.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] questioned this Under Secretary, and it was prolonged questioning, I assure you. Mr. ADAIR had to read word for word the agreement that we had entered into with Saudi-Arabia to prove to this Under Secretary of State that he did not know what he was talking about although he was the State Department's principal witness before the committee in behalf of the continuation of the Status of Forces Treaty and secret agreements under which American servicemen are tried in civil courts in certain foreign countries and, if convicted, incarcerated in foreign prisons.

Either this Under Secretary of State, Mr. Murphy, was ignorant or deliberately misstated the facts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, this Under Secretary of State, Mr. Murphy, was either ignorant or deliberately misstated the facts. It took the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] a long time to get him to admit that the United States does not have exclusive jurisdiction over its servicemen so far as criminal procedures are concerned in Saudi Arabia.

As I said before, this is an excellent place to begin to save some money for the people of this country. There are Secretaries falling all over each other in the Department of State and no one has in any way justified the addition of another one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], and I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] will continue to give them "heck" on every occasion.

Mr. GROSS. I will say this to the gentleman from Michigan: That this new Under Secretary in the Department of State is needed just about as badly as a bullfrog needs feathers.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he would define these various ranks. You have a Deputy Under Secretary and you have Assistant Secretaries and several other kinds of assistants.

Mr. RICHARDS. Here is what you have. You have a Secretary of State and an Under Secretary of State.

Mr. WIER. How many of those do you have?

Mr. RICHARDS. One Secretary and one Under Secretary. We have no statutory position of Deputy Under Secretary, but we have two Assistant Secretaries of State who are designated as Deputy Under Secretaries of State. What we want to do in this bill is to create 1 new Deputy Under Secretary of State and promote 2 Assistant Secretaries of State to the position of Deputy Under Secretaries of State. Thus, there will be three Deputy Under Secretaries of State.

Mr. WIER. Isn't that clear?

Mr. RICHARDS. The 2 vacancies in the ranks of the Assistant Secretaries will be filled by promoting 2 GS–18 people. These are the Director of the Policy Planning Staff and the Controller, both of whom have responsibilities, and perform functions, comparable to those of Assistant Secretaries.

That is just as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. This State departmental organization is completely described in the report on pages 2 and 3 and those who are getting up and asking about this organization can save the time of the rest of us by reading what is there.

What is happening is that we create one new position and upgrade four others. There will be one new face down in the Department of State if this bill is passed. All this will cost $15,600 under existing law. It will cost more if the executive pay bill which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] opposed the other day but which passed by a two-thirds vote, is adopted in the other body. The new man is going to be Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. It seems to me this country, with about 20 percent of all the exports of the world and 15 percent of all the imports, should have a man in the State Department who can give his full time to policy in the realm of economic affairs.

With this change in the law there will be 14 below the Secretary of State in the Department of State with the rank of Assistant Secretary of State or better. In the Department of Defense there are 25 or 28, depending on which way you count them, that are of the rank of Assistant Secretary of Defense or better.

Why do you need so many people of such rank in the Department of State? I counted in the Congressional Directory Saturday 81 countries that have representatives in the United States. These representatives, when they go to the Department of State about their business, always want to see the head man or at least a "big shot." The Secretary of State is a busy man, often out of the

country. This keeps the Under Secretary very busy. By creating 1 more Deputy Under Secretary of State, and upgrading 2 Assistant Secretaries to be Deputy Under Secretaries we make room for 2 more Assistant Secretaries of State, 1 a Comptroller and the other the Director of Policy Planning. We will then have 14 who can talk to these representatives of foreign countries, so they will not feel they are talking to some underling. Because the Department of State deals with foreign nations is the reason we need so many high-ranking officials, although it is half the number we have now in the Department of Defense.

We are "beefing up" the economic side of the Department of State. I think that is a good thing. We are putting in as Comptroller and Assistant Secretary of State Zeke Carpenter, who is a successful businessman from Omaha, who is putting more business methods in the operations of the Department of State. I think that is a good thing. He had the rank of Assistant Secretary last year, but stepped down to make room for an organizational shift. He should have that rank again.

Here, however, is the real reason for this bill. President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles and Herbert Hoover, Jr., who is Under Secretary of State, say they need it for the good of the Republic, they need it to operate the Department of State. Herbert Hoover, Jr., this man who is a genius in business organization and operation, has devoted his time selflessly as a public servant in the Department of State as Under Secretary, and he is the operational head, to free the Secretary of details. He says they need this setup in order to attend to the business of the State Department.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. This is an administration bill; is it not?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDS. I just wanted to get that straight.

Mr. VORYS. With all due respect for the encyclopedia and kaleidoscopic knowledge and wisdom of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], on foreign and domestic affairs, as between his judgment on the way the State Department ought to be organized and that of President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and Herbert Hoover, Jr., I suggest we string along with the latter three and give them what they say they need in the interest of our country.

This same suggestion applies to the creation of a new grade of career Ambassador in the Foreign Service, provided in this bill, and to provision changing the base for computing annuities. These changes are needed, as stated in the title of the bill "To strengthen and improve the organization of the Department of State."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the reasons for this legislation by the gentleman from Ohio, let me ask this: With all of this high brass at the top, and with all of these deputy assignments defined in so many ways; it is not possible for the Secretary of State to make possible promotions without a new appointment? This is merely finding a job for somebody who is not already in the Department.

Mr. VORYS. If there is going to be 1 new job, there are going to be 4 men promoted under this bill. There will only be one new face and that is for the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. All the other positions will be filled by promotions within the Department. That is why it is not going to cost very much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for 14 years. I have watched our country grow in responsibility. On the other hand, I have not seen us here in the House of Representatives as ready, as I feel it is necessary for us to be, to build a Department of State and a Foreign Service second to none in the world. We have very, very real obligations. We need people who know their jobs. We need enough of such people.

There are representatives here of 81 other nations who, as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has just said, want to be able to consult our people about every phase of international life. As the gentleman has said so well, they are not satisfied with the little fellow. When they go to a Government department, they want to speak to somebody with authority, then they can say back home, "I talked to the Assistant Secretary" or "I talked to the Deputy Assistant Secretary." You may say that is foolishness, that they should be satisfied with a lesser person. But it is just human nature; we feel the same way. When we go to the various departments of our Government, are we satisfied to talk to an underling? No, indeed.

It is my earnest hope that the House will bring to the 1956 session a recognition of the need we have in responsible world leadership to build a well-trained and adequate Foreign Service backed by a well-administered, well-trained, well-equipped State Department without which we cannot expect to carry the burden of responsibility which is ours and to have the influence in world affairs that can and should be ours. We cannot do what needs to be done for other people nor can we do what needs to be done for ourselves, if we do not have the adequate personnel.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House act favorably upon this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will pass this bill by the required two-thirds vote; there is no doubt in my mind that we need another Deputy Under Secretary of State. You have one good man there now, nominally a Deputy Under Secretary, for personnel. You have another good man there now, nominally a Deputy Under Secretary, for policy. As the gentleman from Ohio stated, to handle world problems confronting us of an economic nature, we need a Deputy Under Secretary for economic affairs. There is no doubt about that in my mind. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that no matter what you do about this bill, this country is facing the most deceptively perilous times we have ever faced since Communism confronted us on the world front with the avowed purpose of destroying us. Only today we got the news from Geneva that the 11 flyers are going to be released and our people are saying that the leopard has changed its spots. That announcement comes at the time that we are preparing to adjourn and go home to our constituents—splendid timing.

Evidently the intention on the part of the Communist world is to inoculate us properly so that we can aid further in putting our constituents to sleep.

There is more than one kind of brainwashing, the most diabolical form of suffering ever devised. We know about the pressure, the misery, and the pain and the abject surrender of strong American boys who have been subjected to this form of Communist torture. We know about that. They are masters in that art. They are masters too in another field of brain-washing. What is it? Today they are following exactly the lines that Lenin and Stalin laid down. That is, when the going gets tough, smile, retreat, zig and zag and compromise and put the free world to sleep with the peace anesthetic.

If you have not read Secretary of State Dulles' book, War or Peace, published in 1950, you should read it. There you find a man who understands communism and its dangers to our way of life—and who knows that smiles coming from the Communists mean nothing. I quote from his book:

> There exists a great power—Russia— under the control of a despotic group fanatical in their acceptance of a creed that teaches world domination and that would deny those personal freedoms which constitute our most cherished political and religious heritage.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The "enemy"—the self-proclaimed enemy—is the relatively small, fanatical Soviet Communist Party. Stalin is its leader, and the Politburo is the principal source of the decisions which command the blind obedience of the hard core of loyal Communist Party members everywhere in the world.
>
> These party members have despotic political power in Russia and elsewhere. They believe that it is their duty to extend that power to all the world. They believe it right to use fraud, terrorism, and violence, and any other means that will promote their ends. They treat as enemies all who oppose their will.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The actual purposes of Soviet communism are to be judged in the light of its official creed that is taught to the millions of Communists who make up the party in Russia and in other countries. That creed is a far more reliable guide than the words that are occasionally uttered for our confusion.
>
> * * * * *
>
> "We are living," says Lenin, "not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side

by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable."

* * * * *

In the foregoing paragraphs I have presented as fairly as I can the doctrine of Soviet communism and its methods as taught by Stalin. There are, I know, recurrent efforts to say that this is "old stuff" and "obsolete"; that Soviet communism has changed; that it no longer seeks world conquest and no longer uses methods of fraud, secret penetration, and civil violence. That, in my opinion, represents wishful thinking.

* * * * *

There is no illusion greater or more dangerous than that Soviet intentions can be deflected by persuasion.

Wait until they put the squeeze on Mr. Dulles. Wait until the misguided "Peace" and "we must compromise with them" pressures begin hounding him in full cry, urging that he compromise or be destroyed.

Certainly we should be willing to talk with anyone or any nation in the interest of peace as long as we do not abandon our principles, as long as we do not compromise with evil, as long as we do not abandon friends and allies of the free world who have gallantly withstood the Communist menace. But surely, Mr. Speaker, the moral stamina of this country has not sunk so low, the love of peace at any price risen so high, as to fall for the siren song of those who would neutralize, divide and conquer us. Make no mistake, that is their purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Now, do not forget this. We will soon be away from here. We will be back home talking to the home folks trying to answer their questions. Everything may appear to be peaceful there and when they ask us, "is this peace talk real?" it may be hard to disillusion them and bring them face to face with the stark reality that we can place no confidence in this new brand of smiles of the Communists. This new form of brainwashing is an insidious thing, doubly dangerous because it ties in so closely with the longing of our own people for release from the tensions and strain of warlike talk.

Thus the plan is to blend the Geneva summit talks with the Geneva Chou En-lai Red China talks at a high level, and give us the one-two punch when the time is ripe, and all the while the faith of the fringe free world will be whittled away until we stand alone.

You will remember the days when another administration was in power and Acheson and Truman were carrying the load of foreign policy. They were just as conscientious and patriotic, I am sure, as Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower are today. You Members on my left, day after day, rose and condemned them for foreign policy mistakes, and they made some. This Republican administration will probably make its share. But, Mr. Speaker, there have been few to rise on the Democratic side of the aisle in this day of trial and condemn and damn Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles for their mistakes in the face of difficulties.

Why? Because we believe in a truly hundred percent bipartisan foreign policy and because we believe Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles are patriotic Americans and that there should be no division in the face of a common enemy.

I would hate to stand in Mr. Dulles' shoes. He is under great pressure. These pressures to make concessions to the Communists, to recognize Red China, to abandon our commitments to weaker allies, to enfold in our arms the Communists' promises of peace will grow and grow while we are away from these halls.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my lack of confidence in the new face of the Communists does not appear cynical.

Why should we have confidence in their smiles and their charm campaign when every teaching of Stalin and Lenin seeks to justify a campaign of charm and compromise to achieve the ultimate goal of world revolution? Here is the chain of events happening since the charm campaign was inaugurated—here is the anesthetic by which to put the free world to sleep while they reform their lines:

THE SOVIET CHARM CAMPAIGN

First. The Soviet signed a peace treaty with Austria—with Austria to remain neutral.

Second. Russian Ambassadors went to Belgrade to woo Marshal Tito, who returned the courtesy by agreeing to visit Moscow.

Third. Russia invited Chancellor Adenauer to go to Moscow to discuss unification of Germany.

Fourth. The Soviet is making peace overtures to Japan.

Fifth. Russia entertained Nehru and induced him to sign in Moscow a declaration to neutralize India. In farewell address to Nehru, Bulganin quoted Hitler almost verbatim when he declared: "Relations between India and the Soviet provide an example of how to put into practice the principles of peaceful coexistence."

For me, all of that is not enough. If Russia and Red China wish to convince us of their sincerity, let them announce to a waiting world that they once and for all renounce the teachings of Lenin and Stalin; that they abandon the aim of world revolution.

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on one of the most forthright and informative speeches in the well of this House in this session of Congress and possibly in any session of this body.

The distinguished gentleman whose responsibility it is to keep abreast on a day-to-day basis on all those events throughout the world which have an important bearing upon the security and welfare of the American people, has put his finger on the real tactics of this latest maneuver by the Communists to lull the free world into a deep slumber, so that they in turn will have time to consolidate the greatest colonial empire ever built up in the history of mankind. With the skill of an unusual statesman, the gentleman from South Carolina has analyzed the Russian effort to cause a great dilemma within the body politic of the United States. The great dilemma they seek to create is that those who fail to support the Russian demand for peaceful coexistence, on terms which can lead only to the enslavement of the American people, will be characterized as enemies of peace. This is a dilemma which the ruthless Russians seek to place each and every Congressman in as he returns to his home constituency, where they must face the question as to whether the Russians are sincere or as usual are deceitful. As the able chairman has stated, the American people seek only peace and consequently desire an easing, where possible, of international tensions. This places a grave responsibility on each and every Member of Congress to tell his constituents the hard, cold truth concerning this latest tactic of the Russians, which the gentleman from South Carolina has so ably analyzed. I wish to assure my colleagues that I shall, during the time Congress is in recess, do everything in my power to bring to the attention of my constituents and all the American people the challenge of the basic issues which Mr. RICHARDS has analyzed for us today. I know that all the Members of Congress will join with me in this assurance and that they will, without hesitation, bring to the attention of their constituents, the full truth concerning this latest Russian maneuver which they call peaceful coexistence, but which we, as realistic Americans, recognize as the same old Marxist-Engels, Leninist-Stalinist line calculated to advance the Russian master plan for world conquest.

I again congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for his courage, for his wisdom, and for his wise counsel on the greatest problem which America has been required to face since the founding days of our Republic.

Mr. RICHARDS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wish to say that this is the most important speech that has been made in this House this session. I wish the words that the gentleman has said here could be written in letters of fire on the brain of every American, because he has pointed out a danger that is ever existent.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is not the gentleman convinced that the President of the United States and Secretary Dulles will not let their guard down in dealing with these Communists at these high-level meetings?

Mr. RICHARDS. I pray God they will not.

Mr. MORANO. Is not the gentleman convinced that they will not?

Mr. RICHARDS. I am convinced that they want to do the right thing. I hope they will stand up.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself wholeheartedly and completely with what the gentleman has said.

I was one who criticized some in former administrations when I thought they were not resisting with sufficient alertness and determination the wiles and tricks of Communist forces, especially in Asia. I know this administration, which is of my own party, does not intend to weaken or fall into the Red traps, but if I found it yielding on these basic issues, I would fight it just as hard as I did its predecessors.

The gentleman from South Carolina has made a splendid statement, has laid the plain, hard facts before us. We must not let our zeal for peace cause us to lose it by grasping too eagerly at the straws the Communists skillfully toss out before us. I hope and I believe our officials will successfully resist the terrible pressure that I know is being put upon them to break our word to some of our allies in the vain notion that will somehow bring peace with our enemies. All that would accomplish, if we were to do it, would be to lose our friends and make stronger our enemies. The only peace it would bring would be the peace of slavery.

Let me read you this dispatch from Tokyo taken right off the ticker. After talking about the fear among our anti-Communist allies in Asia that Washington is moving closer to recognition of Communist China, it goes on:

> And the Asians, who have been urged by the United States to resist communism, cannot understand United States willingness to negotiate with the Chinese Reds.

It also says:

> An important Filipino leader raised the question in a private conversation on the matter: "Is the principle of negotiation and compromise—or coexistence by any other name—more important than the principle of right and wrong?"

Mr. Speaker, we have come to the crossroads, and I pray that the executive branch and the legislative branch, and our people as a whole will prove steadfast and worthy of our heritage of freedom in this hour when we are being so sorely tempted. If we were to falter once more we shall lose the ground that has been gained, and go down in history doomed ourselves and condemned by all mankind. But if we hold high our courage and put first honor and human freedom, we shall save the world and be blessed by all history.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, realizing the limits of time, I ask unanimous consent that I and others who wish may extend their remarks at this point in connection with the very strong and important statement on our present peril the gentleman from South Carolina has made, with which I entirely agree.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. I want on this my last chance to talk to the House this session to pay my tribute to the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, an extremely level-headed, far-seeing, independent, and patriotic Member of the House. He is also, because of his record and his character, an extremely influential Member. His amendment, the Richards amendment, was accepted by a Republican administration and a Republican President 2 years ago, and this amendment did much to bring our allies together in Europe in the Western European Union.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. I hope the gentleman's words today are listened to. We have been hearing too much of counsel of another kind from another body.

An American ambassador is meeting today in Geneva with an ambassador from Red China. Chou en Lai, the Red Chinese Premier, in a speech last weekend, said, "The purpose of these talks would be not only to settle the repatriation of civilians," but "to facilitate further discussion and settlement of other practical matters now at issue—between both sides, so as to contribute to the relaxation of the tension between China and the United States."

This is in line with suggestions made recently by an important figure at the other end of the Capitol.

What does this mean? What are these "other practical matters" to be discussed and settled?

Are we headed toward an Asian summit meeting like Munich and Yalta, to relax tensions and secure peace in our time by consenting to the subjugation of free people in other countries?

I hope not.

Remember, we are dealing at Geneva with a gang denounced as aggressor by formal action of the U. N. Assembly; a gang that has violated their cease-fire agreements in Korea and Indochina; a gang not recognized by 43 members of the United Nations; a gang denounced by a whole series of resolutions of Congress.

Only recently, during the summit meeting, Congress passed the McCormack resolution opposing Communist imperialism, as well as other forms of colonialism.

Nevertheless, the free fighting nations of Asia, our real friends, who are opposing communism, are trembling. Korea, Formosa, Indochina, the Philippines are wondering where they stand; whether they are going to stand or fall. They cannot stand alone; they cannot stand together against Communist aggression without our help.

I hope we let them know, on and off the record, publicly and privately, that we are standing firm against their takeover by communism, either by aggression or by appeasement, at Geneva or elsewhere.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me that the great chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has spoken up this afternoon and has issued a word of warning to the American people.

This is what I tried to do last Saturday in the remarks which I inserted in the RECORD for that day.

A little while ago, it was announced that 11 Americans were released from unjust imprisonment by the Chinese Communists.

Some people have spoken today concerning the release of these innocent Americans and have used language such as "hailing with joy."

I find nothing to hail with joy in this long overdue liberation of innocent Americans, and I think it is almost ghoulish to use such language while a large number of other Americans languish in Communist jails.

Sometimes I almost lose hope that our people will retain any sense of balance about our international situation when prominent men use such extravagant language.

I believe that these prisoners could have been and should have been released long ago, and that had we handled our affairs properly, all of these prisoners would have been home by now.

Instead, the civilians are retained to be used as pawns in a sordid game of international politics.

One of them is a constituent of mine, John T. Downey of New Britain, Conn., and he is under a life sentence in Red China.

Anxious as I am to return to my home, I earnestly believe that this Congress should remain in session and find out what is being said in Geneva by Mr. Ural Alexis Johnson to the Red Chinese Ambassador.

When we return next January the opportunity to do something about commitments made in Switzerland this week will have passed us by.

It appears to me that the arrangements for the release of the 11 fliers was made some time ago and when it was believed that Congress intended to adjourn last Saturday.

Some day we will find out what price was paid. But we are in the dark now. This is a good time and place to state that I have been trying to get accurate figures on the number of Americans believed to be held in Communist prisons throughout the world and thus far, I have not been able to obtain accurate and consistent figures.

My own conviction is that there are several thousands of American citizens held in Communist prisons throughout the world. Many of them who have been confined were either visiting or traveling abroad when the Russian and the Chinese Communist swept them up in the course of aggressive conquests of free nations.

From time to time, as individuals have been released from Soviet slave labor camps, we have caught glimpses of American citizens still confined, and so far as I know, no real effort has been made to find out who they are, where they are, why they are held and why they are not released. I shall press this matter further to the best of my ability at a later date.

Some knowledge must have been in the State Department about these people years ago, and some knowledge must be in the State Department about these people now.

It may be that only a committee of this House with power to investigate, can really ascertain the facts.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS].

The Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, disturbed by recent statements and reports of growing optimism caused by the Chinese Communists' clever doubletalk which gives the appearance of sincerity and of the Reds' desire to resolve the Far East tensions peacefully, has prepared the following statement which I wish to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AUGUST 1, 1955.

STATEMENT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The recently concluded discussions at the summit have started a chain reaction of optimism. Without detracting from the efforts of our Government to pursue every reasonable and honorable path to an enduring peace, we must warn against unjustified overoptimism. None of the fundamental issues have been adjusted or resolved. Solid accomplishments that justify any relaxation of our efforts have not been forthcoming. They may be forthcoming, and we hope they will. But until such time there is every reason for us to pursue our course with resolution.

The meetings that start today between our representative and a representative of Communist China have only heightened that optimism. Our Government has stated that they are confined to a few practical issues, foremost of which is the return of Americans whom the Chinese Communists have held as hostages, some as long as 5 years, to use them as bargaining pawns. But even before they started, distinguished Americans have cut the ground from our negotiator by stating that we ought to discuss the Formosa issue with Red China at higher levels.

Negotiations on Far East issues cannot be based on the easy and false assumption that the same preliminary conditions exist there as in Europe. In Europe the free world participants, after years of negotiation among themselves, were in agreement on their position. They could lead from a position of strength and unity. Such is not the case in the Far East. The peaceful protestations of Red China must be measured against its truculent demands. These have not changed. They are simply presented in more appealing and seductive words.

The fact that 1 hour before negotiations were to start at Geneva the Chinese Communists announced release of 11 airmen they had been holding in violation of their solemn commitment at Panmunjon is one more demonstration of their shrewd and devious tactics and their ruthless disregard of human values in pursuit of their unchanging objectives.

Chou En-lai's address of a few days ago is a studied effort in doubletalk. With an air of injured innocence he restated Communist China's demands in a manner calculated to make it appear that tensions in the Far East were the fault of the United States.

He called for the unification of Korea and of Vietnam. He ignored the fact that they are divided only because of Communist China's imperialist policy of conquest. Are we expected to forget that only 5 years ago we fought to keep even South Korea independent? Communist China was adjudged an aggressor by the United Nations. We know that Communist China has violated the Korean armistice time after time. Similarly, it has violated the armistice in Vietnam. Are we to conclude that we should negotiate for the unification of those countries only to have them taken over by the Communists?

Chou stated that the United States "occupies" Formosa and "interferes with the peaceful liberation of China's coastal islands." Under the leadership of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and then of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Congress expressed itself overwhelmingly on this matter. One of the reasons prompting congressional concern was the premise that "the secure possession by friendly governments of the western Pacific Island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean." We are unaware of any change in that part of the world that makes the resolution any less meaningful or necessary now.

Indicative of the perverted logic of Chou's talk is his statement that "the lawful status (of Communist China) in the United Nations has not been restored to it." Communist China has never been a member of the United Nations. On the contrary, it has the unique distinction of having gone to war against the United Nations and of having been condemned as an aggressor by the United Nations. Are we to believe that a regime that has been so stigmatized meets the standards necessary to hold a seat in an organization pledged to support the United Nations Charter?

Only last week Secretary Dulles stated that the present talks with Communist China do not imply any diplomatic recognition nor will they result in arrangements that would prejudice the rights of the Republic of China on Formosa. We subscribe to those views. It is the height of folly to jeopardize our position and that of our allies in Asia for an illusion of accomplishment by declaring that we ought to meet with the Chinese Communists soon to settle the Formosa issue. The problem is not Formosa. It is the lawless and aggressive behavior of Communist China. Only the Communists can change that.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, Chairman; THURMOND CHATHAM, North Carolina; JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma; ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; J. L. PILCHER, Georgia; ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Illinois; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; CHESTER E. MERROW, New Hampshire; MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Illinois.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald carried a story entitled "Ike's Geneva 'Triumph' Has Britain Cheering." The article was written by Chalmers M. Roberts, and it stated that "in British eyes, America has come around to a sensible approach toward Russia and has begun to give ground from its obstinate stand against the Chinese Communists." Mr. Roberts said that the British played an important part at Geneva "in breaking the American-Red Chinese deadlock" and that British Prime Minister Eden told the House of Commons that the situation in the Far East had been discussed "in private summit talks."

The article points out, however, that the real seed from which will ultimately be reaped the whirlwind was sown before President Eisenhower left Washington for Genera, and that the key date appears to have been July 6 when the President received India's roving Ambassador, V. K. Krishna Menon, at the White House, because it was then and there that Menon won his point from Mr. Eisenhower that the United States must make the first move to begin talks with the Communists lest they start military action in the Formosa area.

Now, no one can doubt that the British have been intensely eager for the United States to duplicate their mistake of extending diplomatic recognition to Red China. They have had a yen for bowing the knee to the Reds since 1924 when the British Government under the leadership of MacDonald, first granted official recognition to the Soviet Union. Of course, this recognition was short lived and, as a result of Communist interference with British internal affairs, diplomatic relations were ruptured in 1927 only to be restored in 1929 when Henderson was British Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Nonetheless, you will recall that before 2 weeks had passed, relations between Britain and Russia were again reduced to a state of suspicion and distrust because of the disregard for the diplomatic contract by the Reds, who published an inflammatory proclamation in the Daily Worker inciting the English working class to prepare for a revolutionary government by the organization of a network of "cells" which would unite the laboring class of Great Britain and seize power at the proper time. Recognition was subsequently renewed, however, and the United States committed this same moral and political blunder by granting long delayed dejure recognition to the Soviet Government on November 17, 1933, the first of a series of events which greatly improved Russia's position.

After a long delay, we followed the British in that instance and we shall never cease to rue the day. Now the British are hoping that we will be persuaded to give the stamp of approval to the illegitimate Chinese People's Republic. But two wrongs do not make a right, Mr. Speaker. Our mistake of granting recognition to a reprehensible clique in 1933 will not be corrected by recognizing an equally detestable coterie of cutthroats in 1955 or 1965 or 1975 or ever.

Mr. Speaker, the world followed the British appeasement will-o'-the-wisp to disaster only a decade and a half ago. That is not very long in the memories of men, or is it? Yet, we are being told that, in British eyes, America has come around to a sensible approach toward Russia and has begun to give ground in its obstinate stand against the Chinese Communists. Was this the subject of the private summit talks? And, if so, does this explain why the British have hailed the talks as "Ike's Geneva 'triumph' "?

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is true and the secret gets out, the American people will not hail the triumph as such. The mothers and fathers of boys who today sleep in Korea will not proclaim it a triumph that America is about to give ground against the murderous regime which robbed them of their jewels and sent their sons to early graves. Is this

the price which we are to pay for a phony peace? We are told that Menon delivered a virtual ultimatum that America must make the first move to begin talks with the Communists lest they start military action. And now it looks as though we are going to knuckle under to the threat delivered by the most anti-American individual in all of Asia. Ostensibly the talks are to be about the freeing of American prisoners, but what will be the cost? Chou En-Lai hints that the release can be easily settled. Will the price be diplomatic recognition of Red China? Will the ransom be Red China's entry into the U. N.? Will Formosa be the pawn? Whatever the price, it will be high. Mr. Speaker, there was a day when American statesmen would say: "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute." Where is this spirit of defiance which made America great? There was a time when patriots would shout: "Give we liberty or give me death." Is this love of liberty, this courage of conviction, this deep sense of honor no longer attribute of men in high office?

Mr. Speaker, the issues of freedom and justice are on a par with the issue of peace, and the American people are not willing to subordinate the one to the other. And I say further that political victory for any person or any party is not worth sacrificing the national honor of our country to achieve. Nor is political victory in 1956 as much to be desired as the keeping of the faith and the shouldering of the responsibility which we owe to the dead of yesterday, the living of today, and the unborn of the future.

Not to prolong my remarks, I feel impelled to make it known that it is a disheartening thing for me to find our Government virtually blackmailed into sitting down with the spokesmen for Red China. Certainly this procedure is not calculated to increase our prestige in the world. In effect, it is an insult to the majesty and the dignity of the United States Government, and an affront to every man and woman in America.

Why should we make the first move to begin talks? And why should we talk at all? These wretched butchers who torture and kill American fighting men, who imprison American fliers, and who demean our Government then have the temerity and the gall to say through the parrot mouths of their cooperating emissaries that the United States should make the first move or else they will begin military action in the Formosa area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come when we should begin to have some sense of proportion about these conferences which have made us all so giddy for so long. As a result of these fiascoes, the United States has lost and the Russians have profited. They have gained in time and prestige, in conquered lands and subjected peoples. Shall we continue to be outsmarted, outwitted, and outdone?

I say that it is time to cut out the talk and turn on the heat. We have turned the other cheek long enough, and we should now say to these international brigands that from this moment forward, the ruthless and unwarranted shooting down of defenseless planes will not be tolerated.

As for Chou En-lai and his so-called easy settlement, we should have only the strongest of contempt and, instead of bending the neck to him and his associate, Menon, we should put them on notice that while the United States will continue to work and strive for peace, we are just as determined to defend the principles of honor and the cause of freedom against any encroachment by any power or any combination of powers.

If the sword-rattlers, by their ill-advised actions, then choose to place the present uneasy peace in jeopardy, they and they alone must assume the responsibility before the bar of world opinion for whatever unhappy results may follow.

Let us not be misled, Mr. Speaker. The leaders in Peiping and in Moscow may be unconscionable men and they may have shut all fear of God out of their inimical minds, but beneath all of their bluff, they have the same respect for power as do other human beings, and the shivers which run down one's spine at the thought of falling bombs are no less dreadful to the Communists than to ourselves.

Honor has no price tag.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to take the 4 minutes.

The gentleman from South Carolina has made quite a statement, but he has strayed very far from the issue.

The issue is whether to create another Deputy Under Secretary in the State Department at a cost of $20,000 a year plus an expensive staff. That is the issue before the House, not a speech on foreign policy.

I say to you that there is no necessity for creating another Deputy Assistant in the State Department. I point out again that under the Executive pay increase bill passed by this House on Saturday the top brackets in the State Department have been increased as well as the other Government departments by $5,000 a year to Deputy Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries by $4,000 a year. There is a limit to what the taxpayers of this country can pay.

We ought to be decreasing the cost of Government agencies and departments instead of increasing them at this time of staggering Federal debt.

In closing, I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who in his earlier remarks this afternoon attributed to me all knowledge with respect to domestic and international affairs that I have voted consistently against the foreign giveaway program which he supports. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio also that I did not vote "present" when an appropriation bill was approved by this House of Representatives to provide food and other relief for American people who were suffering from disaster in this country and needed relief.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 142, noes 27.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the annuity of an annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 140), as amended, or the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended, shall be increased the first day of the second month following enactment of this Act in accordance with the following rules:

If the annuitant was formerly a participant in the system, the annuity to which he is entitled shall be increased $324, provided he retired before July 1, 1949.

SEC. 2. In the case of an officer who elected a reduced annuity at time of retirement and who availed himself of the restoration clause in section 821 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, such officer shall be entitled to receive the increase provided by section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. If the annuitant receives an annuity as the survivor of a former participant in the system, the annuity shall be increased in the amount of $324.

SEC. 4. If a wife of a Foreign Service officer who retired prior to July 1, 1949, becomes an annuitant subsequent to the effective date of this Act, as a result of the election made by the officer at time of retirement, such widow shall be entitled to the same increase as though she was an annuitant on the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. In any case where a widow survivor annuitant of a Foreign Service officer who retired before July 1, 1949, is receiving an annuity of less than $1,200 the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to make grants or loans to supplement such annuity by whatever sum is necessary to increase the annuity to a maximum of $1,200 for such period, and on such terms as he shall prescribe, out of such funds as may be appropriated for the purpose if he finds that such widow (whether remarried or not) is in actual need and without other adequate means of support.

SEC. 6. In any case where a participant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system died before August 29, 1954, leaving a widow who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the system, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to make grants or loans not exceeding $100 per month to such widow, for such period and on such terms as he shall prescribe, out of such funds as may be appropriated for the purpose, if he finds that such widow (whether remarried or not) is in actual need and without other adequate means of support.

SEC. 7. In no case shall an annuity increased under this Act exceed the maximum annuity payable under section 821 (a) or (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 8. No annuity currently payable to any annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system shall be

reduced as a result of the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MERGER OF STREET-RAILWAY CORPORATIONS (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2576) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into an operating contract with the Capital Transit Co. for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act or from the date authority is obtained from the stockholders under paragraph 6, whichever is the later, to provide mass transportation in the area now served by Capital Transit Co., said contract to contain substantially the following provisions, and in addition such other provisions not inconsistent herewith as the Commissioners and the Capital Transit Co. may agree upon to effectively carry out the purpose of this act:

1. Capital Transit Co. will continue to operate its properties as required by its franchise obligations.

2. Capital Transit Co. will enter into a contract with the bargaining agent of its employees covering wages and working conditions under terms and conditions as directed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a period not to exceed 1 year.

3. Salaries of officers of Capital Transit Co. in effect on July 1, 1955, will be continued in effect during the term of said contract.

4. In the event increased wages and benefits are accorded employees under paragraph 2 hereof, appropriate increases may also be granted salaried employees other than company officers subject to the approval of the Commisioners of the District of Columbia.

5. If, at the end of the period of said contract the operating revenues derived by the company from the operation of its properties in utility service for the convenience of the public have not been sufficient to meet the cost of operation during such 1-year period, including but not limited to depreciation and all taxes, but not including any return on investment, the District of Columbia shall pay Capital Transit Co. the amount of such deficiency: *Provided, however*, That such deficiency during said period shall be determined in accordance with the accounting practices now prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission or upon such other terms as may be agreed upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Capital Transit Co.

6. Capital Transit Co. will promptly take all necessary steps to secure from its stockholders authority to amend said contract to provide for the relinquishment of all of its franchise rights upon the termination of said contract. If within 90 days after the date of the contract hereby authorized said authority is obtained the parties agree that said contract shall be amended by inserting the following paragraph:

"Capital Transit Co. shall relinquish all of its franchise rights upon the termination of said agreement and said relinquishment shall be accepted by the Commissioners and thereafter Capital Transit Co. shall be under no obligation to furnish public transportation in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is this the transit bill?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Which gentleman is opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Maryland opposed to the bill?

Mr. HYDE. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the House District Committee has held extensive hearings on this proposed legislation, and we have made an effort to be of assistance to the District Commissioners in solving this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that possibly the Public Utilities Commission and the District Commissioners could have done more than they have toward settling this strike. However, they state that they need some additional legislation before they can place into effect what they would like to do at this time. The House District Committee met 4 hours Saturday with the transit company and the District Commissioners. They came up with a bill here, which we are substituting for the Senate bill. which grants the Commissioners the authority required to take care of the proposition facing them at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains no seizure features, and it does not involve the Federal Government in the transit business here in the District of Columbia. We cannot afford to get the Federal Government into the transit business; we are not proposing in this bill to permit the District Commissioners or anyone else to drag us into the transit business. We feel that this is a problem between the District Commissioners, the Public Utilities, and the transit company, and we want to give them all the authority they need to deal with this problem.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. While I favor the suspension of the rules on this bill in order that it may go to conference, under the provisions of this bill suppose the company does not make a contract. What then?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, it was stated at the meeting they would make a contract.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. I understand that. But, assuming after Congress has adjourned and this bill is on the statute books that the company then, for some reason or other, will not enter into a contract, what then?

Mr. McMILLAN. I think there are sufficient provisions in this bill to take care of that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. How? We will say that the Commissioners for the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into an operating agreement with the Capital Transit Co.

Mr. McMILLAN. At the end of 1 year, the District Commissioners can take over the company.

Mr. McCORMACK. But suppose the company refuses to make a contract.

Mr. McMILLAN. The company is the one that made this offer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. McMILLAN. The company is the one that made this offer to the District Commissioners.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand what I read in the newspapers, but now assuming this bill passes, Congress has adjourned, and then suppose the company says, "We will not make a contract with the District Commissioners." What then?

Mr. McMILLAN. Personally I do not think that is any problem of the Congress to deal with the contract.

Mr. McCORMACK. How is that?

Mr. McMILLAN. Any problem of the Congress to join in framing or preparing the contract.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I might say in response to the gentleman's question, we would be right back where we are now. We would be in disagreement between the bargaining union and the Capital Transit Co. for an extension of contract to go back to work. That is the difficulty now.

Mr. McCORMACK. We want to have it clearly understood that if this bill should become law, after we adjourn if the company refuses to enter into a contract, there is nothing the Commissioners can do; is that right?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is true, yes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. I should like to ask whether it is permissible to discuss a bill without copies of the bill being available to Members on the floor. There are no copies available. Some of us cannot get a copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the House suspends the rules to consider a bill, the House suspends all rules.

Mr. FULTON. As well as the rule that copies be made available at request to Members on the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that copies are available. I just got one.

Mr. HARRIS. Here is one. May I say, if the gentleman will permit, that this is a move of the chairman to suspend the rules and call up the Senate bill, which has been printed and is available to everybody, and to pass it with amendments. Copies of the amendments are available to anyone who wants to see them.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. I feel that the Members of this body and all the people of the District of Columbia owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, for his sincere interest and concern in this current transit problem. He has devoted many hours of time and used the facilities of his office to try to bring the two parties in disagreement together. I believe the number of hours spent in conferences that the chairman had in his office was something like 38. The chairman also called several meetings of the Committee on the District of Columbia in an effort to consider all the various problems and to try to settle this strike.

Again I say I think the people of the District owe a sincere vote of thanks to the gentleman for his efforts in this matter.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman. I should like to state that the gentleman himself attended every meeting. The gentleman and I have diligently tried to get the company and the union together, but for some reason or other, the union was not interested in making a contract with the transit company at this time.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has told us what the bill does not provide. Will the gentleman now tell us what it does provide and what he expects to accomplish through this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. The bill merely gives the District of Columbia Commissioners permission to bargain with the transit company.

Mr. BOW. What type of authority is given them?

Mr. McMILLAN. The company has offered to let the District Commissioners have the franchise at the end of 1 year and immediately bargain with the District Commissioners in order to get the company operating.

Mr. BOW. Does the Senate bill provide for a seizure of the franchise?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. BOW. And this amendment eliminates the seizure provision?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the power to seize this franchise?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is the point. They do not, without authority given them by the Congress. They state they do not.

Mr. GROSS. Who states they do not?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Commissioners.

Mr. GROSS. The Commissioners say they do not have the authority?

Mr. McMILLAN. The Commissioners say they do not have the authority to seize the franchise.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the chairman if the House bill takes into consideration in any way or form the unconscionable conduct of those who have been in charge of the Capital Transit Co. and who have put it in the position in which it is today? Does not the House bill permit them to get away with it entirely while the Senate bill would at least give us some chance to take some action on the morality of the case?

Mr. McMILLAN. The House committee has tried to stay away from that subject, for the simple reason, if we went into it, we would be here talking the rest of the year.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would not the Senate bill allow the Commissioners to go into that?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman ought to take time to explain what is in the bill rather than yielding to Members. I hope he will do so, because there is very little time available.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, you know what is going on with reference to the argument between the Capital Transit Co. and the union organization. After wrangling back and forth trying to come up with something, the Capital Transit Co. offered to turn the matter over to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They offered to give them back the franchise and turn it over to them. The Commissioners found themselves in the position that they did not have authority to accept the offer.

The Capital Transit Co. is operated under a franchise. This franchise is provided by the Congress. Therefore, anything that affects the franchise has to be by action of the Congress. That is the reason the bill is before us, because the Commissioners say they cannot accept any proposition that has been offered to them by the Capital Transit Co.

There is no authority to seize it under the law. Some of us felt that an emergency could be declared under the Taft-Hartley Act because of the national health and welfare and there could be some movement into this problem, but they say it does not come under the provisions of the act and thus, they do not have any authority whatsoever to make the move.

As the result of negotiations between the Capital Transit Co. and the Board of Commissioners this proposition for contract was made. It was a basic proposition made by the Capital Transit Co. The committee went into it rather extensively. We got both the groups together and as a result we amended the basic proposal of the Capital Transit Co. by having our legislative staff draw a bill in line with these discussions.

What this bill does is to permit the Commissioners to enter into a contract with the Capital Transit Co. for a period of 1 year to operate mass transportation in the District of Columbia under the terms outlined in this amendment. Let me explain. First, the Capital Transit Co. will continue to operate is properties as required by the franchise.

Second, the Capital Transit Co. will enter into a contract with the bargaining agent of its employees covering wages and working conditions under terms and conditions as directed by the Commissioners. This is the difficulty that brought on the strike—wages. Therefore, we say that the Commissioners now shall direct the terms of the wages, and therefore the Capital Transit Co. will be required to enter into such a contract with the employees.

The third and fourth points are related to this part 2 which I have just explained.

5. If, at the end of the period of said contract the operating revenues derived by the company from the operation of its properties in utility service for the convenience of the public have not been sufficient to meet the cost of operation during such 1-year period, including but not limited to depreciation and all taxes, but not including any return on investment—

They cannot get any return whatsoever on the investment. If there are deficiencies, the District of Columbia shall pay the deficiency. We adopted an amendment which provided that the deficiency during the time shall be determined in accordance with the accounting practices that are presently in effect by the Public Utilities Commission, and that there can be no windfall then for this group of Capital Transit.

The only thing it does is to provide a basis for them to enter into a contract with the Capital Transit Co. who says that they will, if they can, of course, be protected from the increased wages that seem to be necessary to get mass transportation started.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Arkansas explain the provisions of the depreciation feature which we discussed in committee?

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I just referred to. We amended the bill as originally presented so that depreciation shall be in accordance with the present accounting practices. They wanted a windfall which I objected to, and I would not agree to it at all. I opposed the proposal until it was clarified. They wanted a windfall whereby they could say, "Within a year we have to liquidate, we have to start liquidating this

whole business and, therefore, we will start gradually and maybe in the course of 4 months, we will take 100 buses or 100 street cars and we will say they are not needed to provide the necessary transportation; we will declare them to be obsolete and dispose of them." That would apply on depreciation. We said, "No, you cannot do that." We amended it to say that the present properties have to be maintained in order that this transportation may be provided and that you cannot do this depreciation of the property without consent of the Commissioners. Therefore, we closed up the only loophole that there was in the proposal.

We have brought this bill to you providing authority for the Commissioners which they say they need and have to have to enter into this contract to get transportation started in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. May I inquire of the gentleman, does this contemplate seizure?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it does not.

Mr. HALEY. Not at all? The present bill before the Congress does not even go as far as the company has offered to go. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. HARRIS. The company's offer is the basis for what we have here, but we thought there was a windfall in what they offered and, consequently, we said, "No, you cannot do that," and we amended it accordingly. Furthermore, they wanted this deficiency to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and we did not feel that it should be paid out of the United States Treasury. To avoid a conflict with the Committee on Appropriations, we deleted that provision.

Mr. HALEY. On the basis of that statement, and what the company wants to do, do you not think and agree with the gentleman from Florida that if the Congress of the United States would back out of this thing and leave it alone those people would get together and settle their difficulties?

Mr. HARRIS. I am not sure that that is true at all. I believe that we should provide this authority for the District Commissioners because the company itself is willing to turn it over, but under the franchise that the Congress has given they cannot accept it. There is nothing they can do about it. This permits them to do something about it, I believe, to bring this transportation back into operation.

Mr. HALEY. Does not the gentleman think they already have the authority given in this bill, and that authority presently rests in the Commissioners?

Mr. HARRIS. No; it definitely does not, or else we would not be here with this bill today.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. Is there anything in this bill or is there anything anywhere guaranteeing that the company will accept the terms of the contract as offered to them by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HARRIS. There is nothing in the bill that guarantes it, but there are two things that, I think, will make sure that they will, if it is settled in this way. In the first place, the reason there is a strike is because the company will not meet the terms demanded by the union. They say they cannot do it without a loss to their stockholders. We say that we will guarantee that they will get a proper return to prevent a loss if there is a deficiency under this contract.

No. 2 is that the company itself proposed this approach, and when the Commissioners were asked why they did not accept it they said they were not authorized under the law to accept it.

Mr. LANKFORD. The company proposed to do it on their own terms in the beginning; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. Under somewhat different terms than we have here, because we did not leave the loopholes that were in the bill which was originally proposed.

Mr. LANKFORD. May I say to the gentleman there is one thing that we are interested in and that is getting the strike settled, so that the people in my district and the district of the gentleman from Virginia, and other people, can have the use of this transit company in the District of Columbia. I want to be absolutely sure that this will get the streetcars running. In the opinion of the gentleman from Arkansas, will this get the streetcars running?

Mr. HARRIS. I think this is the best way that has been advanced to get the transportation started in the District of Columbia.

Permit me to say this: Here is what I think we get into with the outright seizure proposition: It is well known that the stock of this company has a book value of about $22, which right now, the best information I have is that it is going at around $9.75 or $10. If we get into the seizure proposition and into court and they say, "We are entitled to $22," you will find the Treasury of this United States or this Congress will have to provide the money for the additional windfall. They have gotten enough out of it already. I do not think we ought to bring in something that would give them an additional $10 besides the $16 I understand they have already gotten. That is the reason I think this is the kind of approach that we ought to work out to get this transportation going.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman says that this measure does not contemplate seizure. If that is the fact, I would like for him to explain this language on page 3, line 16, "authority to take possession and operate." Will you distinguish that from "seizure"?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not believe that is in the amendment. The gentleman has the Senate bill. We are bringing up this bill, striking out all of the language of the Senate bill and offering this amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the House bill provide the same thing?

Mr. HARRIS. No; it does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much time remains, may I ask?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 20 minutes. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] has consumed his 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the time supposed to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has control of 20 minutes, and may yield it as he sees fit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, the proponents have used their 20 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Virginia is in favor of it and he has 7 minutes. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] gets 5 minutes. That leaves 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, this proposal which is before the House today, the Senate bill, as amended by our committee, is the least action that the Congress can take concerning this transit strike before January. Since it is the least action that Congress can take, I believe it is the best action this Congress could take. There is nothing unusual about a wage dispute between management and labor, or a strike. I think the overwhelming majority of the people would like to have them go ahead by their own means and settle this matter themselves. Unfortunately, however, we have a third party involved. There are approximately 900,000 people who ride the Capital Transit system every day.

There are over 500 streetcars and over 700 buses idle. The strike is in its 32d day with no solution in sight.

It has been said, of course, that Congress should not concern itself any more with this strike than with any other local strike throughout the country, yet we do know that this is the Capital of the Federal Government, and therefore all the people of the country are affected by it and the Congress is the only legislative body of the District of Columbia. As I say, there has been a question as to whether we should take any action at all and as to what type of action we should take.

The only direct action we can take to get transportation rolling again is to enact a law similar to the Taft-Hartley Act to provide an injunction against the strike and order the men to go back to

work, or by seizure and ordering the men to go back to work at the same time we seized the company. That has been criticized as being strike-breaking and union-busting; therefore there is very slight chance of getting legislation like that through Congress.

The proposal offered by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia which has passed the other body is to provide for retention of the franchise, seize the company and to give the Commissioners authority to meet the demands of labor. I know that that measure, that approach, is unpalatable to the Members of this body.

The Commissioners have stated that the service provided by the Capital Transit Co. is satisfactory, that their income is not exorbitant, that maintenance of equipment is all right, and that there is no real sound legal reason to revoke the franchise at this time. Then the company acting through their board of directors said: "If you want to lift the franchise, we are perfectly willing to give it up voluntarily." But the Commissioners do not have the authority to enter into such an agreement. So this bill is designed to give the Commissioners the authority, the limited authority, to enter into an agreement with the Capital Transit Co. to lift the franchise and to operate the company for the next year until the franchise actually expires.

There is no way whatsoever that we can guarantee, there is no insurance that the measure proposed by the Commissioners of the District will end the strike, will restore service; there is no assurance that the measure proposed by the District Commissioners will end the strike. But the bill does give them some authority, a limited authority to enter into an agreement with the company before we adjourn. That is what it says in effect, if the Congress in its closing hours believes that legislation is essential to restore transit to the District let it be under terms to be negotiated between the Commissioners and the company.

Criticism has been leveled at it as being repugnant with principle and that a precedent would be established. Again I repeat, this is the last action Congress can take before adjournment if it takes any action, and is the least authority, I repeat, we can possibly give.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Does not the gentleman think that the Congress will be establishing a precedent here and that if we act in this particular situation here later on we will be called upon to act in 5 or 6 other similar situations?

Mr. BROYHILL. We are authorizing the Commissioners to operate under terms reached between the Commissioners and the company.

Mr. HALEY. Who is going to pay if there is any deficit?

Mr. BROYHILL. The taxpayers of the District and in turn the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says the Commissioners are not authorized to operate. I call the gentleman's attention to section 7:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may"—Does the gentleman see it? "May operate the property."

Mr. BROYHILL. It authorizes the Commissioners to enter into this agreement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; it says:

> The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may with the approval of the Public Utilities Commission operate—

And so forth.

Mr. BROYHILL. That agreement would be to operate the line on the terms set forth by the Commissioners.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I think what the gentleman of Michigan referred to is the amendment that was necessary in section 7 to permit the continued operation of buses in Maryland. That is all section 7 refers to. It is not involved here in this controversy at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from Virginia, I think, has devoted more study to this than any other Member of Congress. In the gentleman's opinion, if we pass this bill which he has been talking about will that bring about an operation of the transit facilities?

Mr. BROYHILL. There is no assurance that it will get the street cars and buses going again. It merely gives the Commissioners and the company an opportunity to try to do something. The only way we can guarantee an end to the strike is to pass a law to force the men to go back to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One short question. Suppose the strike is not settled as the result of this, what power do the Commissioners have to provide other transportation? Can they put on more taxicabs, lower the rate, or do something else to get transportation to the people of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HYDE. If the strike is not settled, the Commissioners have no other power.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Do you not think we should give them power to get transportation in some other way if this is not settled?

Mr. HYDE. I feel so.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear what we are doing here. The franchise which the transit company has was given to it by the Congress. Only the Congress can take away that franchise. That was the original thing the Commissioners asked for. They originally asked for a bill revoking the franchise.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Congress cannot take the franchise away from the transit company except on a year's notice.

Mr. HYDE. That is right. I was getting to that. That is the original thing the Commissioners came to Congress with and that is the thing provided by the Senate bill. That bill revokes the franchise.

When the Commissioners asked for that power, the transit company said: We will surrender the franchise. But, then, the Commissioners came back and said: We have no authority to accept a surrender of the franchise. That authority must be given to us by Congress.

When that was done the chairman of our committee asked the Commissioners to present to the committee a bill which would authorize them to accept the surrender of the franchise. That, in substance, is the bill we now have before us. The Commissioners state they do not agree with that, they do not think this bill will give them what they want and what is needed; but they did get together, and I may say they got together with the attorneys for the transit company. This bill is a draft made by the attorneys for the District Commissioners, the corporation counsel's office, and the attorneys for the Capital Transit Co.

All it does is authorize the District Commissioners to enter into a contract providing for the surrender of the franchise within a year from its effective date and providing certain terms for its operation. That is, the operation of the transit company during that year.

Bear in mind, both parties, the District Commissioners and/or the transit company still have to make their peace with the union. There is no provision in this bill saying on what terms the union has to come back, or anything of that sort. Under this bill it is all voluntary on the part of both parties. It is simply an authority to enter into a contract. If the Commissioners will not agree to the contract or the terms that the company demands, there is no contract. If the company will not agree to the terms the Commissioners demand, there is no contract.

So, this bill in and of itself does not settle the strike. We hope it will lead to a settlement of the strike, but I think all of you are aware by this time from the articles in the newspapers that there were two extreme versions about what to do in this situation. One was to seize and operate; the other was an injunction in the nature of a Taft-Hartley provision. Of course, you can all recognize that the business interests opposed the seizure version. The unions, of course, opposed anything smacking of an injunction. There you had two versions pulling and hauling, one newspaper on the side of seizure and no newspaper, for that matter, supporting the injunction but taking the position that we should do nothing. And, as the gentleman from Virginia said, we have a third newspaper saying that a voluntary basis should be provided for.

Now, that is what the House has before it. I do not personally think it is

adequate. I think what has been overlooked is a third interest here, namely, the interest of the public.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, from the very outset of proposals that the Congress intervene in the transit strike, I have been deeply concerned about suggestions for seizure of the privately owned transit lines and a possible ban on the right to strike. Because I am opposed to both actions on principle, I have given the subject some attention even though I am not a member of the District of Columbia committee.

While I recognize that the pending House amendment eliminates both of these extreme measures, it nevertheless involves intervention by the Federal Government in terms of possible operation of the transit lines and in terms of collective bargaining with the union.

It seems to me that the approach here taken is one of treating symptoms rather than causes. Some 2 weeks ago I discussed with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] the possibility of legislation which would deal with causes and I would gladly have supported the bill which he introduced establishing mediation legislation patterned on the principle of the Taft-Hartley Fair Labor Act and the Railway Mediation Act. I commend him for this action.

In connection with this controversy I have reviewed congressional debate at the time of the railroad strike in 1946, and at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, as well as the Supreme Court decision in the Steel plant seizure.

Because of the relevancy which I believe they have to this current problem and to the deplorable lack of mediation and cooling-off-period legislation needed in the District of Columbia, I cite the following statements from this earlier congressional debate and from the majority opinion of the Supreme Court.

From the speech of Senator Robert Taft, May 31, 1946, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, page 5971:

Seizure does not seem to me to be the proper method of dealing with any ordinary labor dispute. The only excuse for seizure is in a case where the functioning of the business has broken down, and the Government itself must undertake the operation.

Page 5972:

If we put this proposal into effect it will become a method of settling every strike in the United States, and it should be only for the settlement of a general strike, which is in effect a revolution. If strikes go so far as to threaten the starvation of people, or to endanger their health and their security we are in effect in war, and only Government operation can possibly deal with such a situation.

From the speech of Senator Robert Taft, April 23, 1947, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, pages 3835–36:

On page 48 of the bill we have provided for the delay of national emergency strikes. We have provided that when a threatened or actual strike or lockout affecting substantially an entire industry engaged in trade, commerce, transportation, industry, transmission, or communication among the several States, if permitted to occur or continue, would imperil the national health or safety, the Attorney General may appoint a board of inquiry to inquire into the issues and make a statement of the issues and report back to him as promptly as he may direct. He may then seek from the court an injunction against striking for a period of 60 days, during which time the Government has another opportunity, through the Mediation Board, to try to bring about an agreement between employers and employees which will prevent a nationwide strike.

If such mediation should fail, then at the end of 60 days it is provided that there shall be an election by the employees to determine whether or not they accept the last offer made by the employer. If they vote to accept it, of course the strike is terminated. If they vote not to accept it, the injunction is dissolved and they are free to strike. The bill provides that when that happens the Attorney General shall submit to the President a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, and that the President shall transmit such report, together with such recommendation as he may see fit to mafie, to the Congress for consideration and appropriate action.

If there finally develops a complete national emergency threatening the safety and health of the people of the United States, Congress can pass an emergency law to cover the particular emergency.

We did not feel that we should put into the law, as a part of the collective-bargaining machinery, an ultimate resort to compulsory arbitration, or to seizure or to any other action. We feel that it would interfere with the whole process of collective bargaining. If such a remedy is available as a routine remedy, there will always be pressure to resort to it by whichever part thinks it will receive better treatment through such a process than it would receive in collective bargaining, and it will back out of collective bargaining. It will not make a bona fide attempt to settle if it thinks it will receive a better deal under the final arbitration which may be provided.

We have felt that perhaps in the case of a general strike, or in the case of other serious strikes, after the termination of every possible effort to resolve the dispute, the remedy might be an emergency act by Congress for that particular purpose.

I have had in mind drafting such a bill, giving power to seize the plants, and other necessary facilities, to seize the unions, their money, and their treasury and requisition trucks and other equipment; in fact, to do everything that the British did in their general strike of 1926. But while such a bill might be prepared, I should be unwilling to place such a law on the books until we actually face such an emergency, and Congress applies the remedy for the particular emergency only. Eighty days will provide plenty of time within which to consider the possibility of what should be done; and we believe very strongly that there should not be anything in this law which prohibits finally the right to strike.

From the speech of Senator WAYNE MORSE, April 29, 1947, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, page 4204:

Here again we found a man [Senator IVES] who has some very deep convictions about the way labor relations should be handled, who believe that, after all, we must cling to our voluntary procedure, that we must develop to the maximum extent possible mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration as the one and long-time lasting method for the peaceful solution of labor disputes. I think he is absolutely correct. I have entertained similar views for many years.

OPINION OF MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS IN THE STEEL CASE

Moreover, the use of the seizure technique to solve labor disputes in order to prevent work stoppages was not only unauthorized by any congressional enactment; prior to this controversy Congress had refused to adopt that method of settling labor disputes. When the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration in 1947, Congress rejected an amendment which would have authorized such governmental seizures in cases of emergency. Apparently it was thought that the technique of seizure, like that of compulsory arbitration, would interfere with the process of collective bargaining. Consequently, the plan Congress adopted in that act did not provide for seizure under any circumstances. Instead, the plan sought to bring about settlements by use of the customary devices of mediation, conciliation, investigation by boards of inquiry, and public reports. In some instances temporary injunctions were authorized to provide cooling-off periods. All this failing, unions were left free to strike after a secret vote by employees as to whether they wished to accept their employers' final settlement offer.

The amendment referred to by Mr. Justice Douglas, which was rejected by the House, was offered by Mr. Javits, of New York, and provided a formula for seizure. This amendment was defeated April 17, 1947, by a division vote of 41 to 130.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I have not had an opportunity to obtain a copy of this bill, but one question comes to mind. Assuming that this bill is passed and the District Commissioners operate the transit company for a period of a year, during that period of operation who assumes any liability for personal injury or property damage?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, that is a legal question. Whether you can sue a governmental agency in a personal injury suit is something that I do not want to answer at this time. The Federal Government cannot be sued without its consent. Certainly the Capital Transit Co. would not be liable. The injured party might well be left without remedy unless we write a provision in the bill authorizing payment to an injured person and if we do that what do you think the amount of a jury's verdict would be in a personal injury case after the plaintiff's able attorney had reminded the jury of current inflation; how little a dollar will buy; of the billions we have given to other nations; and with tears in his eyes and voice made an emotional plea to a tender-hearted jury which—all male perhaps—had sat a day or two watching a sweet, innocent—the attorney's words—suffer from shock, nerves, low or high blood pressure—even a broken engagement.

The situation which confronts us today here in this Congress proves 1 of 2 things: either that the Congress does not have the intelligence or it lacks the inclination or the courage to adequately deal efficiently with a situation which

has existed in this country for the last 10 or 15 years, that is, when strikes which injuriously affect the public safety and health and welfare occur in connection with public utilities. That is what we are up against here now. How did this Congress get into it? It got into it by a bill. I doubt if 10 Members of the House have either seen or read a copy of the House bill, unless they happen to be on the District Committee. I was not able to get one until just a few moments ago when the bill was called up under suspension.

A clerk at the left of the Speaker advises me that the bill has not been printed; that no typewritten or mimeographed copies are available.

The mimeographed, duplicated, or dittoed copy which I hold in my hand was given me when I demanded a second some 30 minutes ago.

This copy of the bill, from the first capital to the last period reads as follows—and, as you read, note please that, on page 2, 6 lines have been stricken and a 2-line typewritten amendment has been inserted:

A bill to authorize the Capital Transit Co., under certain conditions, to surrender its franchise, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into an operating contract with the Capital Transit Co. for a period of 1 year from the effective date of this act or from the date authority is obtained from the stockholders under paragraph 6, whichever is the later, to provide mass transportation in the area now served by Capital Transit Co., said contract to contain substantially the following provisions, and in addition such other provisions not inconsistent herewith as the Commissioners and the Capital Transit Co. may agree upon to effectively carry out the purpose of this act:

1. Capital Transit Co. will continue to operate its properties as required by its franchise obligations.

2. Capital Transit Co. will enter into a contract with the bargaining agent of its employees covering wages and working conditions under terms and conditions as directed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a period not to exceed 1 year.

3. Salaries of officers of the Capital Transit Co. in effect on July 1, 1955, will be continued in effect during the term of said contract.

4. In the event increased wages and benefits are accorded employees under paragraph 2 hereof, appropriate increases may also be granted salaried employees other than company officers subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

5. If, at the end of the period of said contract the operating revenues derived by the company from the operation of its properties in utility service for the convenience of the public have not been sufficient to meet the cost of operation during such 1-year period, including but not limited to depreciation and all taxes, but not including any return on investment, the District of Columbia shall pay Capital Transit Co. the amount of such deficiency: *Provided, however,* That such deficiency during said period shall be determined in accordance with the accounting practices now prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission or upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Capital Transit Co.

6. Capital Transit Co. will promptly take all necessary steps to secure from its stockholders authority to amend said contract to provide for the relinquishment of all of its franchise rights upon the termination of said contract. If within 90 days after the date of the contract hereby authorized said authority is obtained the parties agree that said contract shall be amended by inserting the following paragraph:

Capital Transit Co. shall relinquish all of its franchise rights upon the termination of said agreement and said relinquishment shall be accepted by the Commissioners and thereafter Capital Transit Co. shall be under no obligation to furnish public transportation in the District of Columbia.

7. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, with the approval of the Public Service Commission of the State of Maryland, exercise any of the powers granted in this act to operate property of the Capital Transit Co., or to provide public transportation, or both, within the portion of the State of Maryland which is provided with public transportation by such company.

Is it not an absurity; is it not a shirking of our duty, for— with apologies to the other body—the "greatest deliberative body in the world" to attempt to legislate as we are now doing?

This strike has been with us for a month.

The city had a similar strike in 1945. It was settled without the aid of the Congress, as this one no doubt would have been had not the company believed and the union been convinced that, at the expense of the transportation company's patrons or the District taxpayers, an easy-going Congress would bail them out.

Strikes affecting public utilities—and nation-wide—have injuriously affected the public health, safety, and welfare of the people of our towns and cities for many years.

Why now, just because we want to go home, take a snap judgment, open the door to expensive, long-drawn-out litigation?

While an editorial writer is not always my guide, often one says a mouthful. Let me read you this editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

YOU MAY OWN A DOG

Today may be the day when the citizens of Washington get put into the public transportation business. This will cost them beaucoup jack. They haven't been asked how much they'd like to pay to get into this adventure and they won't be. They'll be told in the annual tax bill. And whether or not they ride public transportation. And in addition to fares.

This may come to pass because the mood in Congress, as it throws its shirts into its bags and gets ready to leave town, is that it is politically expedient to seem to do something about the transit strike so that it can't be accused of doing nothing.

In all this hasty hassle over how to grab a transit line its owners want to dump, nowhere have we heard mention of how much money it will cost the city (that is, you). That shows how ill prepared—even on a standby basis—the city's government is to undertake this job.

So, if the Commissioners wake up tomorrow with a new municipal pet, we fear he's going to seem like a large, wet Chesapeake Bay retriever in their laps before long. We hope they know how to housebreak him, and will be able to get him on the floor again, on his own legs. Damned if we know.

This bill authorizes the Commissioners of the District to enter into an operating contract with CTC for a period of 1 year from the effective date of the bill. Well, of course, the Capital Transit Co. cannot enter into any contract, contrary to the terms of its present franchise unless the union agrees, and it cannot surrender its franchise unless the stockholders consent. The bill admits that, because over on page 3 the bill provides that "Capital Transit Co. will promptly take all necessary steps to secure from its stockholders"—do you get the point?—to amend said contract to provide for the relinquishment of all its franchise rights upon the termination of said contract." Capital Transit Co. cannot do anything other than attempt to start its cars and buses rolling—which would call for the surrender of its franchise—until it gets the consent of the stockholders. And when will that be? CTC has not attempted to turn a wheel since the strike was called 30 days ago.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] had something in mind that we read in the hearings about the stockholders. Will the gentleman read that?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The point of it is that this company has already been milked, and there is nothing in this bill to prevent them from milking it any further. They paid $20 a share and they got $30.80 a share out of it. Mr. Wolfson said—I quote from the hearings:

I will protect the stockholders within the limits of the law in spite of anything, including the Congress and the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That means expensive litigation for an indeterminate time.

Mr. FULTON. This particular bill, on page 2, provides that—

5. If, at the end of the period of said contract the operating revenues derived by the company from the operation of its properties in utility service for the convenience of the public have not been sufficient to meet the cost of operation during such 1-year period including but not limited to depreciation and all taxes, but not including any return on investment, the District of Columbia shall pay Capital Transit Co. the amount of such deficiency: *Provided, however,* That such deficiency during said period shall be determined in accordance with the accounting practices now prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission—

And then the bill adds:

or upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Capital Transit Co.

I might ask, Where is the public in that kind of a deal, where public tax money will have to make up any deficiency?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The tax money of the District.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; the tax money of the District. It should be pointed out that any paper loss for depreciation will have to be paid by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, in cash, under this present bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The money of the District taxpayers. That is provided for in this bill and there is no limit to the amount which the Capital Transit Co. can pay and then pass

on to the taxpayers of the District. Listen to this:

2. Capital Transit Co. will enter into a contract with the bargaining agent of its employees covering wages and working conditions under terms and conditions as directed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for a period not to exceed 1 year.

All that section does is to transfer the powes to bargain with the union from the company—which, as I said a moment ago, has to go back to its stockholders before it can do anything contrary to the terms of its franchise—over to the District Commissioners; and certainly taking from its own officers the authority to contract with the union and granting that authority to the Commissioners is contrary to the meaning of its franchise which provides that the officers of the company—not the Commissioners—shall transact its business. That is an invitation for the Commissioners to surrender to the present demands of the employees.

Let me go back to section L. Will someone please tell me how transit or the Commissioners can operate unless it meets and grants all—I repeat—all the demands of the union?

Is that what the committee wants the company to do? Meeting those demands will not cost the company anything—no matter how high the demands may be—because, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has pointed out, under section 5, the cost of the increased wage, special benefits, all other costs—including paper, even though not a real loss when labeled "depreciation"—will be laid on the backs of the District taxpayers.

One thing the bill will do if approved, and that for sure: It injects this Congress into a labor dispute here in the District without coming up with any solution of the problem. You are just transferring the bargaining activities from the Capital Transit Co. to the Commissioners and you are not putting any limit on that. We are authorizing the Commissioners to pay whatever they want to pay and then add the loss, however great, to the tax rolls of the District taxpayers. Included in that sum will be any and all loss that may result from inefficient management. This is no way to handle a situation of this kind.

My point is this: Why not instead of stepping into this situation write overall legislation covering strikes in any and all public utilities? Away back in 1945, as long ago as that, 10 years ago, this Congress was familiar with situations where strikes were adversely affecting the public and a bill entitled "A bill to enable and to expedite the business of the Federal Government" was introduced and sent to the District Committee which promptly put the bill to sleep. The company and the union promptly settled the strike—the wheels rolled again. In 1945 the Capital Transit Co.'s employees were on strike here in Washington. Then a bill was introduced in January of 1947. It was "A bill to protect the public welfare when injuriously affected by strikes in public utilities." It was sent to the Committee on Labor. The Labor Committee promptly anesthetized itself and has continued to imitate Rip Van Winkle. That bill provided at that time, as did two subsequent bills introduced in June of this year when this matter came up—it was an attempt to permit a committee to write a worthwhile overall bill—that the Capital Transit Co. should proceed to operate, to give the city transportation, that the President should appoint a fact-finding commission which would determine three things. One, what was an adequate wage which should be paid the employee? Two, what was a fair profit to be paid the stockholders? Three, what was a fair charge to levy upon those who rode the Transit Co.'s buses and streetcars?

It further provided that those three things having been determined, if there was a loss and if transportation was a public necessity the loss should be met either by the District or the Federal Government or by both.

Was anything done with that? No. Now we have before us a bill from the other body which, if I understand it, advocates seizure. That is another invitation to litigation, to indefinite litigation, seizure of the system and to governorship. We have this bill which authorizes the Commissioners to a certain extent, but only to a certain extent, to step into the picture in the place and stead of the Capital Transit Co. itself.

Permit me to again ask: Why should we now inject ourselves into this situation without any remedy to offer? Suppose the employees of the union say to the Commissioners, "We won't work unless we get $2 an hour? We won't work unless we get $3." Suppose the stockholders to whom the Transit Co. has to go to get permission say: "Listen! We are not going to vote for the surrender of the franchise unless you guarantee a dividend of 50 or 60 or 70 cents per share," or "pay us $30 or $40 a share for our stock."

Or are we going to give away to both groups, meet the demands of both, and then assess the cost, as this bill would do, back on the taxpayers of the District?

Oh, this is no way to legislate.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was on his feet asking me to yield. This is no time to get into this kind of a mess. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the only thing that would be necessary to settle the strike is to have the District Commissioners, under the authority which they now have, to issue an edict that anybody with a District of Columbia license on his car may pick up passengers and charge 25 or 30 cents per trip, in order to get people interested, give them an incentive to do something to stop this business? Then the strike would be settled in 48 hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That might be one solution, but I am not for that. That would be the direct use of Federal power to break a strike. It might probably put on the streets several hundred irresponsible drivers. It would compete unfairly with taxi drivers, taxi owners, and taxi companies. When the public health, welfare, or safety is endangered by a studied refusal of either party and an impartial fact-finding commission or committee has so determined, the Government should step in, but it should be done by overall legislation—legislation which, while protecting the parties to the dispute, is written primarily in the interest of and for the protection of the public.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be rejected.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have purposely not taken an active part in the current transit strike because so many people have entered the picture and there have been so many charges and counter-charges that I felt that the best course for me to follow would be not to muddy the waters any further. This does not mean that I do not have an abiding interest in the outcome of the strike or in its early settlement, as it affects a great many of my constituents both those that work for the transit company and those that ride the transit company vehicles.

The one thing that I am interested in is the early settlement of the strike. In my mind the means of effecting that settlement are secondary to the main objective. However, any settlement that is to be made should be a fair, just, and equitable one.

Although I do not believe that the House amendment takes positive enough action to insure any settlement of the strike, I shall vote for it in the hopes that when the bill comes out of conference we will have some workable means of settling the strike.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2576 as amended?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HYDE) there were—ayes 94, noes 75.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays, 150, answered "present" 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—215

Abbitt	Bolton, Oliver P.	Dollinger
Addonizio	Bowler	Dondero
Albert	Boykin	Doyle
Alexander	Brooks, La.	Edmondson
Allen, Calif.	Brooks, Tex.	Elliott
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ga.	Engle
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Evins
Arends	Broyhill	Fallon
Ashley	Byrd	Fernandez
Ashmore	Cannon	Fine
Aspinall	Carlyle	Fino
Avery	Carnahan	Fountain
Ayres	Carrigg	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Celler	Gamble
Baldwin	Cheif	Gary
Bass, Tenn.	Chenoweth	Gathings
Bennett, Fla.	Cooley	George
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Grant
Bentley	Curtis, Mass.	Gray
Berry	Davidson	Gubser
Betts	Davis, Tenn.	Hale
Blatnik	Deane	Hardy
Boland	Dempsey	Harris
Bolling	Denton	Harrison, Va.
	Devereux	Harvey
		Hays, Ark.

Hayworth	Magnuson	Rodino
Hiestand	Mahon	Rogers, Colo.
Hill	Mailliard	Rogers, Mass.
Hinshaw	Marshall	Rutherford
Holifield	Martin	St. George
Holmes	Meader	Schwengel
Holtzman	Merrow	Scott
Hope	Metcalf	Sheppard
Horan	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Huddleston	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Ill.
Hyde	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Ikard	Miller, N. Y.	Sisk
Jackson	Mills	Smith, Miss.
Jenkins	Mollohan	Smith, Va.
Jennings	Morano	Spence
Johnson, Wis.	Morrison	Springer
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Steed
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Sullivan
Jones, N. C.	Multer	Taber
Karsten	Murray, Ill.	Talle
Kearns	Murray, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Keating	Norrell	Thomas
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, N. J.
Keogh	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Kilday	O'Hara, Minn.	Thomson, Wyo.
Kilgore	O'Neill	Thornberry
King, Calif.	Osmers	Tollefson
Kirwan	Ostertag	Trimble
Klein	Patman	Tumulty
Knutson	Pfost	Udall
Lanham	Poage	Vanik
Lankford	Polk	Van Zandt
LeCompte	Preston	Velde
Lesinski	Price	Vinson
Long	Priest	Vursell
Lovre	Prouty	Whitten
McCarthy	Rabaut	Wickersham
McCormack	Rains	Wier
McDonough	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
McIntire	Rees, Kans.	Williams, N. J.
McMillan	Reuss	Willis
McVey	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolcott
Macdonald	Rhodes, Pa.	Wright
Machrowicz	Richards	Yates
Mack, Ill.	Riley	Young
Mack, Wash.	Rivers	Zablocki
Madden	Roberts	

NAYS—150

Adair	Donovan	Landrum
Alger	Dorn, N. Y.	Lane
Allen, Ill.	Dorn, S. C.	Latham
Auchincloss	Dowdy	McCulloch
Bailey	Ellsworth	McDowell
Barrett	Fascell	Matthews
Bass, N. H.	Feighan	Minshall
Bates	Fenton	Morgan
Baumhart	Fisher	Natcher
Beamer	Fjare	Nicholson
Becker	Flood	O'Konski
Blitch	Flynt	Patterson
Boggs	Forand	Perkins
Bolton, Frances P.	Ford	Philbin
	Forrester	Pilcher
Bonner	Friedel	Pillion
Bosch	Fulton	Poff
Bow	Garmatz	Quigley
Boyle	Gavin	Ray
Bray	Gentry	Robeson, Va.
Brownson	Granahan	Rogers, Fla.
Budge	Green, Oreg.	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Gross	Rooney
Burnside	Hagen	Roosevelt
Bush	Haley	Sadlak
Byrne, Pa.	Hand	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Harden	Schenck
Canfield	Harrison, Nebr.	Scherer
Cederberg	Hays, Ohio	Scudder
Chase	Hébert	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Henderson	Selden
Church	Herlong	Shelley
Clark	Heselton	Short
Cole	Hess	Smith, Wis.
Colmer	Hoeven	Staggers
Coon	Hoffman, Mich.	Thompson, La.
Corbett	Hosmer	Thompson, Mich.
Coudert	Hull	
Cramer	James	Utt
Cretella	Jensen	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	Johansen	Vorys
Cunningham	Johnson Calif.	Walter
Dague	Jonas	Weaver
Davis, Ga.	Judd	Westland
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Wharton
Dawson, Utah	Kelley, Pa.	Widnall
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Derounian	King, Pa.	Wilson, Ind.
Dixon	Kluczynski	Withrow
Dodd	Knox	Wolverton
Donohue	Laird	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wainwright

NOT VOTING—68

Abernethy	Gordon	Phillips
Andrews	Green, Pa.	Powell
Anfuso	Gregory	Radwan
Barden	Griffiths	Reece, Tenn.
Belcher	Gwinn	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Halleck	Riehlman
Buchanan	Hillings	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Burdick	Holt	Sheehan
Chatham	Jarman	Shuford
Chiperfield	Kearney	Sieminski
Christopher	Kilburn	Siler
Clevenger	Krueger	Smith, Kans.
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Taylor
Dawson, Ill.	McConnell	Teague, Tex.
Dies	McGregor	Tuck
Diggs	Mason	Watts
Dingell	Mumma	Williams, Miss.
Dolliver	Nelson	Wilson, Calif.
Durham	Norblad	Winstead
Eberharter	O'Brien, N. Y.	Younger
Fogarty	Passman	Zelenko
Frazier	Pelly	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion to suspend the rules was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Holt.
Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Sheehan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Andrews with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. DODD, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. WOLVERTON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TUMULTY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. BASS of Tennessee changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The door was opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO INCLUDE CERTAIN PERIODS OF SERVICE RENDERED STATES, ETC.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1041) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist upon the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, DAVIS of Georgia, and REES of Kansas.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES REPRESENTING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. HARRIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1917) to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate public use and enjoyment of the Grand Teton National Park and to make possible an appropriate relocation and use of highways through the park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct within the park, upon a location to be agreed upon between the Secretary and the Governor of Wyoming, a highway which shall replace the present United States Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26. Upon completion of the said highway, the Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with the State of Wyoming, upon such terms and conditions as he deems in the interest of the United States, for the conveyance of the highway to the State in exchange for State and county roads in the park area.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes a new highway from Moose, Wyo., within Grand Teton National Park, eastward to the junction of U. S. 187 and U. S. 89, at the eastern park boundary. The road will run 20 miles on the east side of the Snake River through Antelope Flat, a broad sagebrush basin in Jackson Hole. At two places it will approach near the river, but most of it will be up to 4 miles away from it.

The principal purpose of this new construction is to free the present main road through the park, U. S. 187, from through traffic between Jackson and Landers, Wyo., and other towns, and especially to divert commercial traffic. It will constitute a bypass, shortening the distance to be traveled; and at the same time it will enable the Park Service officials to restrict commercial

use of the present road in conformity with their policy in other national parks. Once the new road is built, the superintendent will be able to issue regulations determining the kind of uses to be permitted on the other park roads. At present, this commercial traffic must follow the road through the heart of Jackson Hole, to the detriment of the park and its enjoyment by visitors.

The new road will be highstandard blacktop, 24 feet wide, with 4-foot stabilized shoulders on each side. The grades will be gentler than on the present route and the curves less sharp, contributing to safety. Several parking overlooks will be built in order to give visitors distant views of the magnificent Grand Teton Range. Part of the road borders the Jackson Hole elk preserve and will enable visitors to see elk conveniently. The highway will cost about $2 million and will require about 2 years to complete.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLENDO DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2339) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to include capacity to serve the town of Glendo, Wyo., in a sewerage system to be installed in connection with the construction of Glendo Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the installation of a sewerage system to serve the Government construction camp and housing facilities at Glendo Dam and Reservoir (68 Stat. 486) and upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, to install sufficient capacity to serve also the town of Glendo, a municipal corporation of the State of Wyoming, and to transfer all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to said system (including necessary rights-of-way) to said town. The total capacity of said system shall not exceed that required to serve 500 persons and no commitment between the United States and the town with respect to the construction thereof shall require the expenditure of more than $75,000. The terms and conditions of this authorization are that the town shall have—

(a) transferred or agreed to transfer to the United States, without cost to the United States, such interest in land required for construction of the sewerage system as is satisfactory to the Secretary;

(b) transferred or agreed to transfer to the United States without cost to the United States, fee title to 10 acres of land for the construction of said camp and housing facilities or such other interest in said land as is satisfactory to the Secretary for that purpose. In the event said land is not located within the then corporate limits of the town, the town shall take all necessary and proper steps under the laws of the State of Wyoming to extend its limits to include said land;

(c) connected and run or agreed to connect and run a water main or mains to such locations on the property line of said land as are agreed upon by the town and the Secretary and agreed to furnish water for the use in said camp and housing facilities and by the residents therein on the same terms and considerations on which it furnishes water to other properties and residents in the town of Glendo. Necessary water meters will be furnished by the United States;

(d) agreed to furnish, without cost to the United States, fire and police protection service to the camp and housing facilities on said land on the same basis and under the same conditions as it furnishes such services to other properties and to inhabitants of the town of Glendo;

(e) agreed to accept such streets and alleys (including rights-of-way therefor) as are constructed by the United States on said land and dedicated by the United States to public purposes and to maintain and keep said streets and alleys in good and serviceable condition without cost to the United States. Necessary streets and alleys constructed by the United States on said land will be of type and quality comparable to existing streets and alleys within the present limits of the town of Glendo;

(f) installed or agreed to install street lights on the streets and alleys constructed by the United States on said land and agreed to maintain said lights and to furnish the electricity necessary for their operation, such installation, maintenance, and electric service to be furnished to the same extent and in like manner as is afforded on other streets within the limits of the town of Glendo and without cost to the United States;

(g) arranged or agreed to arrange for electric and natural-gas service to said camp and housing facilities and to the residents therein on the same terms and conditions as such service is furnished to other properties and residents in the town of Glendo;

(h) agreed to the United States use of the sewerage system throughout its useful life to the extent of that capacity which is required to serve 150 persons and agreed furthermore, that it will operate and maintain said system in conformity with standards agreed upon by the town and the Secretary (which standards shall be those generally employed for the maintenance of similar facilities) and in a manner permitting the satisfactory use of said capacity by the United States, all without cost to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2039) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 2 years after the date of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., that were set apart by the United States for the Indians of the Colorado River and its tributaries, for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases, and for those farming purposes which require the making of a substantial investment in the improvement of the land for the production of specialized crops as determined by said Secretary. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential or business purposes with the consent of both parties may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and all leases and renewals shall be made under such terms and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Income from leases on land in the southern reserve, as defined in ordinance No. 5 of the Colorado River Indian Tribes, dated February 3, 1945, shall be segregated from income from leases on land in the northern reserve, as defined by such ordinance, and from leases on land on the California side of the Colorado River. All income received within 2 years after the date of this act and prior to determination of the beneficial ownership of the lands, from leases on land in the northern reserve and land on the California side of the Colorado River may be expended by the Secretary for the benefit of the Colorado River Indian Tribes and their members. All income received within 2 years after the date of this act and prior to determination of the beneficial ownership of the lands, from leases on land in the southern reserve may be expended by the Secretary for the development or improvement of any land in the southern reserve. All income received more than 2 years after the date of this act, which is hereby declared to be a reasonable time within which the beneficial ownership of the land on the reservation may be determined by the Congress, shall be held in a special account until such ownership has been determined. All income received after beneficial ownership has been determined shall be held in trust for the beneficial owners of the land from which the income was derived and shall be expended as otherwise authorized by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line, 6, strike out "to exceed 25 years, but leases for public, religious," and insert the following: "to exceed 25 years, excepting leases for grazing purposes, which shall be for a term of not to exceed 10 years. Leases for public, religious,"

Page 3, line 6, after "reserve." strike out the remainder of line 6 and all down to and including line 11, and insert the following: "All income received more than 2 years after the date of this act shall be held in a special account until the beneficial ownership of the land on the reservation has been determined.

Page 3, line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as recognizing any ownership in the Colorado River Indian Tribes or any other Indians or group of Indians, nor shall this act be taken as creating any inference of liability or as impairing or affecting any of the defenses of the United States in any litigation now pending before the Court of Claims or the Indian Claims Commission."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUEBLOS OF SAN LORENZO AND POJOAQUE IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consideration for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1906) to authorize the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque in New Mexico to sell certain lands to the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pueblo of San Lorenzo, sometimes known as the Pueblo of Picuris, and the Pueblo of Pojoaque in New Mexico are hereby severally authorized to sell to the Navaho Tribe of Indians all of the right, title, and interest of each of said Pueblos in and to any of the lands situated in townships 6, 7, and 8 north, range 15 west, and township 7 north, range 16 west, New Mexico principal meridian, in Valencia County, N. Mex., the title to which is now held by the United States in trust for either of said Pueblos; and the Navaho Tribe is hereby authorized to purchase all of the right, title, and interest of said Pueblos in and to any of the above-described lands, whereupon the title to the lands so purchased shall be held by the United States in trust for the Navaho Tribe. All sales under this section shall be for such prices and on such terms as may be agreed upon by the governing bodies of the Pueblo making the sale and of the Navaho Tribe, and as may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The consideration for each sale, when so agreed upon and approved, shall be paid out of such funds of the Navaho Tribe as may be designated for this purpose by its governing body. The Secretary of the Interior and the appropriate officers of said Pueblos are authorized to execute such instruments of conveyance as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the transfer of title to any lands purchased by the Navaho Tribe under this section.

SEC. 2. All proceeds received from each of the sales authorized by section 1 of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Pueblo making the sale in the account established for such Pueblo pursuant to section 19 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636, 642), and together with any other funds heretofore or hereafter deposited in the same account, shall be available for expenditure or advance for such purposes, except per capita payments, as may be designated by the governing body of such Pueblo and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of consolidating the lands of the Navaho Tribe, the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the governing body of said tribe, may exchange any lands purchased under section 1 of this act for any other lands situated in McKinley or Valencia Counties, N. Mex., that are owned by the United States, by the State of New Mexico or a political subdivision thereof, or by any person; and, for the same purpose, the head of any department or agency having administrative jurisdiction over lands situated in said counties that are owned by the United States may exchange any such lands for lands purchased under section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVILS TOWER NATIONAL MONUMENT, WYO.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2049) to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States, pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in recognition of the 50th anniversay of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established on September 24, 1906, by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906, and in order to provide suitable public campground facilities and other developments for the public benefit and to facilitate administration thereof, the Devils Tower National Monument hereafter shall include the following-described land comprising approximately 155 acres, which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure in such manner as he shall find to be in the public interest:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

Township 53 north, range 65 west, section 18, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, those parts lying north of and within a loop of the left bank of the Belle Fourche River; southwest quarter northwest quarter, that part lying west of the left bank of the Belle Fourche River;

Township 53 north, range 66 west, section 13, south half northeast quarter.

SEC. 2. For land-exchange purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept title to any land or interests therein situated within the area added to the national monument by this act, and, in exchange for land or interests therein so accepted, to convey any national monument land or interests therein of approximately equal value situated in the northeast quarter of section 18, township 53 north, range 65 west, and lying east of the Belle Fourche River. National monument lands so conveyed for exchange purposes shall be excluded from the national monument.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE NEW YORK CITY AREA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 732) to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TUMULTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], who has introduced a similar House bill. I understand that the other side is not affected; in fact, New Jersey may if it so desires have two members on this commission, so the bill need not be amended. May I ask the gentleman from New York to confirm that?

Mr. KLEIN. There is no doubt whatsoever that if the gentleman from New Jersey has any names to submit, or anybody else from New Jersey, those persons may serve on this voluntary commission.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to appoint an Advisory Board, to be known as the New York City National Shrines Advisory Board. The membership of the Board may not exceed 11 persons. The Secretary shall appoint 1 member to represent the city of New York, 1 member to represent the State of New York, and 1 member to represent the Borough of Manhattan, after consideration of such recommendations as may be made by the mayor of New York City, the Governor of New York State, and the president of the Borough of Manhattan for the appointment of the representatives of their respective jurisdictions. The remaining membership of the Board shall be appointed from the various historical and civic organizations interested in effectuating the purposes of this act. The Secretary shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members to serve as Chairman. Members of the Board shall receive no compensation for their services, but may be paid any necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties, when authorized by the Secretary of the Interior.

The functions of the Board shall be to render advice to the Secretary of the Interior and to further public participation in the rehabilitation and the preservation of those historic properties in the New York City area that are of great national significance, identified as the Federal Hall National Memorial, Castle Clinton National Monument, and the Statue of Liberty National Monument. The Board shall conduct a study of these historic properties and submit recommendations concerning their preservation and administration to the Secretary of the Interior, such report and recommendations of the Board to be transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, together with his recommendations thereon, within 1 year following the date of the establishment of the Board. The Board shall cease to exist when the Secretary of the Interior shall find that its purposes have been accomplished.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept donations of funds for rehabilitation and preservation of the historic properties, including any made upon condition that such funds are to be expended only if Federal funds in an amount equal to the donated funds are appropriated for such purposes. There are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to match funds that may be donated for purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Federal Hall Memorial National Historic Site, established pursuant to the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), shall hereafter be known as the "Federal Hall National Memorial."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF AMITE RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1899) to authorize the improvement of the Amite River and its tributaries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That improvements in the interest of flood control and drainage be undertaken in the Amite River, Bayou Manchac, and the Comite River, such work to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, substantially in accordance with a survey report entitled "Survey Report of Amite River and Tributaries La.", of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, New Orleans district, dated June 8, 1955, approved by the division engineer, Corps of Engineers, lower Mississippi Valley division, and submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on July 5, 1955, at an estimated first cost to the United States of $3,008,000: *Provided*, That local interests comply with the provisions in the district engineer's recommendations, including contribution of 24.7 percent of actual construction cost in cash or equivalent work as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for Amite River and Bayou Manchac, presently estimated at $892,000, and 18.6 percent of actual construction cost in cash or equivalent work, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for Comite River, presently estimated at $67,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARKANSAS RIVER

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 730) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the development and protection from pollution of the water resources of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment among them of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries flowing between such States, and for matters incident thereto, upon the condition that one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the President and to the Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and consented to by the Congress of the United States: *Provided*, That any compact negotiated under the authority of this act shall recognize the respective rights of the States of Kansas and Colorado in the waters of the Arkansas River, as established by the Arkansas River Compact consented to by Public Law 82, 81st Congress, 1st session.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States while so employed, shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this bill brings to a successful conclusion the efforts of the entire Oklahoma delegation, and of the delegations of several sister States, to establish a firm foundation by interstate compact for the wise and fair use of the waters of several principal rivers in the Southwest.

On signing by the President, we now have legislation which authorizes compacts between Oklahoma and Kansas, governing water apportionment on the Arkansas River and its tributaries; between Oklahoma and Arkansas, governing water apportionment on the Arkansas and its tributaries; and among the four States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana, governing apportionment on the Red River and its tributaries.

Of course, all of these compacts will require time and careful consideration, and must be approved by the State legislatures involved as well as by Congress, before becoming effective.

Nonetheless, the groundwork has been laid for all-important agreements between and among the States, which are so essential to the full protection of each State's rights on these rivers, and equally essential to the full enjoyment and use of the waters involved.

I trust that appointments will soon be made of competent and able negotiators, both by the President and by the States involved, to assure an early start on these vital negotiations.

A failure to draw concise and definite agreements, with careful provision for protection of each State's rights, has apparently resulted in unnecessary litigation and misunderstanding between the parties to water compacts in other sections, and I trust these pitfalls will be avoided in the forthcoming compacts involving Oklahoma's precious water rights.

Recent history has certainly demonstrated that water is one of the indispensable keys to the well-being and progress of any modern community and region. Oklahoma, which has seen its share of drought in recent years, can bear witness to this fact.

Let us move forward now, with our neighbors, to conclude wise and fair agreements for the use of our water treasure.

CECILE DORIAC ET AL.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1681) for the relief of Cecile Doriac and her minor child.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cecile Doriac, the fiancée of Dean E. Ballard, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Cecile Doriac is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Dean E. Ballard, and (2) that she and her child are otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Cecile Doriac, she and her child shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Cecile Doriac, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Cecile Doriac and her child as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEKO SUZUKI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 393) for the relief of Chieko Suzuki.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chieko Suzuki, the fiancée of Capt. Jack L. Wulff, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Chieko Suzuki is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Capt. Jack L. Wulff and (2) that she is found otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chieko Suzuki, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chieko Suzuki, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chieko Suzuki as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MERTIKAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1415) for the relief of Anna Mertikas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna Mertikas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. D. Jim Martikas, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LADISLAV MENCL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2088) for the relief of Ladislav Mencl.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are these bills which the gentleman is asking the House to consider at the present time bills that have been passed by the other body?

Mr. WALTER. These bills have been passed by the other body and have been approved by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MARTIN. Have they been approved by the full committee?

Mr. WALTER. They have not been referred to the full committee, no, but they have been referred to the ranking Republican and Democratic Members.

Mr. Speaker, I might say in explanation of the present bill that it is for the relief of a soldier who is now at Walter Reed Hospital. He is a Czech soldier who jumped out of a plane and the parachute did not open. It would be a great morale builder for this soldier if immediate action is had on this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 257) to amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain cases of a sale or exchange of a taxpayer's residence, certain periods of limitation shall not run against the taxpayer while he is on extended active duty in the Armed Forces, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding a new section to chapter 1 of subtitle A immediately following section 1341 to read as follows:

"SEC. 1342. Computation of tax where taxpayer recovers substantial amount held by another under claim of right.

"(a) General rule, If—

"(1) an item was deducted from gross income for a prior taxable year (or years) because it appeared that another person held an unrestricted right to such item as a result of a court decision in a patent infringement suit (whether or not the taxpayer is a party to such suit); and

"(2) gross income is increased for the taxable year because it was established after the close of such prior taxable year (or years) that such other person did not have an unrestricted right to such item or to a portion of such item because of the subsequent reversal of such court decision on the ground that such decision was induced by fraud or undue influence; and

"(3) the amount of such increase in gross income exceeds $3,000, then the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be the lesser of the following:

"(4) the tax for the taxable year computed with the gross income so increased; or

"(5) an amount equal to—

"(A) the tax for the taxable year computed without such increase in gross income, plus

"(B) the increase in tax (including interest) under this chapter (or the corresponding provisions of prior taxable year (or years)) which would result solely from the elimination of such item (or portion thereof) as a deduction from gross income for such prior taxable year (or years).

"(b) Special rule: For purposes of subsection (a) (5) (B) interest shall be computed from the due date of the return for such prior taxable year to the due date of the return for the taxable year."

SEC. 4. The amendment made by section 3 of this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Amend the title so as to read: "To amend section 112 (n) (8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to the suspension of certain periods of limitation while the taxpayer is on extended active duty with the Armed Forces, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to tax treatment where the taxpayer recovers amounts held by another under claim of right."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to H. R. 257. This amendment adds a new section to the 1954 code intended to be complementary to section 1341 of that code.

Section 1341 deals with the situation where a taxpayer is required to restore money or property in which he has mistakenly included an item in gross income for a prior taxable year or years. That section permits the taxpayer, where the item amounts to $3,000 or more, an election of: First, deducting the restored amount in the year it is restored to a third person, or, second, computing the tax for the year in which the item is restored without deducting the amount restored and then lowering the tax of that year by the amount of decrease in tax caused by excluding the item from the income of the year in which it was first reported.

The Senate amendment to H. R. 257 grants a similar option to a taxpayer who mistakenly believes that a third party has claim of rights to money or property and for that reason takes a deduction for the item in an earlier year where in the taxable year the taxpayer recovers the item previously deducted.

The Senate amendment limits this treatment to situations—

where an item was deducted from gross income for a prior taxable year (or years) because it appeared that another person held an unrestricted right to such item as a result of a court decision in a patent infringement case suit (whether or not the taxpayer is a party to such suit) which court decision was later reversed on the ground that such decision was induced by fraud or undue influence. Interest will be computed on the increase in tax resulting solely from the elimination of such item as a deduction for the prior taxable year.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to H. R. 257 adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is complementary to section 1341 of the code.

Section 1341 deals with the situation where a taxpayer mistakenly includes an item in his gross income of a prior year(s), and in a later year is required to restore the money or property which gave rise to the item of income in the prior year. Where the restored item amounts to $3,000, or more, section 1341 allows the taxpayer the option of: First, deducting the restored amount in the tax year it is restored to a third party; or, second, computing the tax for the restoration year without deducting the amount restored, and then lowering the

tax of the taxable—restoration—year by the amount of decrease in tax caused by excluding the restored item(s) from the income of the earlier year(s) in which reported.

The Senate amendment simply extends a similar option to a taxpayer who, mistakenly believing that a third party had a claim of right to money on property, takes a deduction for the item or items in an earlier year or years. An amendment along this line has already been approved by the Committee on Ways and Means. The House should have no objection to the Senate amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of the next two bills which I expect to call up.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 1233 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6263) to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "the closing of."

Page 3, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 452 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining the term 'personal holding company') is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of an organization or trust organized or created before July 1, 1950, if at all times on or after July 1, 1950, and before the close of the taxable year such organization or trust has owned all of the common stock and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes of stock of the corporation, but only if such organization or trust is not denied exemption under section 504 or an unlimited charitable deduction is not denied under section 681 (c) and, for this purpose—

"'(A) all income of the corporation which is available for distribution as dividends to its shareholders at the close of any taxable year shall be deemed to have been distributed at the close of such year whether or not any portion of such income was in fact distributed); and

"'(B) section 405 (a) (1) and section 681 (c) (1) shall also not apply to income attributable to property of a decedent dying before January 1, 1951, which was transferred during his lifetime to a trust or property that was transferred under his will to such trust.'"

Page 3, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 4. The amendment made by section 3 of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954."

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

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

As I understand, these bills have come back from the Senate and have all been approved by the author of the bill in the House?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks with reference to these three bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to H. R. 6263 which changes the definition of personal holding company now found in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. At the present time the definition of a personal holding company includes a corporation if during the last half of the taxable year more than 50 percent of its stock is owned by not more than five individuals. Charitable trusts are generally considered as individuals in applying this test of stock ownership. This provision will consider charitable trusts not to be individuals for purposes of the personal holding company test if the trust was created before July 1, 1950, and if the trust has owned, since that time and until the close of the taxable year, all of the common stock and at least 80 percent of the stock of all other classes of the corporation whose status as a personal holding company or otherwise is being determined.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to H. R. 6263 changing the definition of "personal holding company" in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—defining the term "personal holding company"—provides for treating charitable foundations or trusts as "individuals" in determining the stock ownership test for personal holding companies. This provision was new in the 1954 code and is so broad in its wording as to include investment companies which have been wholly owned by charitable foundations for many years and would thereby for the first time require treatment of such investment companies as personal holding companies.

Certain long-established charitable trusts have, solely for business reasons, owned and controlled certain of their investments through the means of a separately formed investment company. Such company is, of course, subject to payment of the customary Federal income taxes and is used as a matter of convenience in the businesslike handling and development of enterprises requiring additional capital from time to time in their expanding activities. If such organizations are to come under the rule for personal holding companies then they would become subject to the penalty tax applicable thereto. This would make it impracticable to conduct their activities on a normal business basis involving carefully planned reinvestment to provide required capital to meet the needs of growth situations such as public utilities with resulting expansion of income. The alternative would require dissolution of such investment companies which would deprive the Federal Government of the income tax now being paid by such companies.

The Senate amendment amends this provision of the 1954 code in a limited manner so that certain long-established charitable foundations may retain the tax status under which they have operated for many years.

The Senate amendment amends section 542 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which deals with certain charitable foundations. Three conditions must be met. The foundation must be organized or created before July 1, 1950. Second, at all times on or after July 1, 1950, through the close of the taxable year such foundation must own all of the common stock and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes of stock of the corporation. Thirdly, such foundation must not be denied exemption under section 504 or such trust must not be denied the unlimited charitable deduction under section 681 (c) and, for this purpose, the income of the investment company is treated as though distributed to the foundation or trust to the extent of their proportionate interest in income available for distribution as dividends. Also, for purposes of this last condition it is provided that the restrictions in sections 504 (a) (1) and 681 (c) (1) of the 1954 code against unreasonable accumulations will not apply to income attributable to property of a decedent dying before January 1, 1951, which was transferred, either to an inter vivos trust during his lifetime or was transferred under his will to such trust.

This Senate amendment applies only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, a bill to accomplish the same purpose as the Senate amendment was introduced by my distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH]. I might also state that I brought the problem to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means, where it was considered fully. I have no hesitancy in stating that our committee would have favorably reported out a bill to take care of this problem had not the Senate adopted this amendment. Under these circumstances, I urge the House to accept the Senate amendment.

APPLICATION OF SECTION 108 (B) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6887) to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) with Senate amendments

thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 7, insert:

SEC. 2. Section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions from the gross estate for expenses, indebtedness, and taxes) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (d) to be subsection (e) and by adding after subsection (c) a new subsection, as follows:

"(d) Certain State death taxes: Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, for purposes of the tax imposed by section 2001, the value of the taxable estate shall be determined by deducting from the value of the gross estate the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses as described in section 2055. Any tax deducted under this subsection shall be disregarded in computing the credit for State death taxes under section 2011."

After line 7, insert:

SEC. 3. The amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 made by section 2 of this act shall apply with respect to the estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1953 (whether on, before, or after the date of enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), in any case in which the last date prescribed by law for filing the Federal estate tax return is on or after April 1, 1955.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended to read: An act to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) and to amend section 2053 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended H. R. 6887. The Senate amendment will permit an additional deduction for the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, death, or inheritance tax imposed by a State by reason of a bequest to charity.

The Senate thought this amendment necessary because of the following facts: Existing law measures the deduction for charitable bequests by the amount which the charity actually receives. Therefore, if a State imposes a tax on the charitable bequest, and the State tax must be paid from the charitable bequest, the Federal estate-tax deduction permissible because of the charitable bequest is diminished by the amount of the State tax, and the amounts of the Federal estate tax increased accordingly. If the additional Federal estate tax thus produced must also be paid out of the charitable bequest, the charitable deduction will be reduced again in turn and the estate tax correspondingly increased with a resulting pyramiding of tax on tax. The combination of State tax and Federal tax thus imposed results in the dissipation of a large part of the bequest intended by the testator for charitable purposes.

The Senate amendment will prevent this pyramiding and grant a deduction for Federal estate-tax purposes for the amount of an estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses described in section 2055 of the 1954 Code.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has added an amendment to this bill, H. R. 6887. Under present law, a deduction for the Federal estate tax is granted for bequests to charity. Under the Senate amendment, a deduction would also be granted for the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon the transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses as described in section 2055.

The deduction for charitable bequests allowed by section 2055 of the 1954 code for bequests to charity is measured by the amount the charity actually receives and not the amount of the bequest. For example, if a State imposes a tax on the charitable bequest and the State tax must be paid from the charitable bequest, the Federal estate-tax deduction would be limited to the amount of the bequest less the State tax paid from the bequest, and the Federal estate tax would be increased by the corresponding increase in the taxable estate of the decedent. If the additional Federal estate tax thus arising must also be paid out of the charitable bequest, the charitable deduction will, in turn, be reduced and the estate tax correspondingly increased. By this pyramiding of tax on tax, the Federal estate tax can be increased by much more than the State tax on the bequest and the combination of these two taxes can result in the dissipation of a large part of the bequest that the testator intended to be used for a charitable purpose.

To prevent the charitable purpose of the testator from thus being frustrated and to carry out the national purpose of not subjecting charitable bequests to the estate tax, the Senate has added a provision that will grant a deduction for Federal estate-tax purposes for the amount of any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax imposed by a State upon a transfer by the decedent for public, charitable, or religious uses as described in section 2055 of the 1954 code. Thus, the estate will receive the same deduction whether or not a State tax is imposed upon a bequest, legacy, devise, or transfer that is deductible under any paragraph of section 2055 (a) of the 1954 code.

The deduction will be disregarded in computing the credit for State death taxes under section 2011 of the 1954 code.

The amendment to section 2053 of the 1954 code will apply with respect to the estate of decedents in any case in which the last date prescribed by law for filing the Federal estate tax return is on or after April 1, 1955.

AMENDING SECTION 208 (B) OF THE TECHNICAL CHANGES ACT OF 1953

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953—Public Law 287, 83d Congress—which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, how many bills does the gentleman have?

Mr. COOPER. There are five.

Mr. JENKINS. All of which have been unanimously approved in the committee?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee with reference to each of these bills.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of each of the next four bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 is amended by striking out "1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if enacted as a part of section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as the House will recall, section 208 of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 permitted for estate tax purposes the tax-free release of certain powers pertaining to discretionary trusts described in section 1000 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. This treatment was granted only in cases where the grantor was under a mental disability for a continuous period of not less than 3 months beginning before December 31, 1947, and ending with his death. Therefore, relief was not extended to a grantor, under such a disability, who died after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1951. It is the purpose of H. R. 2667 to correct this situation and grant relief in such cases.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2667 amends section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 by making that provision applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1947, instead of to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1950, as provided in the Technical Changes Act.

Section 208 of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 permitted for estate-tax purposes the tax-free release of certain

powers over a discretionary trust described in section 1000 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, if the grantor was under a mental disability for a continuous period of not less than 3 months beginning before December 31, 1947, and ending with his death. The Technical Changes Act did not extend relief to a grantor under such a disability who died after December 31, 1947, and before January 1, 1951. This amendment would grant relief in such cases. The amendment is effective as if enacted as a part of section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953.

This bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXCISE TAX ON INSTALLATION CHARGE ON COMMUNITY TELEVISION RECEIVING ANTENNA EQUIPMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3413) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities shall not apply to amounts paid for the installation of equipment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4252 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions for purposes of the tax on communication services) is hereby amended by striking out the second sentence of subsection (a); and section 4253 of such code (relating to exemptions) is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(g) Installation charges: No tax shall be imposed under section 4251 on amounts paid for the intallation of instruments, wires, poles, switchboards, apparatus, or equipment."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to installations begun on or after the date on which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That section 4252 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining the term 'wire and equipment service' for purposes of the communications tax) is hereby amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: 'Such term does not include the installation charges for community television receiving antenna equipment involving the use of cables or wires from the location of the receiving antenna to the location of the television receiving sets.'

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply with respect to installations begun on or after the date on which this act is enacted."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on wire and equipment service shall not apply to amounts paid for the installation of community television receiving antenna equipment."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3413 amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that installation charges for community television antenna receiving equipment are not to be subject to the 8-percent communications excise tax presently imposed on wire and equipment service.

The Committee on Ways and Means believes that it is necessary to exempt the installation of such equipment from the tax because its imposition penalizes those who live in communities which, due to their geographical location, are unable to obtain direct television reception as a result of natural obstructions.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3413 provides that installation charges for community television receiving antenna equipment are not to be subject to the 8-percent communications excise tax on wire and equipment service. The bill is effective with respect to installations begun on or after the date of enactment of the bill. The bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

INCOME-TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF PATENT RIGHTS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to capital gains and losses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(q) Transfer of patent rights:

"(1) General rule: A transfer (other than by gift, inheritance, or devise) of property consisting of all substantial rights to a patent, or an undivided interest therein which includes a part of all such rights, by any holder shall be considered the sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months, regardless of whether or not payments in consideration of such transfer are—

"(A) payable periodically over a period generally coterminous with the transferee's use of the patent, or

"(B) contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition of the property transferred.

"(2) 'Holder' defined: For purposes of this subsection, the term 'holder' means—

"(A) any individual whose efforts created such property, or

"(B) any other individual who has acquired his interest in such property in exchange for consideration in money or money's worth paid to such creator prior to actual reduction to practice of the invention covered by the patent, if such individual is neither—

"(i) the employer of such creator, nor

"(ii) related to such creator (within the meaning of paragraph (3)).

"(3) Exceptions: This subsection shall not apply to any transfer described in paragraph (1)—

"(A) by a nonresident alien individual, or

"(B) between an individual and any related person.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'related person' means a person, other than a brother or sister (whether of the whole or half blood), with respect to whom a loss resulting from the transfer would be disallowed under section 24 (b).

"(4) Applicability: This subsection shall apply with respect to any amount received, or payment made, pursuant to a transfer described in paragraph (1) in any taxable year beginning after May 31, 1950, regardless of the taxable year in which such transfer occurred."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, prior to the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, there was no statutory provision dealing specifically with the sale or exchange of patents, and the position of the Internal Revenue Service regarding the sale of patents was in opposition to the position taken by the courts. Because of this conflict, taxpayers were burdened with the necessity of litigation in order to obtain the capital-gains treatment to which the court decisions held they were entitled. To remove the necessity of this litigation, Congress enacted section 1235 of the 1954 Code which provides that the sale or exchange of all substantial rights to a patent is to be considered as a sale or exchange of a capital asset held for more than 6 months whether or not payments are to be made periodically during the period of the transferee's use of the patent and regardless of whether the payments are contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition of the patent.

The relief provided by section 1235 is available only with respect to amounts received in any taxable year to which the 1954 Code applies. As the result of this and the announced policy of the Internal Revenue Service to continue its insistence on its position for years beginning after May 31, 1950, and prior to effective date of the 1954 Code taxpayers are still confronted with litigation for taxable years falling in this period in order to secure the rights to which the courts, with practical unanimity, have held they are entitled.

H. R. 6143 eliminates the necessity for such litigation by making the provisions of the 1954 Code available to years beginning after May 31, 1950.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6143 amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to apply the special rules pro-

viding capital-gains treatment for sales or exchanges of patents in section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950. This bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDING SECTION 1237 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was unanimously reported favorably by the committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1237 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "other than a corporation" and inserting "(including corporations only if no shareholder directly or indirectly holds real property for sale to customers in the ordinary course of trade or business)."

SEC. 2. Section 1237 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(a) In subparagraph (A) strike out "sewer facilities" and insert "sewer facilities, other public utilities."

(b) At the end of paragraph (3) insert: "The requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) shall not apply in the case of property acquired through the foreclosure of a lien thereon which secured the payment of an indebtedness to the taxpayer or (in the case of a corporation) to a creditor who has transferred the foreclosure bid to the taxpayer in exchange for all of its stock and other consideration and in the case of property adjacent to such property if 80 percent of the real property owned by the taxpayer is property described in the first part of this sentence."

SEC. 3. This act shall apply to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, prior to the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 those who subdivided real estate for sale were often held by the courts to be engaged in the trade or business of selling real estate. These holdings were predicated on the frequency, substantiality of the sales, and the continuity of sales activity involved in such projects, even though the taxpayer was not a dealer in real estate and was simply utilizing the most profitable and expedient method of liquidating property acquired by inheritance, foreclosure, or other nonsale purpose.

With respect to individuals, section 1237 of the 1954 code removed the uncertainty in this field by providing special rules for the taxation of gain from the sale of real property. Thus the taxpayer will not be regarded as engaged in the trade or business of selling real property solely because he subdivides a tract for purposes of sale or because of any activity incident to the subdivision or sale of the property comes within the scope of the section if he is not a dealer in such property.

The relief granted was not extended to corporate taxpayers, therefore, H. R. 6712 extends the scope of section 1237 of the 1954 code to include corporations if no shareholder of such corporation holds property for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his business. The bill also broadens the scope of section 1237 by extending its provisions to certain property on which the taxpayer has made public-utility improvements.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6712 amends section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to real property subdivided for sale. Under this bill the capital-gains treatment generally granted by section 1237 is extended to certain corporations and other taxpayers who may not qualify under the present section. This bill also allows taxpayers under certain circumstances to make public-utility improvements on the property that is within the scope of this section. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

PROVIDING THAT AMOUNTS WHICH DO NOT EXCEED 61 CENTS SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM TAX IMPOSED UPON AMOUNTS PAID FOR TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7634) to provide that amounts which do not exceed 61 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (exemption of certain trips from tax on transportation of persons) is hereby amended by striking out "The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 35 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 61 cents".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation on or after such first day.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert: "That part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on transportation of persons) is hereby amended by striking out 'The tax imposed by section 4261 shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 35 cents,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The tax imposed by section 4261 shall not apply to amounts paid for transportation which do not exceed 60 cents,'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, when the tax on the transportation of persons was imposed in 1941, certain short trips of a local nature were not subjected to the tax.

This was achieved by exempting fares which did not exceed 35 cents. Because of the general increase in the costs of operating transportation services and the necessary offsetting fare increases the 35-cent fare exemption is now ineffective for purposes of exempting commutation travel. H. R. 7634 is designed to restore the effectiveness of the exemption and accomplishes this objective by increasing the exempt fare from 35 to 60 cents.

The reasonableness of this figure is evidenced by the fact that railroad coach fares in the eastern part of the country have risen since 1940 from 2 cents a mile to 3.375 cents, an increase of 68 percent.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7634 increases from 35 cents to 60 cents the maximum charge for fares which are to be exempt from the 10-percent excise tax on amounts paid for the transportation of persons. When the tax on the transportation of persons was imposed in 1941, it was the intention of the Congress to exempt from tax certain short trips of a local nature. The exemption was designed to free from tax the ordinary trip involved in commuting to and from work. The increase in the size of the exemption contained in this bill is simply an adjustment to allow for the increase in transportation costs since 1941. The bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], as was a similar bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

AUTHORIZING STATES TO ORGANIZE AND MAINTAIN STATE DEFENSE FORCES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7289) to authorize the States to organize and maintain State Defense Forces, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "forces" over to and including "President" in lines 8 and 9 on page 2.

Page 2, line 22, strike out "1952." and insert "1952.' "

Page 2, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 10 on page 3.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF GOVERNMENT CAPITAL IN INSTITUTIONS OPERATING UNDER SUPERVISION OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5168) to provide for retirement of the Government capital in certain institutions operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration; to increase borrower participation in the management and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; and for other purposes, do pass with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 12, line 9, after "allocated", insert ": *Provided*, That any surplus and contingency reserves shown on the books of the banks as of the effective date of title I of the Farm Credit Act of 1955 shall not be distributed as patronage refunds."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST RIVER, CONN.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2514) to declare the portion of the waterway of West Haven and New Haven, Conn., known as the West River, northerly of a line running north 85° 54′ 43.5″ east from a point whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers Harbor Lines System are north 4,616.75 and west 9,450.80, a nonnavigable stream.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. PRIEST. This is a bill that would declare a certain portion of the waters of West Haven and New Haven, known as the West River, a nonnavigable stream.

May I say that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA] introduced the bill. It came to our committee. We did not have time for hearings. It is my understanding that Governor Ribicoff, the State highway department, and everybody in the State of Connecticut favors it, and there is no objection from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. MORANO. If the gentleman will yield, this just permits the State of Connecticut to build a throughway over a part of a stream that will be declared nonnavigable under this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in which is located the West River in the town of West Haven, Conn., and the city of New Haven, Conn., lying northerly of a line extending north 85 degrees 54 minutes 43.5 seconds east, from a point (1,158.535 feet from the most westerly corner of the existing bulkhead and pier line) whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers Harbor Line System are north 4,616.76 and west 9,450.80, is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The line hereinbefore described shall be established as a combined pierhead and bulkhead line of the West River.

SEC. 3. Any project heretofore authorized by an act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above-described portion of the West River, is hereby abondoned.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORAL REARMAMENT STATESMEN'S MISSION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention at this point in the proceedings to the heartening and inspiring news of the MRA statesmen's mission. The program for this mission was prepared at the World Assembly for Moral Re-Armament under the leadership of Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman at Mackinac Island, Mich., May 26 to June 5. Following its reception in Washington, the mission left on June 10 for Honolulu and Japan.

BACKGROUND FACTS

A group of African and Asian leaders prepared a statement following the World Assembly for Moral Re-Armament at Washington in January 1955. In it they said:

Moral re-armament points the way to achieve a constructive cooperation which none need fear and which can benefit all mankind.

At the Bandung Conference in April, Dr. Fadhil Jamali, leader of the Iraqi delegation, in a vigorously applauded speech at the first plenary session made an appeal for East-West unity on a basis of moral re-armament.

Mr. Speaker, national leaders who were hosts to or received the statesmen's mission were Ichiro Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan; the Foreign Minister and Acting Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea; President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, and O. K. Yui, Prime Minister of the Republic of China; Ramon Magsaysay, President of the Republic of the Philippines; Ngo Dinh Diem, President and Prime Minister of Vietnam; Field Marshal Pibulsonggram, Prime Minister of Thailand; Dr. Ba U, President, and U Nu, Prime Minister of the Union of Burma; Sir John Kotelawala, Prime Minister of Ceylon; Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of India; Mohammed Ali, Prime Minister of Pakistan; His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran and Prime Minister Hussein Ala; Burhanuddin Bashayan, Foreign Minister of Iraq; Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser, Prime Minister of Egypt; Members of the Council of Ministers of Kenya and the Mayor of Nairobi; and Adnan Menderes, Prime Minister, and Fuat Koprulu, Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey.

MISSION WHO'S WHO

The mission itself is composed of political and other national leaders from all five continents and they take with them the cast of a new ideological play The Vanishing Island, written by Peter Howard. The party consists of 198 men and women from 28 nations.

Among those taking part, either throughout or at certain stages of the journey, are Dr. Theodor Oberlaender, Minister for Refugees in the German Federal Cabinet; Diomede Catroux, member of the French National Assembly, Minister of Air in the Mendes-France cabinet; Ole Bjorn Kraft, leader of the Danish Conservative Party and chairman of NATO 1952–53; Mohammed Masmoudi, Minister of State for Tunisia; The Tolon Na, Yakabu Tali, Member of the Gold Coast Legislature and president of the Northern Territories Council; Eugene Claudius-Petit, Cabinet Minister in 10 postwar French governments; the Honorable B. C. Okwu, member of the House of Assembly in Eastern Nigeria; Madam Irene Laure, former deputy in the French Parliament and secretary-general of the Socialist Women of France; Dr. Oskar Leimgruber, Chancellor of the Swiss Confederation, 1943–51; Majid Movaghar, representing the Shah of Iran; Air Vice Marshal Thomas Traill, former Director General of Personnel, Royal Air Force; John McGovern, member of Parliament, Great Britain; James Haworth, member of the national executive of the British Labor Party; Niro Hoshijima, member of the Japanese Diet and signatory of the Japanese Peace Treaty; the Honorable Charles B. Deane, Member of the United States House of Representatives; Joseph Scott, leading Catholic attorney of Los Angeles; Senator Shidzue Kato, Member of the Japanese House of Councillors; Kanju Kato, former Minister of Labor of Japan and leader of the rightwing Socialist Party; Ibrahim Shukrullah, Secretary of the Arab League Council, Cairo; Dr. Daniel Lew, United Nations technical counselor for Nationalist China; Kahi Harawira, New Zealand; Daw Nyein Tha, nationally known educator of Burma; Surya Sena, son of Sir James Pieris, first Ceylonese to preside over the Legislative Assembly of Ceylon; Ian MacLean, executive officer, Kenya Coffee Board; Prof. Barend Nel, dean of the faculty of education, University of Pretoria; Dr. William Nkomo, founder and first president of the African Na-

tional Congress Youth League; Thio Chan Bee, noted educator of Malaya and for 7 years member of Legislative Council of Singapore; Fausto Pecorari, vice president of the Italian Constituent Assembly; Robert Carmichael, president of the jute industry of France and newly elected president of the European jute industry; Robin C. Mowat, senior lecturer in history, Royal Naval College, Greenwich; Ole Olsen of the Olsen and Johnson productions.

The national hosts to the MRA Statesmen's Mission, beginning in Japan, received the following message from the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the majority and minority leaders of the House. The message reads:

To the Honorable Ichiro Hatoyama, Prime Minister of Japan:

As Members of the United States Congress, we recognize the great significance of the moral re-armament mission of 170 from some 28 countries now traveling to and through the principal capitals of Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East with the musical play, The Vanishing Island, which dramatizes the central struggle of our time. The play was witnessed in Washington by overflow audiences including key administration, political, and military leaders.

The principles that moral re-armament represents, which are basic to all people who desire freedom, can be a decisive factor for the whole world when applied by men and women of all races, all creeds and in all walks of life. We heartily commend this mission to you and to your people.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives.
JOHN MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives.

En route to Japan the mission stopped at Honolulu for a presentation of The Vanishing Island which had been arranged by a committee of invitation whose chairman, Walter Dillingham, senior businessman of Hawaii, stated:

A great gift has been made to the people of Honolulu. It is the only thing I have ever heard of that has any chance of revolutionizing the thinking of the world.

JAPAN

Mr. Hatoyama, the Prime Minister, said at the reception of this mission:

This has been the most memorable moment of my life.

Mr. Ogata, newly elected head of the Liberal Party, said:

This is something we have never seen before. The problem in the world is division. The only answer is unity. MRA is the agency that is going to bring it.

The evaluation of a member of the Diet was:

You have changed the fate of Japan. You have given us back the hope that had gone out of our lives.

The Prime Minister, members of his cabinet, and over 100 members of the Diet went to see The Vanishing Island. It was given to the nation on the television network. News of it was on the radio and in the newspapers every day and night. For the first time in history Japanese homes gave hospitality on such a scale to westerners. Said the Nippon Times in an editorial:

In Japan we have need for this ideology of MRA. Hatred, bitterness, jealousy, and greed have permeated deep into the hearts of too many of our people. We need to clean out the dregs which have poisoned our spirits and made us chase after false values and ideologies. The coming of the MRA task force is an opportunity for all of us to do some serious soul searching and above all let there be no hypocrites among us.

This newspaper then published a 4-page special edition on the work of MRA around the world.

Thirty of the principal national labor leaders of Japan, including 7 national chairmen, representing over 3 million workers from all 3 major divisions of organized labor, met with leaders of the Mission.

Prime Minister Hatoyama designated Niro Hoshijima, top policy adviser and one of the signatories of the Japanese Peace Treaty in San Francisco in 1951, to accompany the mission to Formosa and the Philippines. Also with him was Kanju Kato, the former Minister of Labor.

There was also Nakajima, who lost his family and was seriously burned when the atomic bomb was exploded over Hiroshima. This man was a trade-union leader who lost his bitterness toward America when he came to the Moral Re-Armament Assembly in Caux, Switzerland, 3 years ago. He will travel with the mission throughout Asia, giving his evidence of the ideology which is uniting the East and West.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA

"Chiang Salutes MRA as Invincible Force," headlined the New York Journal-American in reporting the response to the moral re-armament statesmen's mission in Formosa. President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek received the Mission in Taipei. He said:

Moral Re-Armament is providing the world with ideological leadership.

It is the most important form of aid we have ever received. Your mission has created a great impression not only throughout this nation but also on the Communist mainland.

He told Reginald Owen, who plays in The Vanishing Island, that the theater was the most powerful ideological weapon today, that the Communists had effectively used it, and that he rejoiced that the free world was now doing the job effectively in the moral re-armament plays.

Gen. Ho Ying-chin, who received the surrender of the Japanese armies in 1945, evaluated the work of the mission:

You are forging the moral and ideological basis of East-West unity. This visit is unprecedented in the history of China. Never before has such a group come to China or for that matter to any Asian nation.

The streets of Taipei were crisscrossed with scarlet banners emblazoned in gold with the words, "MRA, an idea to win the world."

Dr. Daniel Lew, technical counsellor for Nationalist China at the United Nations, was designated to travel with the mission. He said:

I expected to find some brand of anticommunism. Instead I found an idea to win humanity.

Eight broadcasts to southeast Asia and Communist China were made from Formosa, Japan, and Manila. Peter Howard said in one of these broadcasts:

Attempts, however sincere, to make a new world must inevitably fail unless a new type of man is created to live in it. New systems crumble before the same old motives of greed, mistrust, and exploitation. Those who use hate to gain control inevitably find that they have to use force to keep it. You cannot make a new world out of the same old people. You cannot make a good omelet out of bad eggs. A new type of world demands a new type of man. The ideology which produces the new type of man will win the world. And basic change in a man's motives can take place. I know it because it happened to me.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The Government of the Republic of Korea arranged for a delegation from the mission to visit Seoul. The delegation was received by members of the cabinet, chiefs of armed forces, and leaders of education and social welfare.

A favorable turn to the vexed problem of Korean-Japanese relations was given by a message of apology from leading members of the Japanese Parliament conveyed on their behalf by former NATO Chairman Ole Bjorn Kraft to the Foreign Minister and other members of the Korean Cabinet.

The Foreign Minister, who was also Acting Prime Minister under President Syngman Rhee, said:

I am convinced that unless the world catches this spirit of moral re-armament, another world disaster will be inevitable.

Members of the mission were honor guests at the ceremonies on June 25 marking the fifth anniversary of the invasion of South Korea in 1950.

THE PHILLIPINES

Joseph Scott, of Los Angeles, one of America's senior Catholic laymen, led the moral re-armament statesmen's mission when it arrived in the Philippines on June 27.

A dinner was given for the visiting representatives by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Senate President, Eulogio Rodriguez, in his speech of welcome, stated:

The hope of a turbulent Asia lies in the effect of such a force.

The mission was front-page news in the Philippine press and an hour was given for a national broadcast. Typical of the press comment was:

Joseph Scott, 87 years strong in the faith of his fathers and his family—Catholicism—gave a stirring message on the impact moral re-armament has on every religion—and in his Catholicism, its power to deepen and strengthen that faith in his life.

Another comment:

The Vanishing Island caught fire with the audience. It creates quite a vision of the future. A godless ideology is undoubtedly creeping over the islands of freedom. It must be stopped. The Vanishing Island proposes the solution. * * * The solution is not only worth a try. It is the only solution.

Niro Hoshijima, for 35 years a member of the Japanese Diet, apologized to the nation for the wrongs Japan had committed.

That is why my Prime Minister urged me to come on this mission. Please forgive us.

Moral re-armament is already building a new Japan and with moral re-armament all Asia can unite.

The Manila Evening News in an article by the American columnist Winifred Bissinger gave these impressions of a thinking American living in Asia:

Saturday night we stepped off the cocktail party circuit and went to see the moral re-armament play, The Vanishing Island. It was the most rewarding experience of our life. MRA's musical is exceedingly cleverly conceived, magnificently presented propaganda for what, at this stage of an unhappy game, seems to be the answer—the only answer. Notably unsusceptible to propaganda—we hope—we can happily say we have fallen for this hook, line, and sinker. We left the Far Eastern University auditorium Saturday night in a glow. We could never wholeheartedly accept either of the world's two opposing ideologies. Of communism, we have a horror because we love freedom. In smug democracy, we have found many flaws. Here in moral re-armament we find an ideology we can accept—if only we were unselfish enough, decent enough, and—we must say it—good enough.

After the performance, several national groups of persons affiliated with the movement were introduced to the audience. They included highly respected statesmen, two former British admirals decorated for great heroism in the last war, resistance leaders and mineworkers. As outstanding and impressive a group of people we have never seen gathered together in all our newspaper experience.

Congressman Roseller T. Lim evaluated the visit in these words:

The coming of this mission at this time is the beginning of a tidal wave of change in the nations of Asia. I have decided to live MRA and with God's help I hope to give the rest of my life to it.

SINAGAPORE

Conferences and meetings were held with the rival Malay and Chinese political parties, with heads of the chamber of commerce and trade-union leadership, and with educational and student leaders.

A reception, tendered by the president of the Chinese chamber of commerce, many of whose members have close family ties with Communist China, was attended by Singapore's chief minister, David Marshall, and other notables from the Malayan, Chinese, British, and Indian communities.

Mr. Thio Chan Bee, noted educationalist and former legislative council member, and one of those who was responsible through MRA for bringing the rival Malay and Chinese communities together after the war, joined the special plane as Singapore's representative on the world mission.

VIETNAM

With the people of South Vietnam only 12 months away from the fateful July 1956 deadline when they must vote for or against the Communist North, President Ngo Dinh Diem on July 5 welcomed as Government guests a delegation from the MRA world mission.

An hour after the special plane landed at Saigon Airport, the President and his Cabinet formally received the mission in the same Palace of Independence where recently he had turned the tide in his civil war. He said:

You are carriers of a noble ideal and powerful advocates for this idea—I would even say of a vast movement for the unity of men and nations. You have straightaway won the active sympathy of the Vietnam people. * * * For myself I understand the immense repercussions that will come from this mobilization of spiritual forces in the world which you have undertaken in effective cooperation with all men of good will. You have confronted an ideology that supposes to unite the world on the basis of hatred, fear, and strife with an idea which proclaims love and understanding and which proposes to bring about unity to the world by way of the heart and spirit.

In sharing your idea I have the firm conviction that a worldwide renaissance of moral and spiritual forces which we are all aiming for in the depths of our hearts, will be accomplished in the coming days, for the greatest benefit of us all. This will be the dawn of a new age which will see the transformation of the world.

Next morning, first anniversary of Diem's taking office after the Geneva armistice, he invited the mission to address the massed crowds from the palace steps. In his introduction he referred to MRA as "the great ideology that is sweeping the world."

That evening he gave a state banquet in honor of the MRA mission to which the diplomatic corps and chief Government leaders were invited.

Before leaving Saigon, members of the mission spent an afternoon with the Minister of War and 50 picked officers responsible for indoctrinating the country for next year's critical vote. The Chief of Psychological Warfare, Dr. Phuoc, said:

We were grateful for American military and economic aid, but lacked an ideology. Now you have given us the idea which can win.

THAILAND

In Thailand, keystone of SEATO, the MRA world mission were official guests of the Prime Minister, Field Marshal Pibulsonggram, who opened the Bangkok premiere of The Vanishing Island and welcomed his visitors "on behalf of my Government and the Thai people."

At a reception and dinner for the members of the mission, the Prime Minister referred to his visit to the MRA World Assembly at Caux, Switzerland, the month before. He declared that "peace-loving peoples will sooner or later yield to the ideology of MRA," which he described as "a strong force that answers world materialism." He continued:

Our honored guests are from all walks of life and are sacrificing themselves for the sake of the peace of mankind. The MRA mission aims to build up unity between nations and to bridge East and West. Its ideology is pure and sincere. Since its inception MRA has been growing larger and larger and will continue to grow with great force. The doors of Thailand will be gladly opened to MRA at all times.

In introducing the play at the theater of the Ministry of Culture, the Prime Minister declared:

The Vanishing Island is a remarkable play and teaches us a unique lesson. It will be a most potent weapon for casting away doubt and fear and so healing the differences between nations.

For the first time breaking a firm rule against attending theatrical productions, 15 members of the supreme Buddhist council, including the president of the council and other high priests of the Buddhist faith, attended the second performance of The Vanishing Island as the Prime Minister's personal guests. The president of the council said:

MRA has the same purpose for righteousness as the Lord Buddha. The ability of MRA to change men is proof that MRA has the power to unite the world.

Concluding their visit in this heart of the Buddhist world, which numbers some 400 million of Asia's population, the mission was received for 2 hours by the Lord Abbot of Wat Mahatat, one of the largest monasteries in the land, who said:

As a Buddhist, I take the greatest pleasure in receiving this mission. Our Buddhist faith teaches us to keep company with what is good, and from MRA I find in the four absolute standards something which is good. You can be assured that I shall be only too glad to serve you in any capacity. And I say this in front of the Lord Buddha. I am less lucky than you, because I am not able to accompany you. But I am happy you are accompanied by some who will be traveling on my behalf. It is a great tribute to Dr. Frank Buchman that a force like this can travel around the world—and such a strong force. This should be regarded as one of the great and important events in the history of humanity. Dr. Buchman is one of the great men of the world.

Among those present at the play were delegates to the current SEATO military talks.

BURMA

Prime Minister U Nu's official representative U Win, the Minister of National Planning, welcomed the world mission to Burma.

Performances of the play The Vanishing Island were packed out with hundreds standing. All classes of Rangoon University were suspended for a special showing for more than 3,000 students.

The President of Burma, Dr. Ba U, gave a state presidential reception for the MRA mission and personally took a party of 16 to an overflow performance of the play.

Dr. Hla Tun, head of the Karen state government and Minister for Karen Affairs in the Federal Government, represents more than a million Karens, who have been in bitter dispute with the Federal Government since this country received its independence. In a statement to the MRA mission, Dr. Hla Tun said:

One failing has poisoned our national life—our hatred for our Burmese brethren. It is high time for us to face this matter squarely and get rid of this moral evil from within our hearts.

We are grateful for your coming. We thank you for the wonderful play The Vanishing Island. We are sure that without a moral basis there can be no real peace and cooperation. In these days of doubts, fears, and general pessimism your visit has cheered us and given us hope that a new world can be built.

A leading Burmese Communist commented after seeing The Vanishing Island:

I came here expecting to see a western play. But I found a great Burmese drama. It shows the way by which each one of us can change his nature.

An Asian Ambassador to Rangoon epitomized the East's response to the moral re-armament mission when he said:

I have looked down on the West with contempt. I thought the West with the hydrogen bomb was drawing us all to destruction. Last night when I saw The Vanishing Island and saw the Americans, South Africans, and all nations on the stage—particularly the Americans—all my prejudices vanished and my bitterness for the West went with them, too.

The Times of Burma stated editorially:

This idea has certainly found expression and struck a concordant note in the hearts and minds of millions of people. MRA is today a world force and stands unrivaled in the fight against moral decadence. It is a spiritual insurrection against a world enmeshed in the tentacles of hate, greed, or selfishness and intolerance.

CEYLON

The Prime Minister of Ceylon, Sir John Kotelawala, threw open the grounds of his residence, Temple Trees, in an official welcome to the moral re-armament world mission. Sir John became the seventh leader of Asian nations to give powerful support to the mission. He personally took a party of 50 people to the premiere of The Vanishing Island, including 6 members of the Cabinet and Chief Justice H. H. Basnayake.

Sir John said:

I hope that by employing MRA we shall have peace in the world so that people can walk it in freedom and majesty. We in Ceylon will learn from all of you.

Among others who attended the play were the Governor General of Ceylon, the president of the senate, the leader of the house, the leader of the opposition, speaker of the house, the mayor of Colombo, many Members from both Houses of Parliament, general secretary of the Ceylon Trades Union Congress, representatives of the Ceylon Federation of Labor, Ceylon Workers Congress, and Ceylon Trade Union Federation.

Trade-union leaders traveling with the mission met separately with the principal officers of the 4 trade-union groups of Ceylon representing 400,000 workers of all political opinions.

Commented the Speaker of the House, Sir Albert Peries, on the nationwide impact of The Vanishing Island and MRA's Mission: "We need nothing in this island so much as we need MRA."

Leader of the opposition S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike summed up the universal response to the play when he said:

The brain and intellect of the world have outstripped the world's character in growth. With this play and the spirit of MRA you are developing the character of all mankind.

Before leaving by air for India, once again at the Prime Minister's invitation, the entire mission was entertained at his home estate.

INDIA

In Delhi the President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, received members of the MRA ideological mission. Delegations from the mission were also entertained by the Vice President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and Congress President U. N. Dhebar, as well as the leader of the Socialist Party of the House of the People, K. P. Kripalani, and Home Minister Pandit G. B. Pant, Minister of Labor Khandubhai Desai and the deputy chairman of the Planning Commission, Sir V. T. Krishnamachari. The latter stated:

The greatest problems today are conflicts between races and that is where MRA is bringing an answer. Its growth is inevitable.

During its four packed performances in Delhi The Vanishing Island was attended by a number of the members of Cabinet, as well as the Speaker of the House, G. V. Mavalankar, who describes moral re-armament as, "the old ancient way of the East. It has given our own philosophy a new orientation and it has given it wings."

Devadas Gandhi, son of Mahatma Gandhi, and editor of the Hindustan Times, arranged for the mission a special showing of the film The Voice of India, the story of his father's life, for which MRA artists had contributed background music.

The Vanishing Island played to packed houses in Madras, Calcutta, and Delhi. A group of leading Madras citizens, including the mayor, the vice chancellor of Madras University, the president of the Motion Picture Producers Association of India and the general secretary of the Southern Railway Employees Union cabled from Madras to the Delhi performance:

Grateful your inspired visit to Madras. A widespread response to MRA here. Our best wishes for the success of the mission in Delhi.

Eleven of the foremost papers have printed special MRA supplements ranging from 4 to 10 pages in the past 2 years. These include The Bombay Chronicle, the Hindu, The Hindustan Standard of Delhi and Calcutta, The Advance, Indian Finance and Juguntar of Calcutta.

Mr. Tashar Kanti Ghosh, editor of the influential daily Amrita Bazar Patrika, said: "The world tour is an event of profound significance, particularly at this crucial moment in the history of the world. As far as India is concerned, your ideological Mission will be warmly appreciated." Reviewing the play the paper said:

The Vanishing Island depicts an answer to the very problems faced by the summit conference—conflict between democracies and dictatorships. The problems are presented with pungent satire in songs and humorous dialog, and the solution is presented with a surprise that leaves a lasting impression.

The Times of India carried an illustrated account of the ideological mission. Its dramatic critic wrote:

The grand way in which the story is treated, with such perfect team spirit even for a stupendous cast, is an example of grand showmanship worthy of emulation on the Indian stage.

The man who helped organize a demonstration against moral re-armament when the force came to Calcutta 2 years ago was on hand to welcome the MRA ideological mission. Phani Gupta, a trade-union organizer, said:

I've spent most of my life in the Communist Party. I have fought in the streets and fields with Sten guns and bombs for the liberation of my country but never found the answer. In MRA I found it. It's the most effective way of solving national and international problems.

A Delhi theater owner called the play an absolute masterpiece. An industrialist's comment was:

I saw all the ideological plays they are showing in China, but none touches this one.

The proprietor and editor-in-chief of the Hindu was host to a number of the mission. His paper carried many columns on the mission and the play.

A militant trade unionist who had been a member of the Communist Party said:

The Vanishing Island is the most powerful ideological drama I've ever seen. It's just like a rocket. It covers 95 percent of the problems we face in India today and brings a clear answer.

MRA is the answer to the need of the hour—said T. V. Anandhan, general secretary of the Southern Railway Employees Union. Anandhan, with 75 of his officials, welcomed labor members of the mission to union headquarters in Madras.

Addressing 400 students of Madras Christian College, the president of the student body, who visited Moscow last year, told of the change that had begun in his life since meeting moral re-armament. He said:

The aim of MRA is to revolutionize the world starting with change in the individual.

The Indian Express, with the largest circulation in the country, carried an excellently displayed article on the editorial page by Vincent Evans, former Washington bureau chief of the London Daily Express.

PAKISTAN

The Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mohammed Ali, gave a garden reception at his home to welcome the whole Moral Re-Armament ideological mission. The reception was attended by several members of the cabinet, the diplomatic corps, chiefs of the armed services, and the judiciary.

Speaking on behalf of the 198 from 28 countries that arrived with the MRA mission, Peter Howard, author of the MRA musical drama, The Vanishing Island, referred to the long friendship between Dr. Frank Buchman, initiator of MRA, and the late Mohammed Ali Jinnah, founder of Pakistan. He quoted the latter, who told Dr. Buchman in London, "Honest apology is the golden key. You have the answer to the hates of the world."

Among the other guests present were Mr. Ispahani, Minister of Industry, and Begum Ispahani; General Ayub Khan, Minister of Defense; Ibrahim Rahimtoola, Minister of Commerce; Adm. H. M. S. Choudri, commander in chief of the Royal Pakistan Navy; Air Vice Marshal MacDonald, commander in chief of the Royal Pakistan Air Force; Maj. Gen. Mohammed Musa, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff; the Ambassadors of Iraq and Iran; and Yussef Haroon, publisher of Dawn. Chaudri Mohammed Ali, Minister of Finance and incoming Prime Minister, received members of the Mission on the morning in which he announced the devaluation of the currency.

The Chief Minister of East Pakistan received a delegation from the mission in Dacca, saying:

You in MRA have a common ground on which all people can stand. You can be sure of a great response in our country.

The delegation was officially received by His Excellency, Mr. Amiruddin Ahmed, Governor of East Pakistan, and 70 leaders in politics, industry, commerce, the diplomatic corps and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, under general permission to extend remarks, I am submitting additional material completing my speech on the Moral Re-Armament statesmen's mission.

IRAN

The MRA world mission were personal guests of the Shah and Government of Iran.

In the official reception line at Teheran Airport were representatives of the court, the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the services, the universities, and industrial, labor, and women's organizations.

A 2-hour national broadcast, directed by the Vice Premier and the Minister of Education, and keynoted by the President of the Supreme Court, inaugurated a visit described by Foreign Minister Entezam as "a world move to bring international relations into a new dimension."

Prime Minister Hussein Ala spent a morning with representatives of the mission. He said:

My Sovereign and Government are wholeheartedly with you in support of moral re-armament. We consider it a fundamental step toward uniting nations for the creation of peace which the common people of every land need and long for. What you are doing is perhaps the only hope of the world if we are to create understanding and prosperity for all peoples. The Koran and Islam sponsor and favor moral re-armament. You are showing the world how to put aside the old ideas of 19th century imperialism from which we have suffered in the Middle East and replace them with moral standards which are universal. You are giving a superior idea to communism and that is why you will succeed in winning the world.

The Minister of Education, Dr. Mohmoud Mehran, took first steps toward the ideological training of Iranian youth. He said:

Moral re-armament has a vital role to play in giving to our youth an ethical ideology which is the only answer to materialist ideas and propaganda.

Special lunches, dinners, and receptions were given in honor of the mission by the heads of every principal national organization and an extensive series of industrial visits brought them into touch with workers and managers on a factory level.

The Iranian premiere of The Vanishing Island was a command performance for the Shah and Queen Soraya given by royal order on a specially constructed stage in the grounds of the summer palace. The impact of the play was such that by imperial command the palace grounds were, for the first time in history, thrown open to the public to witness the last two performances of the play.

An Iranian Goverment delegation is being formed to attend the Caux Assembly in September.

Before leaving for Baghdad the mission were guests of the 50th anniversary celebrations of the Iranian Parliament, the Majlis.

IRAQ

Members of the MRA mission were guests of Burhanuddin Bashayan, Foreign Minister of Iraq, during a 4-day visit to this heart of the ancient world.

The Vanishing Island had its Baghdad premiere in the King Feisal II Theater before a cross-section of the governmental, diplomatic, industrial, and labor life of the capital.

Dr. Fadhil Jamali, former Premier and chief of his country's United Nations delegation, and who as Chairman of the Iraqi delegation at the Bandung conference has stood up to communism and has appealed for Asian-African unity on the basis of moral re-armament, gave a thought-provoking evaluation of the play to the press of Baghdad. The following is a translation from an interview by Dr. Jamali in Al Akhbar, leading Arabic daily of Baghdad:

Without doubt the theater is one of the most effective of the fine arts in propagating good character, the social virtues, and a lofty example to mankind. This is the task to which moral re-armament is actually applying itself. It portrays in its stage presentations a picture of human society, whether it be in the home, in the factory, in business, or in international relations, stating the problem and making clear the answer. It was my privilege to witness a number of these plays in America.

The day before yesterday I saw The Vanishing Island. Without doubt this play produces an amazing artistic effect and evokes real appreciation. The most important point about this play is its human, social, and political implications. The play presents two islands. One of them stands for democratic freedom, but materialism and selfishness have so led it astray that its people pay no attention to an imminent threat to their way of life. They do not believe that destruction peers at them from behind the door.

In the portrayal of this kingdom is a telling lesson for the anti-Communist countries which believe that they are right—completely right—forgetting that they themselves are ruled by materialism, selfishness, and exploitation.

The second act portrays a land under Communist government where dictatorship, slavery, and cruelty reign, where with the death of individual liberty human feelings are forgotten. Thus all of mankind is led along in slavery by chains of materialism.

These two regimes which are alike engulfed in materialism have no one to guide them aright. It is the good king of the first country who foretells the imminent danger to his island which is complacent in its freedom. When finally they refuse to accept the advice of their king, their island disappears and does not return until after they have repented and returned to their senses.

This good king is mankind's apostle and rescuer, the one who unites the social order, divided into leftist and rightist elements, by presenting a superior plan—a program of absolute purity, absolute love, and unselfishness among all the peoples of the world. Here the play ends by asking that the principles which MRA stands for be applied among all men. These principles are part of all the inspired religions. Together they are the essence of Islam, as they are of Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism. These principles are not the special property of any one religion or nation or geographical area, but are common to all mankind.

These principles are not new. What is new is that the world stands in greater need of them than ever before in history. In this atomic age mankind has before it the choice either to change human nature and thus to change human destiny by establishing these principles, or to continue to a war of extinction. Moral Re-Armament believes that the first thing to be effected is a change of character, and that this change is the effective way for individuals and societies. On this basis MRA is spreading in all parts of the world through a change of heart based on the light of God's guidance. This light of faith is the way which will save mankind from final destruction.

We absolutely cannot hold back from accepting this ideology presented by Moral Re-Armament. I urge that we all work together to purify and dedicate ourselves to absolute honesty, unselfishness, and love in all our work and in our family, social, economic, political, and international life. What this ideology calls for is a faithful confirmation of the verse from the holy Koran which says, "God does not change the condition of a nation until the men of that nation change themselves."

EGYPT

The mission were guests in Cairo of Lt. Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser, President of Egypt. He received the mission in his office.

In a press interview given the following day Colonel Nasser said:

This ideology could be a solution to save the world from the conflict between the so-called West and East. We should all believe in it.

In his cable invitation he had said:

I wish to welcome to Egypt the delegation of Moral Re-Armament. Your principles and objectives are highly appreciated in Egypt where all efforts are mobilized to restore moral values, social justice, human dignity, and freedom.

The Governor of Cairo, Dr. Abdul El Latif Salem, and Dr. Abdel Khalek Hassouna, Secretary-General of the Arab League, headed a distinguished first-night audience at a gala performance of The Vanishing Island in Cairo's famous Opera House, built 80 years ago for the world premiere of Verdi's Aida on the occasion of the opening of the Suez Canal.

Earlier Dr. Hassouna was host at a reception for the mission. The Secretary-General, who is a former Foreign Minister of Egypt, in welcoming the mission on behalf of the Arab League, paid tribute to what had been accomplished in the last 2 months. He specially referred to Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, initiator of Moral Re-Armament, and said:

We will be working with them through the four absolute standards of MRA for the salvation of humanity and the well-being of the whole of human kind.

Chinese Ambassador Ho Feng-shan, dean of the diplomatic corps, gave a dinner and said:

We have been talking about honesty and unselfishness for thousands of years, but these standards have not come into a con-

crete force as we see now in MRA. We have been talking too much and philosophizing without an effort to practice. Here is a force to inundate the world for generations to come.

Labor members of the mission were given a reception by 100 trade-union leaders at the headquarters of the Liberation Rally. Maj. M. Noor, Chief Provincial Officer for the Egyptian trade unions, declared:

I am absolutely dumbfounded by four words—the four words of the absolute standards. I want to help to give these to our whole country and the whole world.

At the close of the meeting the speakers were inundated with requests for literature and entire stocks were emptied.

The Minister of Education, Kemal Edin Hussein—youngest member of the Council of Revolution—gave a warm reception to members of the mission and told them, "It is a tremendous and worthwhile task you have undertaken." He proposed to translate MRA literature into Arabic for use in the schools and universities. He expressed the keenest appreciation at the presence of the 32 Egyptian students sent to Caux by President Nasser.

"Images" of Cairo, leading pictorial magazine of the Middle East, carried 3 pages of pictures of The Vanishing Island and commented:

The admiration this play inspires has been expressed in superlative terms—"a resurrection of the theater," "brings renaissance to nations," "greatest spectacle of our time." In Cairo, where it was invited by Prime Minister Nasser, its success has been equally brilliant. Symbolizing a new dimension in international relations, it has made an indelible impression on the capital.

In Alexandria, commercial and industrial center of Egypt, the enthusiastic audiences at the play included the Governor of Alexandria, the Chief of Staff of the Egyptian Armed Forces, the admiral commanding the Egyptian Navy, the Governor of the Bank of Egypt, and officials of the ruling Liberation Rally who came by invitation of their chief, Lesy Abdel Nasser, brother of the President.

KENYA

Nineteen hours after closing at Cairo, the cast of The Vanishing Island opened before a packed multiracial audience in the Kenya National Theater in Nairobi, 2,500 miles south of Cairo, where the Governor of Kenya, Sir Evelyn Baring, received members of the Moral Re-Armament mission.

Kenya officials greeted the entire mission of 192 on their arrival. Mayor I. Somen welcomed the party on behalf of the city of Nairobi. A. B. Patel, Minister for Asian Affairs in the Kenya Cabinet, and Alan Knight, commandant of the Athi River Mau Mau detention camp, were also at the airport.

At the Athi River camp, 500 hard core Mau Mau leaders had earlier renounced their Mau Mau oaths as a result of applying Moral Re-Armament principles, and Knight brought 24 pounds sterling which had been contributed in shillings and pence by 150 detainees to help finance the mission. The men earn only 1 shilling a day.

Hon. Michael Blundell, minister without portfolio and member of the Emergency War Council, came to the theater to express the warmth of his welcome to Kenya, while Cabinet Minister Patel told a gathering of the Asian community:

Under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman, MRA has made great strides in the last years. It is an ideology essential to the progress of the human race if we are to establish peace.

At the premiere, former Communists, Africans, Asians, Europeans, and Maoris from New Zealand all spoke from the stage. The first members of the mission to be introduced were Mary Waruhiu, daughter of a senior Kikuyu chief, and Mrs. Agnes Hofmeyr, daughter of a famous English settler. The fathers of both had been murdered by the Mau Mau.

At the camp a group from the mission, including Congressman CHARLES B. DEANE of North Carolina and Basil Okwu, Member of the Eastern Nigeria Parliament spoke to 1,500 detainees gathered in the camp theater, giving their own experience of MRA and of its uniting impact across the world.

The climax of the mission's visit in Kenya was an open air meeting for members of the Kikuyu tribe, heart of the Mau Mau revolt, when 7,000 crowded a grassy hillside in the Kikuyu Reserve at 24 hours' notice on the invitation of Chief Simon Waruhiu and his brother David. Hundreds of thousands of Africans later heard the meeting by radio.

TURKEY

Invited by the Turkish Government, members of the mission visited Istanbul and Ankara, modern capital of the country on the plains of Anatolia.

Following the thunderous ovation from the packed theater in Istanbul, Dr. Bahrettin Goekay, Governor of Istanbul, spoke from the stage. He said, "I believe Turkey will be the greatest exponent of MRA among all the nations. There will be no limit to what MRA can do in Turkey."

The ecumenical patriarch, Athenagoras I, head of the 250 million Christians of the Eastern Orthodox Church, received members of the mission at his official residence in this ancient capital of the Eastern Empire, and said, "Moral Re-Armament is the agency which is bringing a new world to birth. Tell Dr. Buchman we believe in him and thank God for him and for all he has done and is doing for the world. Yours is a modern apostolic mission. You have found the secret of life."

In Ankara the mission were guests of honor on Turkey's Victory Day at the Hippodrome where 5,000 picked troops demonstrated the armed strength of the Turkish nation. After the parade the Deputy Prime Minister and former Foreign Minister, Dr. Fuat Koprulu, received the entire mission. "You are serving the sublime cause of an ideology which has opened new horizons for all humanity. The play last night made a terrific impact on our nation," he said. "Rearming is not enough. In the world today we need moral re-armament to complete it. You understand this and the day will come when all the world will realize it."

The Governor of Ankara, Kemal Aygun, added, "Since your play came here everyone in Ankara wants to be a part of MRA." The Chief of Staff of the Turkish Air Force, Gen. Tekim Ariburun, acted as interpreter for the Governor as he spoke from the stage following the play.

Speaking to the audience, Representative CHARLES B. DEANE, of North Carolina, said, "The choice before the nations today is moral re-armament or world communism. The ideology of this play is the strength of democracy and the hope for a new world."

MORAL REARMAMENT WORLD ASSEMBLY AT CAUX-SUR-MONTREUX, SWITZERLAND

Since 1946, 90,000 people from over 100 countries have attended the Moral Re-Armament World Assemblies at Caux-sur-Montreux, Switzerland.

In June of this year the German cast of the MRA play, The Man With the Key, went to Bonn at the invitation of a committee headed by Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. A cabled message of support to Adenauer came from representatives of the United States Congress, including ALEXANDER WILEY, former head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and JAMES P. RICHARDS, present chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It said in part:

We send warmest greetings on the presentation of the Moral Re-Armament play in Bonn, The Man With the Key. The inspired ideology for democracy which it represents is for all men everywhere and is an answer that works.

The play was attended by 50 members of Parliament and their families, and a distinguished audience of parliamentarians, key government officials, and the diplomatic corps. Further special showings were given in Bad Godesberg to a similar audience, and for 250 members of the federal border guard, Germany's miniature 20,000-man army.

Introducing the play, Secretary of State Nahm, who spoke in the name of the Chancellor and his committee, said:

The whole world longs for a great ideology capable of bringing a solution. We believe this ideology has found its expression in this play. Only the country with this ideology can bring negotiations to a successful conclusion.

Speaking before the curtain, Prof. Theodor Oberlaender, Minister of Refugees in the German Cabinet, stated:

Germany and France have to operate together like chambers of one heart working in the same pulse to feed life-giving blood into Europe. If as nations and individuals we learn from the mistakes of the past and change, we will build a new future.

The German Cabinet Minister then introduced Eugene Claudius-Petit, former Minister of Labor and Reconstruction in the Mendes-France government, who was one of 17 members of the National Council of Resistance in France during the war. Claudius-Petit said:

MRA enables us to go much further. It enables us, France and Germany, to be united in a common ideology in the service of the world. To achieve this each of us has to be a man with the key. This goes especially for statesmen. If they check their actions against moral standards of absolute

honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love, then they will change their attitudes toward social, national, and international problems. They will no more be pushed by events but will create the event and change other people by beginning to change themselves. Together they will find new motives and create new men to take responsibility for a new world.

At Caux, Gen. Touzet du Vigier, wartime Chief of Staff to Gen. de Lattre de Tassigny, said:

I found it difficult to go to Germany for the first time. A German miner said to me, "France is our hope." This man felt communism was the danger. He did not see anything but MRA to save him and his country. I, as a French general of a tank division who fought bitterly in the last war, became his friend. He was a former Communist, a miner, and a German. This is the way to rebuild Europe, for it cannot be done solely on economic and social plans.

Said Ludwig Kroll, German Federal Member of Parliament from Baden-Baden:

Reunification of Germany cannot be solved on the political level alone, for it is equally an ideological problem.

He was speaking before four of the German Federal Government observers at the Geneva Conference who had come to Caux to pay their respects to Dr. Frank Buchman. They said:

We know of no force other than MRA that is bringing an answer.

Kroll declared:

These men return to Geneva with new hope.

Dr. Anton Storch, a former leader of the Social Democrats in Sudetenland, said:

The Iron Curtain is a sieve and in many places is being rifted. We have always hoped for this time. Now we are almost afraid because we are unprepared. Only at places where MRA is at work have the Slav, Polish, and German peoples of Europe been able to meet effectively. I have committed myself to fight for everyone on both sides of the Iron Curtain, to bridge the disunities in Europe, and to build conditions for a free and united Christian Europe.

Said 70-year-old Georgian David Sagiraschwili, a contemporary of Joseph Stalin, who had fought for his country's liberation from Czarist domination:

The Russian people are open to MRA. I am convinced that humanity can only be saved through the moral foundations which rule here in Caux. Therefore I have decided to fight with the same passion for moral rearmament.

Bishop Bengt Jonzon of Lulea, Sweden, told the assembly of the cure for communism in the strategic iron-ore mines of Kiruna north of the Arctic Circle which had been under Communist control for 30 years. Jonzon said:

Men trained in Moral Re-Armament at Caux and Mackinac now hold the leading trade-union positions. I am out to make MRA the policy of my nation.

A prominent part in the assembly this summer has been taken by the African delegates who include representatives from South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Rhodesia, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, the French Cameroons, and Egypt. Fifty of these representatives were greeted at a reception in the Federal Palace by the President of Switzerland, Max Petitpierre.

Marthinus Sonnekus, lecturer in the Department of Education of Pretoria University, noted for its Afrikaner nationalism, said:

The map of Africa has been likened to a question mark. But I believe Africa can provide the world with the answer. It is obvious that the different races must find an answer together. I can only be part of the answer when I begin with myself. That is why I am committed to this force.

A member of the Nigerian House of Representatives, the Honorable H. O. Chuku, said:

MRA has worked miracles in my country in Parliament, in the local councils, in businesses, in private lives and between the Government and the members of the opposition in the eastern region.

On July 26 under the sponsorship of Governor Baring, of Kenya, the MRA drama, The Man With the Key, opened in Nairobi. After the play an African security officer said:

I am a Kikuyu. This is an answer to Mau Mau and for my people.

A reception to welcome the cast and the international force of MRA to Kenya was given jointly in Nairobi's best known hotel by leading representatives of the Kikuyu and Luo tribes. It was the first time in the history of Kenya that such a function had taken place.

Dr. Frank Buchman, speaking to the audience of 800 people from 30 nations assembled at Caux, said:

Some people think the way is just to go on enduring communism. Our program is to cure it.

Dr. Buchman pointed to the example given at the Bandung Conference when Dr. Fadhil Jamali, leader of the Iraqi delegation, called for East-West cooperation on the basis of Moral Re-Armament.

Commenting on the Caux Conference, Vaterland, organ of the Catholic Party, Lucerne, Switzerland, in an article on July 22, 1955, entitled "Peace With Justice, Dr. Frank Buchman in Caux," said:

On the morning of the 20th of July, 1955, the founder of Moral Re-Armament, Dr. Frank Buchman, arrived in Switzerland from the United States to take part in this year's world conference in Caux which began on the 28th of May. Because of the events of international politics in these days, the World Conference of Moral Re-Armament in Mountain House, Caux-sur-Montreux, has a very special timeliness.

While in Geneva the Big Four with many advisers and assistants try to achieve peace for the nations through mutual compromise and—if we can express it that way—by diplomatic bargaining for concessions so that at least a short breathing space is achieved in the cold war, 800 people from 30 nations, of the most varied races of the globe, gather round Frank Buchman with the purpose of answering the urgent demand for peace at last among the peoples of the earth through a personal, united and national change on the basis of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love, lived absolutely.

The aim of the Geneva Conference as given by President Eisenhower in his opening speech "peace with freedom for all nations" begins without doubt with the actual liberation of individuals, of families, of peoples, of nations, and of the whole world from the human—all too human—tendency to half—and theferore comfortable—truths; the tendency to conscious or unconscious selfishness and the tendency to indifference toward our neighbors.

The original Christian conception of the need, the naturalness, and the practical possibility of honest, pure, and selfless living for the healing of the world which Dr. Frank Buchman has given to people of our age in a new, attractive, yes, compelling way, has kindled the hopes of numerous or rather innumerable people that there is a way out of the blind alleys into which the many social, cultural, and political developments of the present time have led. Above all, the personality of the veteran founder of Moral Re-Armament radiates on everyone who comes near him, a strangely powerful, fascinating light of confidence and love of humanity that wins people who want to avoid the ideas of Moral Re-Armament or even to condemn them.

So we understand the deep love and the simple cordiality with which his friends celebrated Dr. Buchman's arrival in Switzerland. In a speech of thanks to the workers of Caux, Dr. Buchman mentioned the words of an American newspaper article: "If the principles of Moral Re-Armament are applied at the Geneva meeting of the four powers, they could have a colossal effect in creating a peaceful world," and he described the aims of the world conference as bringing peace with justice.

CONCLUSION

On the eve of the summit conference in Geneva there appeared in the Washington Star an article entitled "MRA Shows Way to Peace With Justice," written by the dean of political columnists of Washington and former president of the Gridiron Club, Gould Lincoln. Following its printing it was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator SMATHERS July 11. His introduction and the article follow herewith:

REMARKS OF HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS, OF FLORIDA, IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MONDAY, JULY 11, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Honorable Gould Lincoln—able, experienced, and astute political writer for the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers over the Nation—recently wrote an article which appeared in the Evening Star entitled "MRA Shows Way to Peace With Justice." I hope that every Senator, and many other persons, had the opportunity of reading this very splendid article which clearly and factually describes what MRA is and how it operates.

I personally can state that I know of some of the great good which MRA has accomplished, for I have seen it in action. I know for a fact that a group of dedicated members of MRA voluntarily offered their services and brought about the settlement of what appeared to be a bitter and long-drawn-out strike between the employees and management of National Airlines.

Subsequently, the same members of MRA, with the help of others, were able to bring about a settlement of the transportation strike within the city of Miami. Since that time I have seen the principles of MRA capture the mind and heart of several hard-bitten, unyielding union leaders, as well as a host of uncompromising, selfish owners of large businesses.

The power of philosophy of MRA is irresistible, and it is making itself a great factor in the fight for freedom in Europe and Asia. Strangely enough it seems to be better known there than here in our own country. Undoubtedly in time it will prove its efficacy here as people become acquainted with it through the writings of Frank Buchman and Peter Howard as well as through

witnessing the simply marvelous plays which they are continually putting on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Gould Lincoln as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

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

"MRA SHOWS WAY TO PEACE WITH JUSTICE

"As President Eisenhower and the heads of three other great governments prepare to meet in Geneva, two forces are working toward success of this four-power meeting at the summit. First, the hunger of people everywhere for peace—and for freedom and justice which can go only with peace. This is the positive force. Second and negative, the fear that an atom- and hydrogen-bomb holocaust will consume the human race.

"On the positive side, a task force that has grown with the passing years is influencing men and women in key positions and in the ranks of peoples the world around. It is MRA—Moral Re-Armament. And MRA, under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman, is exerting a great moral and spiritual influence which has brought bitter enemies to friendship and which is showing the way to statesmen, if they will accept it, to a peaceful world.

"Its principles are the strength of the movement. They are at once as soft and as gentle as the down on the breast of a dove and as rugged as the peaks of the Rocky Mountains. They call for absolute moral standards. And how have they operated? They have brought, first, individuals—men and women—to a conviction they must be honest with themselves and with other people, with a consuming faith in God.

"Far flung influence

"Today MRA is a far-flung force. It has its headquarters in Washington, in Los Angeles, and on Mackinac Island, Mich., in Caux, Switzerland. It has spread into Asia and Africa. It has brought into its ranks statesmen, leaders in business and in labor. It has taught them to sit down and talk honestly with opponents. It has produced an ideology that can be, and is, accepted by the representatives of many races and many nations. It has brought together Germans and Frenchmen. Communists and non-Communists, labor leaders, and employers—and always the results have been for peace and justice. Today MRA has sent to 15 Asian and other far-eastern countries a group almost 200 strong which is producing MRA's latest play, the Vanishing Island. It has sent this group on the invitation of the presidents, prime ministers, and other leaders of these nations.

"This latest play is one of a long series which MRA has used to bring to the peoples of many nations the ideology for which it stands. It has adopted the stage and the drama as its instruments, and with great success in England, in France, in Germany, in India, in South Africa, in the United States, for example. The Vanishing Island, written by Peter Howard, a brilliant British newspaperman, and in the production of which some of Hollywood's most talented men had part, was given at the National Theater here just before the cast, accompanied by leading citizens in some of the countries it is to visit, took off from Washington. Already it has played to large audiences in Japan, in Formosa, in the Philippines, in Bangkok, Thailand, and is currently in Rangoon, Burma. Other countries and cities to which the group will take the play include Madras, Calcutta, and Delhi, India; Pakistan, Tehran, Baghdad, and Cairo.

"No platitudes

"MRA recognizes the problems that beset the world, that divide nations. It does not believe that they can be solved by merely saying, 'Let everybody be good and be kind.' It does believe, however, that these problems can be dealt with realistically on a basis of fairness and good will. At the very bottom lies the honesty and fairness of the individual. Its aim is to change individuals, and when they are changed, nations change. It does not seek to set up an international church or religion. Its principles are the best of all churches and religions and can be accepted by all. Labor leaders and heads of business management who have affiliated with MRA testify freely they have been able to obtain settlements and to win friendships through the tenets of MRA.

"These principles of MRA, if carried into the Geneva meeting of the great powers, could work immeasurably in the interest of a peaceful world. They do not hold with world domination by any nation or group of nations. They do call for the great ultimate boon which the late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, when describing the aim of the United Nations, called peace with justice."

CONTROL OF WATER CHESTNUT INFESTATION IN UPPER CHESAPEAKE BAY TRIBUTARIES

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6686) providing for a preliminary examination and survey by the Secretary of the Army for the purpose of controlling water chestnut infestation in the upper Chesapeake Bay tributaries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FALLON. This is a bill I called to the attention of the gentleman the other day. This bill is an effort to control the water chestnut infestation of the upper Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army shall make a preliminary examination and survey of the tributaries of the upper Chesapeake Bay, in order to determine the extent to which such tributaries are infested with water chestnut (Trapa natans), and the feasibility of undertaking measures to eradicate or control such infestation so as to protect navigation, public health, wildlife, commercial fishing, and the beaches in the area from the disastrous consequences of permitting this pest to spread unchecked.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2430) to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That with respect to the restrictions and conditions required by section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the city of Charleston, S. C.," approved May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1387), which restrictions and conditions prohibited the city of Charleston from transferring title to the property conveyed under that act and reserved a right to the United States to retake such property in the event of a national emergency (and which restrictions and conditions were included in deed executed pursuant to such act), the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to release to the city of Charleston, S. C., by an appropriate written instrument, such restrictions and conditions so far as they pertain to the portion of the tract of land conveyed pursuant to such act of May 27, 1936, which is commonly known as tract 12, and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the west harbor line of the Cooper River (which point is south 41 degrees 31 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 13.2 feet from the southernmost corner of the concrete dock, formerly the dock of the Charleston Quartermaster Intermediate Depot; and which point is the terminal point of the fourteenth call in the deed dated February 24, 1950, from the city council of Charleston to West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.); thence north 48 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds west for a distance of 2,999.27 feet, along the property line between tract 12 and tract 2, part 1, to a point (which is distant 11.42 feet north 68 degrees 33 minutes east from an iron pipe); thence north 69 degrees 00 minutes east a distance of 104.71 feet, more or less, to a point common to this tract 12, tract 13 (leased to South Carolina State Ports Authority by West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. by indenture dated February 4, 1947), and tract 10 (leased by the city council of Charleston to North Charleston Terminal Co.); thence along the property line separating tracts 12 and 13, north 86 degrees 45 minutes 50 seconds east 15.58 feet, north 88 degrees 32 minutes 20 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 87 degrees 23 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 82 degrees 42 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 76 degrees 46 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 70 degrees 20 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 64 degrees 09 minutes 40 seconds east 50.0 feet, south 56 degrees 48 minutes 30 seconds east 25.0 feet, north 86 degrees 57 minutes 50 seconds east 373.90 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 899.77 feet, south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 25.0 feet, south 48 degrees 27 minutes 10 seconds east 1,494.83 feet to a point on the east edge of the concrete dock; thence along the east edge of the concrete dock south 41 degrees 32 minutes 50 seconds west 525.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after "directed", insert "upon payment by the city of Charleston, S. C., of $500,000."

Page 3, line 21, after "beginning", insert: "and as is shown on drawing numbered 799–47–1, dated August 1949, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5047) to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (1) of section 48 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended (11 U. S. C. 76 (c) (1)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) Normal administration: When the trustee does not conduct the business of the bankrupt, such sum as the court may allow, but in no event to exceed 10 percent on the first $500 or less, 6 percent on moneys in excess of $500 and not more than $1,500, 3 percent on moneys in excess of $1,500 and not more than $10,000, 3 percent on moneys in excess of $10,000 and not more than $25,000, and 1 percent on moneys in excess of $25,000, upon all moneys disbursed or turned over by them to any persons, including lienholders: *Provided, however,* That in any case, after the trustee has paid all expenses of administration and has realized upon all available assets, the maximum compensation allowable to him hereunder does not exceed $150, the court may of its own motion allow the trustee a fee which with the commissions, if any, paid or to be paid him shall not exceed $150."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, after line 10 insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall apply to all cases in which the petition initiating the proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act is filed subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy. Their compensation has not been changed since 1910. At the present time trustees not conducting the business of the bankrupt are paid a fee as follows: 6 percent of the first $500 of the estate; 4 percent on the next $1,000; 2 percent on the next $8,500, and 1 percent on all in excess of $10,000. If the fee is less than $100 at present, the court can fix a fee up to $100. If the trustee conducts the business of the bankrupt, the court may fix a fee up to twice the above amounts.

The Judicial Conference of the United States, the National Bankruptcy Conference and the National Association of Credit Men support H. R. 5047. They feel it will greatly improve the administration of smaller estates by encouraging a greater use of trustees in such cases. The increases as set out in H. R. 5047 are reasonable. For example, if the trustee does not operate the business, on an estate of $5,000, the fee would be increased from $140 to $215; on an estate of $10,000 the fee would be increased from $240 to $365. Since the fees of trustees are paid out of the estate of the bankrupt, there is no burden on the United States Treasury by this legislation.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION INTO LAW TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "ARMED FORCES" AND TITLE 32 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "NATIONAL GUARD"

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I say that I objected to the consideration of this bill a few days ago because it sought to repeal by implication an act that was passed in 1901. This act forbade the sale of intoxicating liquors on bases where our servicemen are quartered. I understand now that they will strike by amendment the entire section and are not codifying the act of 1950 which let the bars down against the sale of intoxicants or the act of 1901. This would leave the laws in status quo. Therefore, I have no further objection for this leaves the old law in effect, unless the courts hold that the latter statute repealed the former.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Louisiana, there is no part of the code that changes any of the present existing laws regarding the Military Establishment?

Mr. WILLIS. No, and not only that, but the Committee on Armed Services was advised of this.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and he said he wanted the staff to study the entire matter. He told me that yesterday. But if there is no change, I do not see any reason for a study of the matter by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIS. We have a letter from your chairman [Mr. VINSON] on the subject.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman put the letter in the RECORD?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this legislation does not in anywise affect the present law, being United States Code, chapter 31, section 1350, entitled "Sale of Intoxicating Liquors" and reads as follows:

The sale of or dealing in beer, wine, or any intoxicating liquors by any person in any post exchange or canteen or Army Transport or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States, is prohibited. The Secretary of War is hereby directed to carry the provisions of this section into full force and effect.

Mr. WILLIS. What the gentleman says is correct. There is an amendment pending at the desk to cover that.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have more than a passing interest in the enactment of this bill. As chairman of the then standing Committee on Revision of the Laws, in the 76th Congress, I had the honor to make the very first suggestion that the laws relating to the Army and Navy be codified. This was to be part of the program that my committee initiated at that time—to enact into law every title of the United States Code. The advent of World War II at that time interfered with the preparation of bills with respect to the Army and Navy because of the necessity of enacting many new laws affecting the services. However, we did proceed with the preparation of bills relating to other titles of the United States Code and I am happy to see that the work has been carried on under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act by the Committee on the Judiciary. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the able chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], the able chairman of the subcommittee in charge of codification of laws, and his predecessor, the late Honorable Joseph R. Bryson, for their diligence in pursuing this most important work.

Mr. Speaker, no program has ever been carried on so faithfully without regard to the political complexion of the Congress. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the contributions made by the chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 80th and the 83d Congresses, the Honorable Earl Michener and the present ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

The preparation of the present bill began in 1948 by the War Department and thereafter by the Department of Defense and the several military departments. Throughout the entire course of the work the departments consulted regularly with the law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, Dr. Charles J. Zinn, and had the benefit of his broad experience in drafting and codifying statutes since 1939.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Willis:

Page 95, strike out all of chapter 49.

On page 786, in the schedule of repeals, under date of February 2, 1901, insert before the period in the parentheses: ", and sec. 38."

On page 816, in the schedule of repeals, under date of June 19, 1901, strike out the reference to section 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to codify the existing laws relating to the Armed Forces and the National Guard. It is part of the comprehensive program inaugurated by the Committee on Revision of the Laws, and continued under the Legislative Reorganization Act by the Committee on the Judiciary, to enact into law all 50 titles of the United States Code.

It is purely and simply a codification of existing law and has been reported favorably by unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary after consultation with the Committee on Armed Services and has been sponsored by the Department of Defense with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Please let me state as emphatically as I am able that this bill is not designed to make a single substantive change in existing law.

As a matter of fact we have gone to the extreme of inserting in the bill a provision—section 50—that it is the legislative purpose to restate the existing law without substantive change. Moreover, there is a line of United States Supreme Court decisions applying the well-known canon of statutory construction that in this type of bill even though Congress changes the language of the existing law the court will construe it as a continuation of existing law without substantive change unless Congress clearly manifests an intention to make such substantive changes.

Any undue fears about this bill on that score should be allayed in view of the following:

First. The canon of statutory construction just referred to will be applied;

Second. The interpretation clause contained in § 50 and in other savings provisions in the bill, together with similar statements contained in the committee report, clearly manifest the intention of Congress to make no substantive change; and

Third. The bill has been most carefully prepared over a period of almost 8 years. During that period the several military departments and the Department of Defense have assigned from time to time extremely capable and expert personnel. Although I do not want to slight any individual connected with the work by omitting mention of his name I believe it is appropriate to mention the fine work and cooperation of the following:

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense: Dr. F. Reed Dickerson.

For the Department of the Army: Col. Alfred C. Bowman, Col. Archibald King, and Lt. Col. Joseph P. Ramsay.

For the Department of the Navy: Lt. Col. George M. Lhamon (USMC), Comdr. Earle Bennett, Comdr. Enser W. Cole, Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, Lt. Cmdr. Charles J. Murphy, and Lt. William J. Bryson.

For the Department of the Air Force: Mr. James B. Minor and Mr. Allan J. Morrison.

From the very beginning the Committee on the Judiciary has been closely associated in the drafting of the bill by its law revision counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn, and during recent months, Cyril F. Brickfield, assistant law revision counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Congress is committed to this extremely important task of enacting into law all 50 titles of the United States Code and thus far we have so enacted 11 titles. I know of no other general aspect of congressional activity that is as important to the Congress, the courts, the executive branch and to the public. I sincerely hope that no Member will hamper this work because of vague, unfounded fears or by offering controversial substantive amendments. We shall be happy to answer any specific questions or objections to the bill but we beg the membership not to oppose it without good reason.

This program has enjoyed the confidence of the Congress up to this point and we cannot hope to accomplish anything further without that confidence. No one can seriously believe that we would be dishonest or foolish enough to jeopardize the entire program by attempting to include surreptitious changes in substantive law in this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion among Members about the suggestion that the law of 1901 had been repealed by implication by the Cole amendment to the law of 1951, section 6, title I, Public Law 51.

In this connection I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from the gentleman from New York, Mr. COLE, to Mrs. CECIL HARDEN, chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, in connection with an investigation into the operation of package liquor stores by the armed services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1955.

Mrs. CECIL HARDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. HARDEN: It has been brought to my attention that in the course of a hearing on the subject of alcoholic beverages before your committee, Capt. W. G. Chapple, of the Bureau of Personnel, Department of the Navy, made a statement to the effect that the sale of alcoholic beverages was authorized for the Department of Defense by section 6, Public Law 51, 82d Congress, approved June 19, 1951, and that later on in answer to a question by Staff Director Ward: "Do you have any real authority for saying that the act of 1901 has been superseded by the act of 1951, Captain?", Lieutenant Colonel Wise replied: "I will answer that. I think I speak for the entire Department that our Judge Advocate General of the Army has advised that they are of the opinion that section 6 of Public Law 51 does, by implication, repeal the so-called Canteen Act of 1901."

I introduced the amendment which became section 6, Public Law 51. The purpose of section 6 was not to in any way repeal existing law but to give the Secretary of Defense authority to make uniform regulations for all three departments of the armed services and also to empower him to deal with the problem of alcoholic beverages not only in camps, stations, posts, and other places, but also in their vicinity.

Sincerely yours,

STERLING COLE.

The day previous to the introduction of the Cole amendment, I had myself introduced an amendment intended to supplement the law of 1901 and give the Secretary of Defense power to make regulations which would apply to all branches of the armed services, and in discussing it, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] stated:

I understand that the Canteen Act of 1901 is still in effect which regulates that and is Federal law.

So that the fact that the law of 1901 was still in effect was in the minds of the Members of the House when they were considering the Cole amendment.

My own amendment was as follows:

Following line 11, page 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"SEC. 5. No person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine, inside the confines of or within reasonable distance of any military camp, station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes; but the Secretary of Defense may make regulations permitting the sale and use of alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take appropriate action to carry out the provisions of this section."

In opposing the Bryson amendment which was directed to the program which was to be presented by the National Security Training Commission for members of the National Security Training Corps, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, said:

The proper way to approach this subject is somewhat along the line of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, and probably to be offered today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

It is apparent that in considering the Cole amendment, the House had in mind the terms of my amendment which were in harmony with the law of 1901.

FOOD AND DRUG ACT

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7605 and H. R. 7606 introduced by Congressman PRIEST and myself, respectively, are successor bills to H. R. 4099 and H. R. 4100, also introduced by us.

H. R. 7605 and 7606 differ from H. R. 4099 and 4100 in that the provision setting up an advisory committee is completely eliminated. Additionally, the provision requiring the Secretary to take into consideration the functional value of the proposed additive is eliminated.

There has been added a provision consistent with existing provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibiting any person from using or revealing information acquired under the new food additives section. The term "new chemical additive" has been changed to "new food additive" as being more definitive of the subject.

Language changes have been made to eliminate possible inconsistencies between section 409 of the new bill and section 406 of the present Food and Drug Act. The new bills would require the Secretary to take action on an application within a specified period, and the appeals provisions are broadened to give increased protection to any person adversely affected by any action of the Secretary under section 409. No other major changes are involved.

The definition of "new food additive" is essentially the same as that of "new chemical additive" used in H. R. 4099 and 4100. A slight rearrangement of language has been made for the sake of clarity. H. R. 7605 and 7606 would continue to use the administrative procedure approach in considering applications subject to appeal to the United States court of appeals in any proceeding arising under the amendment. Except for clarifying language changes and strengthening the right of appeal from adverse decisions of the Secretary, this provision remains the same as in H. R. 4099 and 4100.

The purpose of introducing these revised bills at this time is to give all interested groups an opportunity to study the amendatory legislation.

FRED P. HINES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 204) for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of compensation and allowances to veterans, to Fred P. Hines (C. 2389074), of Minot, N. Dak., the sum of $778.78, representing the amount necessary to pay private medical and hospital expenses incurred by him incident to an emergency operation when his physical condition was such that he could not be removed to a Veterans' Administration hospital: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELZIE C. BROWN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of Elzie C. Brown, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "received", insert "on or about Thanksgiving of 1945."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET MARY HAMMOND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3024) for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after "act", insert ", : *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in case of such medical or hospital expenditures as may be deemed reimbursable."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2295) to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) In establishing farm acreage allotments for burley tobacco crops for the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 the acreage allotment for any farm which has not been retired from agricultural production shall not be reduced below the acreage allotment which would otherwise be established because the harvested acreage was less than the allotted acreage unless the acreage harvested was less than 50 percent of the allotted acreage in each of the preceding 5 years, in which event it shall not be reduced for such reason to less than the largest acreage harvested in any year in such 5-year period."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 125) for the relief of the State of Illinois.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Illinois shall have the exclusive right in interstate commerce to use, manufacture, and to control the right to manufacture the emblematic design heretofore published by the secretary of state of the State of Illinois consisting of a profile of the head of Abraham Lincoln superimposed upon an outline map of the State of Illinois which is surmounted by the name "Illinois" and overlaid by the caption "Land of Lincoln."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed to confer any right to recover damages for violation of this exclusive right, by any act performed before the date of enactment of this act, or to prevent the use of any matter utilized before that date.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARIZATION OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to alert this House that although the Senate bills, S. 1271 and S. 1272 on the Private Calendar, have been objected to and ordered recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services—we may not as yet have heard the end of these two measures in this session of the Congress—as we shall certainly hear more about them in the next.

For these reasons, I wish to inform the House clearly and unmistakably as to the nature of these bills and the principles which are involved. To me these command the serious consideration of all Members of the Congress before taking action upon these measures.

The Senate bills, S. 1271 and S. 1272, would exempt Gens. Frank H. Partridge and Edwin B. Howard from the provisions of the dual positions statute and thus enable these retired officers to accept appointments as Assistant Commissioners in the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice.

I deeply deplore the fact that I could not concur in the action taken by the Committee on Armed Services in favorably reporting out these bills. At the time of the hearings on these bills before the committee, the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs—of which I am chairman—of the House Government Operations Committee was conducting an investigation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the reorganization initiated by Gen. J. M. Swing, the newly appointed Commissioner.

From the facts revealed by this investigation, I found it impossible to avoid the following conclusions:

First, neither General Howard nor General Partridge was eligible for employment by the Service except as a consultant.

Second, the two retired officers were occupying full policymaking and policy-administering positions in violation and circumvention of both the statutory and regulatory provisions of the law.

Third, both received compensation in excess of that authorized by law.

Fourth, there is reason to believe that had it not been for the insistence of the subcommittee, supplemented by a ruling by the Comptroller General, the employment of General Partridge would have been continued after the legal period of his eligibility had expired.

The situation involving the 2 retired generals with whom we are concerned in the above 2 bills was only a sidelight of the subcommitttee's study. The information revealed by this study has, however, since been substantiated by the highest authority available in the executive branches of the Government, the Comptroller General and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

Nevertheless, these two Senate bills would enable Generals Partridge and Howard to accept appointments as Assistant Commissioners in the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice—positions which they have, in reality, been occupying ever since their employment as consultants.

I would like to make it perfectly clear at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my opposition to these bills is not directed against either of these two gentlemen personally. I have the greatest respect for their unquestioned honor and integrity and equal regard for their undoubted qualifications as soldiers.

But I am unconditionally and unalterably opposed to what these two bills would accomplish—the further militarization of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak lightly. The Immigration Service has been the subject of intensive investigation and extensive hearings by the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs. I am deeply concerned by some of the facts which have been brought to light through the subcommittee's efforts. I am even more alarmed by the indication of hidden activities which we have been unable to bring to light.

With the greatest reluctance, I speak of these latter matters now. It has always been my practice to ignore anonymous communications. Every Member of Congress, I am sure, receives his share of such communications and treats with the contempt they merit these nameless informers who lack the courage to stand up like men and speak their minds for what they sincerely believe to be for the good of their country.

Unhappily, Congress has little choice today but to attach significance to some of these nameless communications because the executive branches of the Government refuse to deal candidly with our proper and pertinent inquiries, and because of the censorship which has been clamped upon even the most plebeian activities of the civil departments and agencies of the Government.

It is of one such anonymous communication that I am about to speak. Addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, the charges it makes regarding secret plans and activities being conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service are, I am sure you will agree, far too serious to be disregarded.

The Immigration Service has been given an opportunity to refute these charges. The fact that it has refused to deny them forces but one conclusion—that the shocking revelations in this communication are, indeed, founded upon fact.

Consequently, I feel that there is no other recourse open save to make its content public as a thoroughly disquieting example of what happens when we permit the militaristic mind to dominate the operations and functions of civil government.

It begins as follows, and I quote:

> It is suggested that you obtain a copy of plan A which is a communication labeled "Secret" and recently sent out to Immigration Border Patrol sector headquarters from the Immigration central office, Washington, D. C. The communication is over the signature of Frank H. Partridge, special assistant to the Commissioner, and contains instructions for the establishment of a military setup within the Immigration Border Patrol. A brief outline as follows provides for the recruiting of about 8,000 volunteer patrol inspectors to be under the supervision of the local patrol officers in case of emergency (emergency presumed to mean invasion) and, in such case, to be placed on the payroll as patrol inspectors:
>
> The purchase of jeeps, trucks, airplanes, rifles, revolvers, submachineguns, ammunition, roadblock signs, flares, etc. A reserve stockpile of gasoline is to be set up; additional radio communication systems established; used telephone poles and railroad ties to be placed in boundary line road crossings for use in setting up roadblocks; to persuade county commissioners adjacent to international boundary to dig deep ditches along the line to hamper crossings; oral instruction to local officers to alert demolition or promote demolition squads to be prepared to blow bridges across roads leading from the international boundary; to persuade the State highway patrol and the National Guard to participate in the plan.
>
> The above only touches the high spots of the plan, the original of the plan taking up about 12 or 15 pages of instructions. This is the most fantastic thing I have heard of and reeks of military planning and operate and, if not stopped, could develop into trouble.
>
> As noted above, the plan A is marked "Secret" and contains instructions that it be kept secret, but the plan is in existence and the recruiting of volunteer patrol inspectors has begun and the rest of the plan is to be carried out as promptly as possible.
>
> It is with reluctance that I have decided this must be forwarded without signature. I know you are a gentleman and would respect the request that I remain out of the picture. However, for the obvious reasons I cannot risk the possibility of the letter falling into unfriendly hands for, in that case, I would not have a leg to stand on.

Granting the truth of this communication, I could not possibly be in more profound agreement with the writer's sentiment that "This reeks of military planning and operation and, if not stopped, could develop into trouble."

At this most delicate of all moments in our world relationships, when—as a Nation—we are urging the Soviet heads of Government to roll back the Iron Curtain, what example do we set if we, ourselves, are, through a traditionally and allegedly civilian agency secretly plotting a barrier of bayonets along our own borders and between two friendly nations?

Since Congress passed the first general law regulating immigration in 1882, and until today, the regulatory agencies of our Government charged with carrying out and enforcing our immigration and naturalization laws have been administered solely and exclusively by civilians. In all the time intervening, to my certain knowledge there has never been an incident which required such an adventure upon the part of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as this plan A allegedly contemplates. Nor, I feel reasonably confident, has the need for readying such a plan—much less putting it into effect—ever occurred to former civilian heads of the agency.

Today, however, the head of the INS is no longer a civilian. Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, retired, became Commissioner of Immigration on May 18, 1954, shortly after his retirement from the United States Armed Forces. On the previous day, May 17, 1954, Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, also recently retired from the Armed Forces, was appointed special consultant to the INS. In September 1954 Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, retired, was likewise retained as a special consultant to the service.

As the Members of this House are aware, Mr. Speaker, existing statutes specifically set forth the manner, amount of compensation and period of time under which consultants may be employed by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

Because of the nature of the facts revealed by the investigation initiated by the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, only these conclusions—as I have said before—can be drawn:

First, that both Generals Partridge and Howard were serving in full executive and administrative capacities in circumvention of the statutory and regulatory provisions of the law;

Second, that both were being paid in excess of the amounts authorized by law; and

Third, there is reason to believe that had it not been for the insistence of the subcommittee, supplemented by a ruling by the Comptroller General, the employment of General Partridge would have been continued after the legal period of his eligibility had expired.

These conclusions have since been substantiated by the highest authorities available in the executive branch of the Government. In response to my request for an opinion, the Comptroller General informed me, in a letter dated June 7, 1955:

> The rate of compensation paid to Generals Partridge and Howard is in excess of that

authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600 with the Department of Justice.

The Comptroller General further observed that he was informed by the Department of Justice that the retired generals were serving in a strictly advisory capacity. Nevertheless, he deferred judgment in this matter to the Civil Service Commission.

On June 20, the Comptroller General advised me with respect to General Partridge that: "We have ascertained that his services were terminated by the INS for pay purposes effective May 16, 1955."

General Howard is still retained theoretically as a consultant and doubtless will remain so until September of this year when he also will be required to leave the service under the 1-year limitation of eligibility.

In line with the Comptroller General's statement that he deferred to the CSC with regard to the manner of Generals Howard's and Partridge's employment, I requested the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Phillip Young, to initiate a desk audit.

According to statutory and regulatory provisions, and the rules of the Civil Service Commission itself, individuals employed in an advisory capacity may not perform operating responsibilities normally assigned to regular executive positions within the organization.

The desk audit which I requested the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to undertake was for the purpose of ascertaining whether Generals Partridge and Howard had served solely as consultants or advisers to the Immigration Service or whether they had not, in reality, actually carried out operating responsibilities within the Service.

I have just received, over the signature of Chairman Young, the final findings of the Civil Service Commission as a result of this desk audit. In a nutshell here is what the Commission has determined:

"If it is assumed that the provisions of section 15, Public Law 600, apply to the appointment of Generals Partridge and Howard as consultants in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the recent investigation conducted by the Commission at your request within that organization reveals that in substantial part the duties performed by these appointees were properly classifiable as a part of the normal functions of that organization."

It is clearly evident that operating responsibilities, normally assigned to regular executive positions within the organization, constituted a significant portion of the total responsibilities assigned in each case.

In further evidence of this, a directive outlining the details of Operation A, relating to the operations of the border patrol, was signed by General Partridge as "Special Assistant to the Commissioner." And on June 3, after the period of General Partridge's eligibility for employment had expired on May 17, the chief special inquiry officer of the INS, Mr. Sidney Rawitz, testifying before the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, stated:

The Enforcement Division (of the Immigration Service) is presently operated by General Partridge, Special Assistant to the Commissioner.

And that was sworn testimony.

It is, I think, highly significant that General Partridge's employment with the INS occurred simultaneously with General Swing's appointment as Commissioner; and that General Howard's appointment came within the next 4 months. In addition, at about this same time, one David Carnahan, who served under General Swing in the 11th Airborne Division during World War II, was named General Regional Commissioner of the Southwest Region, one of the four top positions in the immigration field service.

When Commissioner of Immigration Swing appeared before the Committee on Armed Services of the House it was to urge the committee's favorable consideration of the two bills, S. 1271 and S. 1272. He stated that although he had endeavored to fill these positions of Assistant Commissioners from within the Service, he had been unsuccessful in his efforts to find qualified people.

This would suggest that the general's efforts—covering so brief a period of time—were either less than strenuous or the qualifications he sought were of a military cast, similar in character to his own background training, experience, and thinking.

Otherwise, I find it quite incredible to believe that there was no choice but to turn these traditionally civilian-held positions over to the military.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is a long-established governmental agency. It has, on the whole, done an effective and commendable job of administering our immigration and naturalization laws. I am confident that there are many qualified, capable civilians within the Service, and if not in the Service itself—certainly, already in the career civil service—who could creditably fill these positions.

I am not ready to concede such barrenness of civilian capabilities nor, I am confident, are the members of the Congress prepared to make so startling a concession.

Let me point out that the INS is already headed by a retired general—thus setting a precedent in this historically established area of civil authority in Government. If the two bills now under consideration by this House are enacted by the Congress, 3 of the top 5 operating positions in the service will have been yielded to military control and supremacy over the civilian.

The dual-positions statute has been a part of our governmental pattern since 1894. I submit that no unique circumstances exist nor have any arguments been advanced in support of S. 1271 and S. 1272, which would warrant the granting of exceptions to that statute in either instance.

There should be no question in anyone's mind but that General Swing has used every possible means at his disposal to gain his ends—the retention and permanent employment of Generals Partridge and Howard to replace civilians in positions of traditional high civil authority and full policy-making and policy-administering responsibility in the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The evidence is unmistakable that he has made a continued and contemptuous effort to thwart the will of Congress and to circumvent the law. Nor, in the insistent lobbying activities which have been carried on, are there any signs that there will be a relaxation of General Swing's efforts.

It therefore remains the responsibility of Congress itself to correct this grievous situation and to take such steps as may be necessary to halt the further militarization of what was once a totally civilian-administered agency of the Federal Government.

THE LATE BURTON L. FRENCH AND JOHN T. WOOD

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the most profound regret that I advise the House of the death of two distinguished former Members of this body, the Honorable Burton Lee French and the Honorable John T. Wood.

Mr. French was born near Delphi, Carroll County, Ind., on August 1, 1875. He moved with his parents to Kearney, Nebr., in 1880 and from there to Idaho in 1882 where he attended the public schools and was graduated from the University of Idaho at Moscow in 1901. He was awarded a fellowship in the University of Chicago where he studied law, 1901–3. He was later admitted to the bar and commenced his law practice in Moscow, Idaho.

His townspeople elected him to the State house of representatives where he served with distinction from 1898 to 1902. In 1902 he was elected to the 58th Congress of the United States and was reelected to the 59th and 60th Congresses. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1908 to the 61st Congress but was returned to the 62d and 63d Congresses, March 4, 1911, to March 3, 1915. In 1916 he was elected to the 65th Congress and reelected to the 7 succeeding Congresses, serving until March 1933. He was appointed a delegate to the Interparliamentarian Union Conventions at London in 1930 and at Bucharest in 1931.

During his time in Congress he served on the following committees: Appropriations, Memorials, War Claims, Indian Affairs, Public Lands, Elections No. —, Public Buildings and Grounds, Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Mines and Mining, Immigration and Naturalization, and Education.

Mr. French was professor of government at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, from 1934 until his retirement in 1947 and has been a member of the Federal Loyalty Review Board since 1947.

He is survived by a sister, Mrs. Clara McMinimy; two nieces, Miss Margaret McMinimy and Mrs. Winfred Murphy—all of Washington, D. C.; and a brother, Dr. Harley French, retired dean of the

Medical College at North Dakota University.

Dr. Wood, Republican, of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, was born in Wakefield, England, in 1876. He came to North Dakota with his parents in 1889 where he was educated in the public schools. He taught school for 6 years, after self-study and passage of the teachers' examination. Later he graduated from the Detroit College of Medicine and started his medical practice in North Dakota. In 1905 he moved to Coeur d'Alene and obtained a license to practice medicine in Idaho. He was a charter member of the Kootenai Medical Society and served as president for many years. Dr. Wood discovered and made public, cojointly with Dr. E. J. Barnett, of Spokane, Wash., the knowledge relating to Rocky Mountain tick fever. Dr. Wood did graduate work at Westley Memorial Hospital in Chicago, at University of Pennsylvania Postgraduate Hospital, and at Bellevue Hospital in New York. He was one of the founders and the first president of the Coeur d'Alene Hospital Co., serving in that capacity for 15 years. He was local surgeon for the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad for 40 years. During his life he served as president of the board of trustees of Northwest Medicine, mayor of Coeur d'Alene, past grand master of Masons in Idaho. He received the 33d degree, Scottish Rite Mason.

He is survived by his wife Margaret and two sons. Dr. Wood became well known as a physician, author, and student of history and philosophy before he was elected as a Republican to the 82d Congress, November 7, 1950, where he served on the House Public Works Committee.

Burton L. French and John T. Wood were men of the highest integrity and moral courage and each made a most valuable contribution to the welfare of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered today, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mr. MINSHALL was given permission to vacate the special order he had for today, and to address the House for 60 minutes on Tuesday, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF THE VISTULA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, August 15th will mark the 35th anniversary of the Battle of the Vistula. Mr. Jan M. Okoniewski of 90 Midland Avenue, Rochester, N. Y., has prepared appropriate remarks to commemorate this significant occasion. This anniversary is deserving of our recognition as a tribute to a stalwart band of freedom lovers. Mr. Okoniewski's statement follows:

The 15th of August marks the 35th anniversary of the Battle of the Vistula. Some historians consider this as the 21st decisive battle in the history of the world. This battle stopped the Communist move to the west, particularly into a strongly communized Germany. For a period of 20 years following the Battle of the Vistula, Russian communism was forced to stay within her own borders.

It should be mentioned, that those who fought this battle against communism in the summer of 1920, were the Poles, who had only 2 years previously regained their independence from Germany, Austria, and Russia after 150 years captivity during the partition of Poland.

In view of the fact that the world is trying to stop the Communists in their advances today, this battle should become a symbol of the free world's determination and ability to withstand Communist onslaught. The Polish forces under Marshal Pilsudski numbered some 600,000 in the regular army, with another 300,000 volunteers, who were recruited within a period of 6 months. Against these freemen, the Bolsheviks had an army in the field of 2½ million men, forming some of Russia's crack divisions. The struggle between the ideology of the West against the new philosophy which had taken root in Russia was fought by the Poles without any assistance from the other Western Powers. Strikes in France and England barred the shipment of arms to the Poles, and the borders of other nations were closed to the passage of arms for the defending forces. The results of this first and only military victory over the Communists were quickly dissipated some 20 years later by the conferences held by the Grand Alliance of the Second World War at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Because of the decisions made at these conferences, the first nation to fight the evils of communism was placed under the bondage of the Russian rulers.

This is the reward free people achieve for giving the world 20 years to learn the intentions of an ungodly philosophy, such as communism. Such is the reward for the sacrifices made by the Poles in the victorious battle of the Vistula.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 13, 1955:

H. R. 6042. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

On July 14, 1955:

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1692. An act for the relief of Frederecik F. Gaskin;

H. R. 1745. An act for the relief of Paul E. Milward;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.; and

H. R. 3363. An act for the relief of Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vincente D. Reynante.

On July 15, 1955:

H. R. 4915. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen;

H. R. 6766. An act making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7066. An act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Co. of Ohio, Inc.

On July 23, 1955:

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1955:

H. R. 122. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act;

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 4046. An act to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4585. An act to amend the act of August 24, 1912, to simplify the procedures governing the mailings of certain publications of churches and church organizations;

H. R. 4753. An act of amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from

2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4946. An act to amend title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act;

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5792. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, to extend the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments;

H. R. 6419. An act to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended; and

H. R. 6832. An act to provide for payment of a reasonable attorney's fee by the insured in a suit brought by him or on his behalf during his lifetime for waiver of premiums on account of total disability.

On July 28, 1955:

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1801. An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 5559. An act to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 6295. An act to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt.

On July 29, 1955:

H. R. 1617. An act to amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940;

H. R. 1619. An act to amend certain provisions of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 6086. An act for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens; and

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1621. An act to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1757. An act to amend the act known as the "Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946," approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1759. An act to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

S. 1792. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954;

S. 1849. An act to provide for the grant of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment; and

S. 2098. An act to amend public law 83, 83d Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6198. An act to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2501) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to States for the purpose of assisting States to provide children and expectant mothers an opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. IVES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 223)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great importance of western irrigation to the Nation as a whole, on July 4, 1955, I approved H. R. 103 "To provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies." That approval, however, was given with reluctance because of serious defects in the act.

Although it contains desirable features for cooperation between the Federal Government and local agencies, the act falls short of according to the United States the protection which it requires. Important in that connection is the proviso that title shall at all times reside in the contracting water users. With that proviso in the law the United States lacks the means of assuring that the loans will be repaid, that the systems will be constructed in accordance with the plans, specifications, and other engineering requirements of the Secretary of the Interior, and that they will be operated in conformity with the reclamation laws. Accordingly, I recommend that the act be amended so as to require, prior to the consummation of any loan, the transfer to the United States of the titles to the systems and rights-of-way held or acquired by the borrowers. Titles to those properties should remain in the United States until the loan is repaid.

In keeping with such recommendation, it is desirable that only revokable permits be granted across any of the lands of the United States. That limitation necessarily follows in view of the fact that the United States will probably advance virtually all of the funds which will be expended in the development of the distribution systems. Moreover, those funds are to be advanced for the specific purpose of effectuating the objectives of the reclamation laws. Thus, as stated, retention of title in the United States will assure to it adequate means of enforcing those laws. For that reason, easements for the rights-of-way should not be granted by the United States.

As a consequence, the act should be revised to eliminate those provisions which authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the head of any other executive department to sell and convey necessary rights-of-way. In lieu of that clause, it is suggested that all rights-of-way which are granted to borrowers pursuant to the act be brought within the provisions of those congressional enactments relating to the granting of permits for rights-of-way across the lands of the United States. The safeguards contained in those acts are necessary for the protection of the United States.

Because of the fact that large sums of money will be advanced pursuant to the act, it should contain measures precluding windfalls to the borrowers. An amendment explicitly requiring them to account in full to the Secretary of the Interior in regard to all disbursements of borrowed funds and to return at once for application toward amortization of the loans all funds which are not expended in the construction of the distribution systems would suffice as a safeguard against possible windfalls.

Because of the need for having the corrective measures that I have outlined applicable to all loans made under the act, I hope that such measures will be adopted as promptly as possible after the convening of the next session of the Congress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1955.*

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the remainder of this week

for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 128, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission on the part of the House: Mr. Morrison, Mr. Klein, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Kearns, Mr. Broyhill, Mr. Barnee Breeskin of Washington, D. C., and Mr. Robert Dowling of New York City.

AMENDMENT OF FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 312 and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5222) to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 145]

Abernethy	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andrews	Gregory	Passman
Anfuso	Griffiths	Pelly
Barden	Gwinn	Phillips
Bell	Halleck	Powell
Buchanan	Hillings	Prouty
Buckley	Hoffman, Ill.	Radwan
Burdick	Holt	Reece, Tenn.
Chatham	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Riehlman
Christopher	Kluczynski	Robsion, Ky.
Clevenger	Knutson	Sheehan
Cooley	Krueger	Shuford
Dawson, Ill.	Lipscomb	Sieminski
Dies	McConnell	Siler
Diggs	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	McIntire	Steed
Dolliver	Mason	Taylor
Eberharter	Mumma	Teague, Tex.
Frazier	Nelson	Thomson, Wyo.
Gordon	Norblad	Tuck
Velde	Williams, Miss.	Younger
Watts	Wilson, Calif.	Zelenko
Whitten	Winstead	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 434) to provide appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and I ask that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is made necessary to meet the parliamentary position we are in with reference to the legislative bill?

Mr. ROONEY. It is. The House-Senate conferees on the legislative appropriation bill have reached a stalemate. The pending resolution would permit the legislative branch to operate through the remainder of fiscal year 1956 on the same basis that it has during the month of July. This resolution carries through June 30, 1956.

Mr. TABER. For both bodies?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Not just for one?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct. This would apply to both bodies.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I submit a question to the gentleman? Does this leave the matter of the stationery account and the matter of allowance for clerk hire of the individual Member exactly as it is now?

Mr. ROONEY. It would.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Until when?

Mr. ROONEY. Until June 30, 1956.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It does not change the salaries of any of the employees of the House or add any employees?

Mr. ROONEY. It does not insofar as both Senate and House are concerned.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And it does not add any employees?

Mr. ROONEY. It does not, for either body.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I want to commend the members of the conference committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the other members of the conference committee who represented the House. For some time there has been a struggle going on for increases all along the line. The House Administration committee has studied the problem at length through a subcommittee which came forward with bills on the subject none of which were satisfactory to 6 members who filed a minority report 2 weeks ago. These men: The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], and myself filed a minority report to H. R. 7440 which is printed and I recommend to all of my colleagues to read and study this short account. I believe sincerely that the effort of these men who prepared and signed the minority report has saved millions of dollars for the taxpayers each year. How much the program of increasing salaries for employees of both Houses, creating new jobs, increasing stationery allowance for all Members, raising the authorized amount each Member might expend for research assistants and other clerks and helpers would have run into millions each year—if the full program had been approved.

I commend the men who have stood out for a small measure of economy and have opposed short cuts to fringe benefits. This continuing resolution means millions and millions of dollars to the overburdened taxpayers.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Appropriations to whom was referred the House Joint Resolution No. 434, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1956, reports the same to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the joint resolution be passed.

The Legislative Branch Appropriation bill for 1956 (H. R. 7117), having reached a stalemate in conference, it is necessary to have this joint resolution enacted in order to pay salaries and expenses of the legislative branch through the remainder of the fiscal year.

This joint resolution would permit the legislative branch to continue to operate on the same basis it has during the month of July 1955, at the lower of two rates, i. e., the rate which was in effect for the fiscal year 1955 or the rate of the 1956 budget estimate, plus, in either case, amounts necessary for increased pay costs as authorized by law.

This joint resolution ties back to the authority set forth in section (b) of title I of Public Law 123, 84th Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of title I of Public Law 123, 84th Congress, insofar as they apply to the legislative branch, shall continue in effect through June 30, 1956.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 312 makes in order the bill (H. R. 5222) to amend in slight

particulars the Flammable Fabrics Act. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to consume any time on the rule?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time from the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules in order that I may advise the House that there is serious objection to the bill this rule would bring before the House for consideration. I regret exceedingly that a bill of this type and character should be brought before the House at this late hour in the session, because I am fearful that it may not receive the consideration that it should have. This bill seeks to exempt from the Flammable Fabrics Act scarfs from Japan that do not meet the lawful test as fixed by the statute. This bill is nothing more or less than an effort to bail out some New York importers who claim to be stocked up with Japanese scarfs which do not comply with the law of the United States.

This is admitted. It is claimed, however, that they should be exempted so that these cheap silk scarfs can come into our country in competition with our better made but more expensive scarfs that do comply with our law guarding against flammability. These Japanese lightweight scarfs are cheap and flimsy. They constitute a hazard to the wearers.

This bill has come up in the House, in a way that in my opinion is most regrettable. I do not want the gentleman from New York, who is in favor of this bill, to take from what I say that there is any reflection intended with respect to him as chairman of the subcommittee or as the sponsor of the proposed legislation, but here are the facts.

This bill was in our committee. It was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Hearings were held on April 21. On April 19, the first notice was given that there would be any hearings on the bill. On April 20, the day before the hearings, the notice appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was brought up on April 21 at an afternoon session that met at 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon while the House was in session. This appears from the minutes of the committee. It was finished by 5 minutes after 4 in the afternoon, an hour and 35 minutes from the time the hearing was opened. In the meantime there had been a recess of the committee because of a roll call in the House. So you can realize how short was the hearing that was held on this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Just for a question.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this legislation was presented and requested by the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I understand so, which raises a situation the reason for which should certainly be looked into. The fact is that the original legislation, known as the Flammable Fabrics bill, had as great support as I think any bill ever had in this Congress. It was intended to guard our people from the dangers of highly inflammable materials. It was not legislation that was adopted in a hurried manner. It had been under discussion by our committee for two years before the original act was adopted. We sought to accomplish our objective without doing injustice to a large industry. Finally, when the original act was drawn it had the approval and the support I think of all the industry organizations as well as labor unions identified with the industry. I have before me a list of the organizations that saw fit to endorse the original bill. It was adopted unanimously by this House and it included scarfs of the kind the bill before us seeks to exempt. The organizations to which I refer are as follows:

The Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

National Cotton Council of America.

National Retail Dry Goods Association.

National Association of House Dress Manufacturers.

National Association of Button Manufacturers.

Retail Merchants and Retail Dry Goods Association of New York.

The Society of the Plastic Industry.

Rayon and Acetate Fiber Producers.

American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute.

The fire departments of cities and the fire marshals of States throughout the country, including:

The California State marshal who through the years had been an authority on the subject.

The New York Board of Trade.

The Philadelphia Textile Manufacturers Association.

The Retail Merchants Association.

The Retail Textile Group.

Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America.

Textile Distributors Institute, Inc.

Textile Fabrics Association, New York.

Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association.

That indicates who was in favor of the bill as we finally drew it and presented it for consideration to the House. The bill passed the House unanimously. It has remained in that original form with only one slight amendment until a few New York importers, who are importers of Japanese goods, came down to Washington and sought to get exemption from the act, notwithstanding the fact that what they asked to be exempted from the law is in violation of the very reason the law was passed.

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

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the American textile industry and its union workers are violently opposed to the passage of this bill today?

Mr. WOLVERTON. They are.

Mr. CANFIELD. This is a bill designed to destroy the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is claimed that 3,000 workers have lost their jobs as a result of the importation of Japanese cheap merchandise of a similar type to that which it is sought to exempt in this legislation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making. I certainly associate myself with the views which he has so well expressed.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Thank you. I ask that Members look at the minority report which has been filed by those of us who are opposed to this bill. If you can get a copy of the minority report, read that report, read the reasons for the opposition to this bill. Outside of a representative from the Department of Commerce the only people who testified at the hearings were those in favor of the bill. And they were few indeed. There may have been 2 or 3. The opponents had no notice of the hearings. They were not invited to appear. If they had an opportunity to testify you would find that they would be opposed to this bill and in favor of the law remaining as it was passed and now is.

It was only last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reaffirmed its position. In the report filed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] the following appeared:

> Your committee is convinced that scarfs should be subject to the provisions of the law just as any other item of wearing apparel. They can be as much a danger to human safety as any other improperly protected garments. Scarfs are worn around the head or neck and tied on with a knot which may not be easily removable. Once ignited, the danger of the hair catching on fire is very great. The scarfs cannot be readily discarded under such circumstances.

Also the committee amendment deletes from the bill the proposed exemption for scarfs made of plain fabrics.

It was said:

Importers of and dealers in silk scarves have accumulated large inventories of this highly flammable merchandise. The fact remains, however, that all industries concerned were given 1 full year after the date of enactment of the Flammable Fabrics Act to adjust their inventories and manufacturing processes to the new safety standards prescribed by this law.

It is my sincere conviction that to pass this bill is to endanger the safety of the women and children of our Nation.

Indicative of the strong feeling in opposition to this legislation which will affect the lives of every individual are the following letters and telegrams received:

> INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS UNION,
> *New York, N. Y., April 20, 1955.*
>
> Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
> *Chairman, Commerce and Finance Subcommittee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN KLEIN: We note from the press that your committee is considering H. R. 5222 which would exempt plain-surface scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. When H. R. 9193, which had the same objective, was under consideration last year, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union objected in the strongest terms to the exclusion of silk and other plain-surface fabric scarves from the coverage of the act. There was no reason then, as there is no reason now, to re-

gard a fabric as flammable if used in a nightgown or blouse and as nonflammable if used in a scarf. The possibility that the loose ends of scarves will catch fire is certainly much greater than with other articles of clothing which are worn closer to the body. The exposed portions of a sheer scarf worn close to the face could, if ignited, cause severe injury to the wearer. The same holds true for sheer scarves worn around the neck, or arm, or head.

The issue of flammability of scarves must not be resolved in terms of the interests of the domestic importers or foreign exporters, but solely in the interests of possible victims of ignited scarves. Certainly there is no reason why operations should not continue under existing flammability standards with fabrics which meet the legal standards because they are of somewhat heavier weight or have been flameproofed. Scarves which are being made now are sufficiently sheer to satisfy the wants of consumers. At a matter of fact, domestic and foreign textile mills managed to adjust their production without any difficulty so that their fabrics could meet the burning tests provided by the Flammable Fabrics Act.

We urge your subcommittee to reject H. R. 5222. Last year we submitted a good deal of material in support of our position and comments on the arguments, advanced by proponents of H. R. 9193, which should be in the files of your committee. We will be glad to submit additional material supporting our views should you so desire.

Very truly yours,

JAMES LIPSIG,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

SILK & RAYON PRINTERS & DYERS,
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: On behalf of its members, the Silk & Rayon Printers & Dyers Association of America, Inc., a trade association comprising some 125 concerns who finish silk, rayon, and other synthetic fabrics, and the recognized spokesmen for the silk and rayon finishing industry, wishes to go on record as opposing the enactment of H. R. 5222, which would amend the Flammable Fabrics Act (15 U. S. C. 1191–1200).

Under section 4 of the act in its present form, sheer silk scarves of less than 5 momme in weight are banned by Commercial Standard 191–53. The bill, H. R. 5222, would exempt "scarves made of plain surface fabrics" from the purview of the Flammable Fabrics Act. This would legalize, as wearing apparel for women and girls, sheer silk scarves of 3 and 4 momme weight, the bulk of which is imported from Japan and which admittedly have "rapid and intense" flammability characteristics.

Scarves are frequently knotted or tied about the head, face, and neck. They are not rapidly removable from the person as a general rule, and hence can cause serious and disfiguring damage to the wearer if ignited. Where the items of apparel have "rapid and intense" flammability, as sheer silk scarves admittedly have, they constitute real dangers to the wearers which the act properly seeks to void by banning their importation and sale.

An identical amendment was proposed last year in S. 3379 (83d Cong., 2d sess.), introduced by Senator PURTELL, but it was not enacted into law at that time. The reasons against the enactment of that provision last year hold just as true this year with respect to H. R. 5222.

Although the members of our industry are exempt from the operations of the Flammable Fabrics Act except in the most unusual circumstances (sec. 11, (b)), this association feels that protection for the consumer—the basic objective of the Flammable Fabrics Act—would be prejudiced if sheer silk scares were to be legalized as articles of wearing apparel, regardless of the rapidity or intensity of their flammability.

Therefore, we respectfully urge that H. R. 5222 should not be approved. It is respectfully requested that this letter be inserted in the record.

Respectfully submitted,

SILK & RAYON PRINTERS & DYERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,
By DANIEL L. KREEGER,
Washington Representative.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., June 30, 1955.

Hon. PERCY J. PRIEST,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRIEST: The Textile Workers Union of America has been advised that another attempt is being made to exclude plain surface fabric scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

We are unalterably opposed to H. R. 5222 and S. 1455 as we were opposed to the Purtell bill, S. 3379, in 1954. The Textile Workers Union of America is of the opinion that no special consideration should be given to exempt scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Scarfs are worn by the women of this country about the neck and head. If they are highly inflammable they will constitute a serious menace and hazard. There is no valid reason why scarfs should not meet the same safety standards set for all other type fabrics produced in this country and other countries. The only reason to exempt them would be to give special consideration to increase the importation of Japanese scarfs printed, finished, and handrolled in Japan, regardless of the danger.

The present importation of the fully printed, finished, and handrolled scarf has already deprived 3,000 workers of their jobs. These workers were formerly engaged in screen printing of silk fabrics which were made up into scarfs.

The argument of the industry, in pressing for this amendment, is that $1,250,000 worth of silk scarfs are accumulated in stock and in addition thousands of dollars of such scarfs are tied up in customs due to the unpredictability of the burning tests. These arguments are definitely improper. The industry has had ample notice of the passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act and further that scarfs were included. A great many importers did not believe in the law and therefore continued to import scarfs that did not meet the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. These converters were gambling on the law being changed. It is certainly improper to use this as an argument to change the reasonable provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. Certainly Japan has made the necessary provisions for the production of scarfs that would meet the standards as set down by the Flammable Fabrics Act.

The Textile Workers Union of America respectfully requests you to vote against H. R. 5222 and S. 1455 not only in the best interests of textile workers, but also for the protection of the consumers of this Nation.

Very truly yours,

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
By WILLIAM GORDON,
Director, Dyers and Plastics Division.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1955.*

Hon. CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Rumors are being circulated that the textile workers union of America has withdrawn its opposition to H. R. 5222.

The Textile Workers Union of America has been and still is violently opposed to exempting scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. The exemption would grant special consideration to increase the importation of the fully printed and finished Japanese scarf. The present importation of the Japanese scarf has already caused the loss of jobs of 3,000 American textile workers. It would give preference to Japanese fabrics which are not being given to American produced fabrics. The passage of this bill will seriously endanger the women of our country who wear scarfs about the neck and head. It is criminal to exempt scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act and thus create a serious safety hazard.

We urge you to do everything in your power to defeat H. R. 5222.

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
WILLIAM GORDON, *Vice President.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 25, 1955.*

Hon. CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We trust you will be successful in your efforts to protect the American public from dangerously flammable fabrics and that you will be able to defeat the bill exempting Japanese silk scarves from the flammability test. Promotion of international trade does not warrant imperiling the lives and safety of American consumers by exempting Japanese silk scarves from the dangerously flammable test. Domestic manufacturers are willing to meet the safety standards of the Flammability Act which you sponsored and American consumers should not be endangered to promote business of Japanese manufacturers and importers of dangerously flammable fabrics. Prosecutions already instituted by the Federal Trade Commission show the need for strict enforcement of the Flamable Fabrics Act. As an industry supporting the flammability legislation we urge that regardless of the fiber or country of origin all products sold to the American public for wearing apparel be required to meet the tests of the act.

RAYON AND ACETATE FIBER
PRODUCERS GROUP,
MATTHEW H. O'BRIEN,
Secretary.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 22, 1955.*

Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Capitol:

In the absence of James Lipsig, wish to reaffirm the previous stand taken by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union with regard to amendments of the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt scarves. The views of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union have been previously stated against such an amendment in several communications addressed to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We wish to reaffirm these views.

LAZARE TEPER,
Director of Research, International Ladies Garment Workers.

There is no doubt in mind that in justice to our own women and children, our domestic manufacturers, who are willing to comply with the law and are doing so, and, our own workers in the mills of America, that we should defeat this rule and thereby prevent a bill of this kind coming before the Congress. I hope the rule will be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I think the Members should have the opportunity of hearing full debate on the bill itself.

As I understand, there are 31 members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and out of those 31 only

5 did not vote for this bill. It came before the Committee on Rules and received a rule. So with those great odds of 26 to 5 on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the fact that only 4 members filed a minority report, I reiterate that I believe the rule should pass so that the Members may hear the arguments pro and con in regard to this bill.

Now a word about the Department of Commerce. They are definitely for this bill. In their letter the Department of Commerce said they favor the enactment of the bill. They stated that they applied to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget did not introduce any objection to the bill. The Department of State favors the bill. The Federal Trade Commission favors the enactment of this bill. The Executive Office of the President on April 20, 1955, wrote to the chairman of the committee, Mr. PRIEST, saying that that office would have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as 26 members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce favor the bill, since the Committee on Rules have reported a rule, the majority thinking that the House should consider the rule, and since the Department of Commerce, the State Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Office of the President are in favor of the bill, it is my hope that the rule will be adopted and that the Members may have the opportunity of having the views stated pro and con in connection with this bill, and act accordingly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and I am opposed to the passage of the bill, H. R. 5222, which this rule would make in order. This bill is designed for the simple purpose of permitting certain importers, who, contrary to the present law, went out and imported a number of flimsy Japanese scarves which are very flammable—they have them in warehouses now—to be exempted from the present flammable products law so that they can dump this merchandise on the market at the risk of endangering the lives of the women of American. When this bill first came before the Committee on Rules, it was set aside. Then later on when the pressure developed for some reason or other, the rule reaches the floor. I think it is a very controversial measure. It provides for the establishment of a very dangerous precedent. If we exempt these products, which are imported from foreign countries, so that somebody can make a huge fortune and endanger the lives of thousands and thousands of American citizens, in the last hour of Congress, I say to you it is a poor way, in my opinion, to legislate. I feel very strongly that this matter should certainly be laid over until the next session of Congress, and considered not in the hurly-burly rush of the last few hours on the day of adjournment of this session of the Congress, but when we have time to pass upon it properly. I want to point out to you this bill was introduced on March 24, reported June 28, and here it is on the floor of the House in the closing hours of this session. It seems to me that every Member of the House should have an opportunity to read and study the hearings that were held on this matter and know what the real questions are that are involved in this situation with reference to this legislation. As one member of the committee remarked when he voted for it, "I hope to God that no woman in my district is burned to death on account of the passage of this bill that I just voted for." I think it is an outrage.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true also that the value of the inventories of these Japanese inflammable scarves is now supposed to be more than $1 million?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my understanding, at least, that many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested by a few people who have imported these scarves, thinking they could make a huge profit by dumping them on the American market, and then seek, if they can, to get the Congress in the closing hours of this session to set aside a law that was adopted for the protection of the American people from the hazards of fire.

Mr. CANFIELD. The report of the other body says the value of these scarves is $1,250,000. They are cached away somewhere in some storehouse in the United States at the present time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is defeated and the bill is set aside.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I am taking this time—I did not want to impose on the time of the House as I thought we could take the time in committee—is that I cannot let some of these statements go unchallenged. It would appear that an insidious conspiracy exists to burn all the people in this country to which this Republican administration is a party. Actually, this bill is not my bill. It can only be termed my bill because I introduced it, but I did so at the request of the chairman of my committee [Mr. PRIEST]. I am the chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the Federal Trade Commission, to which the bill was referred. The bill came to us from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sinclair Weeks, who wrote a letter to the Speaker asking that this legislation be introduced. It was then referred to our committee and introduced at the request of the chairman. We got a favorable report not only from the Department of Commerce but from the State Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. Is the entire Government in this conspiracy to burn up the people as some of these people would have you believe? Let us pass this rule and go into the Committee of the Whole, and then I can explain some of these ridiculous charges which have been made, as will other members of our committee. I say to you now that this industry has been in existence for 100 years. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] would have you believe that there was much opposition in committee. Although everybody got an opportunity to testify, all the oral testimony was in favor of this bill. Two letters were sent to us in opposition, one by a union, I believe, in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and another one from a group in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. That is all they did. They never came in; they simply wrote us a letter and did nothing more about it.

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

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that this bill provides the same exemption as is provided for gloves, hats, and shoes?

Mr. KLEIN. Exactly the same.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the committee sought to get a report from the Bureau of Standards to determine whether or not these articles are inflammable?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes, that is in the report, as I understand it, from the Department of Commerce.

The Bureau of Standards is a division of the Department of Commerce.

Mrs. CHURCH. But were they guaranteed to be nonflammable? I mean, were they guaranteed to come under the restrictions of the Flammable Fabrics Act?

Mr. KLEIN. The testimony would indicate that these scarves, plain-surface scarves, while they can ignite, do not burn with any degree of heat or intensity. The testimony indicated that in about a hundred years nobody was ever harmed from this type scarf having burned. With regard to your question about the Bureau of Standards, I understood when we got this letter from the Secretary of Commerce that he speaks for every agency of the Department.

Mrs. CHURCH. It was my understanding that the Bureau of Standards had not established the degree of flammability. I would say that even though these scarves do not burn hard, the fact that they burn at all would endanger the life of every woman who put on such a scarf.

Mr. KLEIN. I do not believe that is so. It was never the intention of the act to apply to articles such as this, which are easily divestible, and present no hazard. It is not an article of clothing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virgina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I remember the long debate held in this Congress in either the 82d or the 83d Congress, in which this bill was fully discussed and the danger exposed. If this is the same bill, it ought to be defeated again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about it, this is a bill

written to weaken provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act, passed by the Congress of the United States to save our people, mostly women and children, from the hazards of dangerous fabrics.

There were children in my district who were burned to death in yesteryear from wearing these dangerous cowboy suits. It was only a few years ago that we had a rash of exploding sweater incidents in which so many women were disfigured or killed.

Now the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], refers to reports from other agencies of the Government, aside from the Department of Commerce. I could not get a copy of the report on his bill in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but I have a copy of the report put out for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Reference is made in that report to a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, in which he said, in answer to a request from Senator MAGNUSON, "We have no comments to make concerning the enactment of S. 1455," a companion bill to Mr. KLEIN's bill.

The Department of Justice letter, dated May 27, signed by the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers, reads in part:

> Whether the bill should be enacted involves a question of policy concerning which this Department prefers to make no recommendation.

The following are also excerpts from the Senate report:

> Many silk scarves made of plain-surface fabrics fail by a narrow margin to meet this minimum requirement, established for relatively safe fabrics.
>
> The only scarves that would be affected by the proposed amendment are imported principally from Japan.
>
> It is estimated that $1,250,000 of such silk scarves have been accumulated and cannot be sold under existing law.

I want to read you a telegram I have recently received from the textile workers union:

> NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1955.*
>
> Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Rumors are being circulated that the Textile Workers Union of America has withdrawn its opposition to H. R. 5222.
>
> The Textile Workers Union of America has been, and still is, violently opposed to exempting scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. The exemption would grant special consideration to increase the importation of the fully printed finished Japanese scarf. The present importation of the scarf has already caused the loss of jobs of 3,000 American textile workers. It would give preference to Japanese fabrics which are not being given to American-produced fabrics. The passage of this bill will seriously endanger the women of our country who wear scarves about the neck and head. It is criminal to exempt scarves from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act and thus create a serious safety hazard.
>
> We urge you to do everything in your power to defeat H. R. 5222.
>
> TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
> WILLIAM GORDON, *Vice President.*

If the women of America, if the fire chiefs and fire marshals of America, knew we were taking this bill up today in the very closing hours of this 1st session of the 84th Congress, they would be marching on the Capitol, they are so anxious to maintain the provisions of this important enactment.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. As my colleague from New Jersey knows, 13 American manufacturers of silk scarves have been driven out of business in the last 3 years because the findings of the Tariff Commission were set aside and the ad valorem rate on silk was restored.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know about the silk story because I hail from Paterson, N. J., which used to be know as the Silk City, the Lyons of America. It is no longer so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated delaying the House in the discussion of the rule. I felt that would go through and we could then discuss the merits of the bill. But I cannot sit silent when this violent attack is made upon a great committee of this House, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I had no idea that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had any thought of trying to burn anybody up or do anything which was dangerous to the people, or bring in a material that was flammable or injurious to human life. I am sure they did not. I am sure you know they did not. But let us see what has happened in this bill.

This bill was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for some time. They filed a report of 10 pages. It was reported out of that committee by a vote of 19 to 4. That is what happened on this bill. Why did they do that? Let us see what the administration says about it.

This bill is recommended by the administration. It comes under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. The Secretary of Commerce wrote a letter to the committee recommending the passage of this bill. They said:

> To the best of our knowledge plain-surface scarves have never presented any serious hazard to wearers, and consequently no danger to the public would result from excluding such scarves from the definition of wearing apparel in the Flammable Fabrics Act.

The Department of State recommends the passage of the bill, saying:

> We are gratified at the introduction of the bill and pleased to recommend its enactment.

Then from the Federal Trade Commission we have a letter recommending the act.

Here is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, what do these Members want? I do not say you should vote for the bill, but let us adopt this rule and then get down to the question of the merits of the bill.

I hope the House will adopt this rule and let us get on to a consideration of the bill itself.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, from all the discussion on this bill in the committee I have come to the conclusion that this is not a bill in the public interest—and it should not be passed.

This is special legislation for a very small group of importers. You are asked to exempt this group from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. I don't believe we ought to exempt any such things as scarfs just because some people happen to be doing a flourishing and profitable business in importing the product.

I realize two Government agencies are supporting this legislation. I have been one of the strongest supporters of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Therefore, I want to say my reasons for being against this legislation have nothing to do with that legislation.

The Flammable Fabrics Act was passed to protect the public—especially women. There is no sound reason to exempt silk scarfs or any other clothing covered by the act. I am against this bill because it exempts this clothing from a law designed for the safety of the public generally. I trust the rule will be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewomen from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it would be unthinkable to pass this bill if there is any danger of inflammability in these scarfs. Also it seems to me our State Department is against protection of our domestic industries. It has always helped other countries first.

At this time when an international conference is being held in Asia and the Far East I beg of the House to pass a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that we will not give away Formosa. That is one of the most important issues that the country has before it today. I greatly fear from the conversations and notices from the press that they may give away Formosa and recognize Red China. The hand of our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and our delegates should be strengthened in case they should waver. Our position be made crystal clear.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am in the fortunate position of not being on either side of this controversy so far as special interests are concerned. I neither have any silk weavers nor printers or dyers in my congressional district and I do not have any warehouses in my district full of silk. It is quite obvious that those who are engaged in the warehousing and importing and exporting business are very much in favor of this bill and those who come from areas which weave silk and other fabrics or have woven silk and other fabrics are against it. The printers are also against it. As far as I can observe from

what I have heard on this bill, the only people who are opposed to it, and I do not believe they are very much opposed to it, are the Ladies Garment Workers and the Silk and Rayon Printers and Dyers Association of America. The Government officers are for it and here is why: The little scarves that are here talked about are inexpensive things. I think they are worn about the head or about the neck. And they have a slightly faster burning time than the allowable, which is 3½ seconds for 6 inches of scarf. Three and one-half seconds is the standard by which we judge those things, and I think these take something like 3¼ seconds to burn. It is not enough to make any difference, but it apparently excites a lot of people and can get a lot of people stirred up talking about fire departments and so forth. I think that is carrying things a little bit far at this stage of the game, although if pieces of paper can be thrown in the air and scare the membership, all is well and good.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the record shows that during the 100 years that silk scarves have been brought into this country there has never been one single incident reported where a person was burned?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. The thing that was talked about are these cowboy pants with several inches of flammable fabric attached to them that went up like a torpedo. But, this is not like that. This is like a silk handkerchief that anybody can purchase in a drug store or a mercantile store of any kind. This is thick mat sort of a deal, not fuzzy in any way. It does not burn fast. The Department of Commerce, the State Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and all of them involved are in favor of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. And is it not true that under the Flammable Fabrics Act silk handkerchiefs are exempt?

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 46, noes 108.

So the resolution was rejected.

CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 333, Rept. No. 1621), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7718) to authorize the Capital Transit Co., under certain conditions, to surrender its franchise, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and all points of order against such committee amendments are hereby waived, and said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BEAVER COUNTY, PA.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6198) relating to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "him", insert "on the basis of an appraisal by an independent real-estate expert."

Page 4, line 14, after the word "made", strike out the period and insert ", and provided that the amount obtained for such project shall be reported to the Banking and Currency Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have other bills that were unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Banking and Currency; similar bills. Will they be brought up, too?

The SPEAKER. Only Senate bills or House bills with Senate amendments.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REESTABLISH COMMON BOUNDARY OF STATES OF MARYLAND AND DELAWARE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 987) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, is authorized and directed, upon the joint request of (1) the Board of Natural Resources of the State of Maryland, and (2) the State archivist and the chief engineer of the Highway Department of the State of Delaware, to resurvey that part of the common boundary running generally north and south between the States of Maryland and Delaware which was originally surveyed and marked by Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon in the years 1763–1767 with a view to assisting such States to remark or otherwise delineate such boundary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 20 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders previously entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) asked and was granted a leave of absence for today and the remainder of the session on account of illness.

NEW HARD-MONEY CRUSADE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks, the process known as the "hard-money crusade," which began in early 1953, has entered a new and significant phase. Unquestionably, the defeat of House Resolution 210 on this floor, June 15, was interpreted by the hard-money advocates as a green-light signal to resume their campaign for higher interest rates and at the same time lay the groundwork for another round of windfall profits in Government securities.

A review of some of the developments in the money market since early June will show the extent to which this new phase of the "crusade" has progressed.

The interest rate on 90-day Treasury bills is the so-called wholesale rate. Treasury bills are the nearest thing to money. There is absolutely no risk in holding them and they are an excellent source of liquidity for the employment of corporate and other funds held as secondary reserves. There have been times in the past when these 90-day bills actually provided a negative yield.

In the first week of June 1955 shortly after the Rules Committee had cleared

House Resolution 210 for floor debate the rate on new issues of Treasury bills averaged 1.390 percent.

Despite repeated professions by Treasury spokesmen of a policy of extending the maturity structure of the debt—a policy I opposed, incidentally—the Treasury decided at the end of June to increase the supply of 90-day bills by offering $100 million extra in the weekly auction. The average interest rate on bills rose sharply to 1.541 percent, nearly 10 percent above the rate in early June.

The rate on the newest issue of Treasury bills was over 1.7 percent. In less than 2 months, the so-called wholesale interest rate has increased by more than 20 percent. The rise in the wholesale rate on 90-day Treasury bills since early June means an added annual interest burden on the taxpayer of more than $4 million.

On July 5, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey announced details of a new financing operation. An additional $750 million of the 3 percent, 40-year bonds, which were issued last February—the longest term issue since the Panama Canal bonds—were offered for cash. The 40-year 3's were the only securities the Treasury had issued since January 1953 which had not been permitted to go below their par price.

The Treasury, bankers, and other financial authorities were quoted as saying the bond offer would have little disturbing effect on the economy, mortgage credit, Government bonds, or investment quality corporate securities. They did not reckon with the Federal Open Market Committee.

SHARP REDUCTIONS IN GOVERNMENT BONDS

Government bond prices have been marked down sharply. The 3's have fallen below their par price for the first time since their issuance. Government underwritten mortgages are being discounted 2 to 4 points off par. Some State highway issues have been withdrawn because of too high interest rates and at least one large utility offering could not be marketed without a heavy loss to the underwriting syndicate.

These developments have stemmed directly from Federal Open Market Committee policies, which I shall discuss presently.

Returning to the Treasury's financing offer of July 5, in addition to reopening the 40-year bonds, the Secretary offered to exchange $8.5 billion of maturing 1-year Treasury certificates at 1⅛ percent for 2-percent certificates, or a seven-eighths percentage point increase in the interest rate. In addition, the Secretary included this giveaway feature. The 1⅛-percent Treasury certificates of indebtedness do not mature until August 15, 1955. Holders of the old certificates, exchanging for the new 2-percent issue dated August 1, were notified to detach the interest coupons dated August 15, 1955, before exchanging, and cash them when due. In other words, the Treasury gave away 15 days' interest at 1⅛ percent on $8.5 billion of the maturing certificates at a cost to the taxpayers of $4 million.

The increase from 1⅛ percent to 2 percent on the new certificates also increased the annual interest charge from $95 million to $169 million. This single refunding increased annual interest charges to the United States taxpayer by $74 million.

AFTER DEFEAT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 210

This is only one facet of the new phase of monetary and credit policies which began with the defeat of House Resolution 210.

The Federal Open Market Committee was, without doubt, greatly relieved when the proposal to study their operations and how they affect the prices of Government securities was defeated in the House on June 15. Speculators in the Government bond market must have also felt reassured by this action.

Since June 15, the market for Government securities has undergone two episodes of drastic price markdowns, which could have netted investors with superior knowledge substantial profits.

The Federal open market authorities have been following a policy euphemistically known as mild restraint.

This policy has not yet brought about a contraction in lending. It is not intended to do that. It has, as I have already pointed out, caused a sharp increase in the wholesale rate of interest—that is, the rate on new issues of 90-day Treasury bills.

SUPPORT GOVERNMENT BONDS AT PAR

But the impact of open-market policy has not been confined to short-term interest rates only. It has been accompanied by a substantial depreciation in the prices of long-term Government bonds. If continued, this drop may prove unsettling and embarrassing for some of our smaller financial institutions and investors who are removed from the New York City money market. Smaller banks are already worried by the fact that the market prices for their Government securities are far below the values on their books. This was noted by the American Banker, July 29, which reported:

> One small bank wrote to us this week saying, "Why do the powers that have the authority permit the value of United States Treasury securities to go below par on the open market?"
>
> It seems to us that something should be done to correct this (p. 4).

For those who are able to guess right about the course of Federal open market policies and consequently the direction of Government bond prices, the recent price markdowns afforded opportunities to make great profits.

In this connection, it has been noted in a study of changes in member bank securities portfolios that New York City member banks respond quickest to shifts in Federal open market purchase policies. They are, of course, closest to the New York Federal Reserve Bank, which manages the open-market account and supervises the daily transactions of millions of dollars of Government securities, which they buy and sell for the account.

SHORT SELLING GOVERNMENT BONDS

It may be of interest to the Members to know that United States Government bonds are traded on an over-the-counter market and that short selling is permissible. In the last year an increase in the amount of such transactions has been observed. In other words, it is possible to profit from selling United States Treasury securities short. For those who may be privy to advance information on monetary and debt-management policies, dealing in the Government bond market is likely to be as profitable as crapshooting with loaded dice. For example, the American Banker states:

> The dealers who were selling 3's for future delivery at slightly under par have already done very well. (July 29, 1955, p. 4.)

CRAPSHOOTING WITH LOADED DICE

The Congress has never conducted a study of how the Open Market Committee operates on a day-to-day basis. It is, therefore, not in a position to know whether or not crapshooting with loaded dice is taking place in the Government bond market. And until the Congress decides to conduct such a study it will never find out. One day, it might blow up in our face. Then it will be too late.

Up to Wednesday, June 15, when House Resolution 210 was debated and defeated, the prices of United States Treasury securities had tended toward relative stability and firmness after displaying weakness earlier in the year. On Thursday and Friday, June 16 and 17, sharp writedowns in Treasury bonds occurred, particularly for the Victory Loan 2½'s. Again, on Thursday and Friday, July 21 and July 22, sharp price reductions of Treasury bonds took place.

It is interesting to note that the writedowns followed the Wednesday closing. On Wednesday of each week a condition statement is prepared, which shows the volume of net open-market transactions which occurred during the week. The Wednesday condition statement, dated July 20, showed that no change had occurred in the open-market account.

LEAKS, LEAKS, LEAKS

Could a leak have developed? On Thursday, July 21, the entire list of Treasury bonds fell sharply as a result of a selloff. The Victory Loan 2½'s dropped $^{18}/_{32}$ and the 40-year 3's dropped below par for the first time since their issuance.

The selloff, which took place on Thursday, clearly reflected a reaction to what the Wednesday condition statement showed—a hands-off open-market policy.

On Friday, July 22, the 2½'s fell another $^{4}/_{32}$.

In just 2 days, July 21 and July 22, the market price of the Victory Loan 2½'s fell $^{22}/_{32}$, or $6,875 per million dollars of bonds traded.

On Friday, July 29, bonds again fell, with the 40-year 3-percent bonds losing $^{10}/_{32}$.

For the entire period, June 14 to July 29, those who guessed right on the course of Government bond prices could have sold short and made $26,250 per million on the price drop in the Victory Loan 2½'s.

I insert in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the closing bid quotations for all taxable and marketable

Treasury bonds on June 14 and July 29, together with the price change in thirty-seconds for each issue:

Closing bid quotations—U. S. Treasury bonds (taxable) June 14, 1955, and July 29, 1955

Issue	June 14, 1955	July 29, 1955	Change in thirty-seconds of a point
3s 1955	101.9	99.4	69
3¼s 1978-83	107.4	104.16	84
2½s 1967-72 (Dec.)	96.20	94.0	84
2½s 1966-71	96.20	94.4	80
2½s 1965-70	96.24	94.10	78
2½s 1964-69 (Dec.)	96.28	94.14	78
2½s 1963-68 (Dec.)	97.10	95.2	72
2½s 1963 (Aug.)	98.24	96.24	60
2½s 1962-67	98.10	96.4	70
2½s 1961 (Nov.)	99.8	97.18	54
2½s 1960 (Nov.)	98.10	96.26	48
2¼s 1959-62 (Dec.)	98.1	95.28	69
2½s 1958 (Dec.)	100.11	99.17	26
2⅜s 1958 (June)	100.3	99.11	24
2⅜s 1957-59 (March)	100.2	99.0	34
2¼s 1956-59 (Sept.)	99.15	98.13	34
2½s 1956-58 (March)	100.15	100.1	14

Source: The New York Times, Wednesday, June 15, 1955, and Saturday, July 30, 1955.

Bearing in mind that every change of one thirty-second up or down may mean a gain of $312.50 per million for those who can guess "right" and act accordingly, the changes in the table show what great profits can be made speculating in Government bonds.

No wonder there is so much support for the so-called flexible bond price policy from the big banking houses located near the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

The recent episode of sharp price fluctuations in Government bonds came after statements by bankers, insurance-company officials, and other financial authorities that the Treasury's decision to reopen the 40-year three's would have little effect on Government bond prices.

The recent sharp price fluctuations in Government bond prices without any apparent reason serves to bring to mind another intriguing incident, which took place 2 years ago at the end of June 1953. Members will recall that credit conditions became so difficult because of the hard-money policy in the spring of 1953 that the Federal Reserve reduced member bank reserve requirements. This action no doubt was discussed with Treasury and Open Market Committee officials beforehand. The action was not announced until after close of trading June 24, 1953. But during the day Government bond prices went up as high as fourteen thirty-seconds without any apparent reason. On the following day, June 25, when everybody knew about the reduction in reserve requirements, prices went up as high as thirty thirty-seconds. If a "leak" had developed and advance information about the reduction in reserve requirements reached any speculators, such information was worth $13,750 per million based on Government bond price changes for the 2 days before and after the Federal Reserve announcement.

SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE

There is another side to these Government bond price fluctuations. Not all investors have the benefit of superior knowledge. For them the recent bond price declines could mean trouble. The Honorable HOWARD SMITH, chairman of our Rules Committee, noted this when he took the floor to speak in opposition to House Resolution 210. I recall how he expressed concern about the impairment of bank capital that would ensue if the delicate balance of the Government bond market was upset and bond prices should start to decline.

IMPAIRMENT OF BANKS' CAPITAL

I share Judge SMITH's concern about the possible impairment of bank capital as a result of these recent bond-price declines. I am particularly concerned about the small country banks who are far removed from the New York Federal Reserve Bank, where the open-market transactions are carried out, and do not have an opportunity to anticipate policy changes as well as the banks in the New York City area. I know these smaller banks are worried by the decline in prices of Government securities.

In this connection, I have noted that the Comptroller of the Currency and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve have notified national banks and member banks that their periodic examination must now include information on the quality of their outstanding consumer loans.

In reading about these new instructions to the banks, I wondered whether it was not equally important to inquire how bank capital has been affected by the decline in Treasury security prices.

I am hopeful that my good friend, Judge SMITH, will join with me in recommending such action to the Comptroller of the Currency and the Board of Governors so that the policy of allowing the prices of Treasury securities to be driven down may be carefully assessed.

PRESENT HARD-MONEY CRUSADE

The new phase of the hard-money crusade has already caused a significant increase in the cost of municipal and utility financing. We will all pay for these increased financing charges.

Interest rates on installment buying are also bound to reflect the increased cost of borrowing in the commercial paper market.

The cost of 3- to 6-month commercial paper was recently raised for the fifth time this year. The increase of one-eighth of 1 percent brought the interest rate to a range of 2 percent to 2½ percent. This compared with a range of 1¼ percent to 1⅝ percent quoted early this year.

If the Federal Open Market Committee continues to stand aside and refuses to supply needed credit to the system, the major impact will be on Treasury securities prices and interest rates rather than on bank loans.

Commercial banks and life-insurance companies have been taking care of the needs of their regular customers even if this required selling Treasury securities in a weak market. However, so-called marginal customers—the less preferred borrowers—will, of course, be affected. Either interest rates will be raised or their loans will not be renewed at maturity.

DENIAL OF CREDIT

Invariably the small-business man trying to survive is the fellow who gets hit. Denial of credit means certain failure for many. In this way the seeds of monopoly are planted. Many of the small businesses were driven into mergers or put out of business because of the credit squeeze of 1953.

Farmers also are adversely affected by the developing credit squeeze. The continuing decline in prices received while prices paid by farmers stays high has put them in a cost-price vise. A boost in interest rates will increase the pressure on farmers further.

WHEN CONGRESS ADJOURNS

I am fearful that the developments of the past few weeks will be followed by a set-up in the functioning of the monetary apparatus just as soon as Congress adjourns. The key or market rate, as I noted earlier, is the rate on Treasury bills and this wholesale rate has risen rapidly. As this rate continues to rise, pressure will be exerted to again raise the Federal Reserve rediscount rate. This is the move the New York banks have been waiting for to use as an excuse to bring the prime interest rate back up to 3¼ percent, where they put it in the spring of 1953.

The groundwork has been prepared for applying the brakes to our economy a second time. Will we have another shakeout of the economy? Will there be a second round of windfall profits on United States bond transactions?

So far as I am able to ascertain, the tendencies in the money market since mid-June point toward such a development.

I urge the Members of this House to keep an eye on the monetary authorities. Open-market policy has become the single most powerful regulator of our economy.

PROVISION FOR GOVERNMENT AUDIT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY—IF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HAD THE TIME AND ASSISTANCE TO LEARN ABOUT ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, MAJOR CHANGES WOULD BE MADE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are two agencies of the Government which are not subject to any audit control by any other agency of Government. The expenses and other accounts of the Board of Governors, the Federal Open Market Committee, and the 12 regional Federal Reserve banks are not subject to any budgetary control by the Congress, nor are they subject to audit control by any agency of the Government.

Although the Federal Reserve System is a central bank owned by the Government, and not, as has been reported, owned in whole or in part by the private commercial banks, the expenditures of the Board of Governors are not audited by any Government agency and it has never been subjected to budgetary control. The expenses of the regional

Reserve banks have been subject only to the supervision of the Board of Governors. As far as I know, there is absolutely no audit of the Federal Open Market Committee by any agency. In fact, the Federal Open Market Committee, which handles the greatest securities portfolio in the history of the world—$25 billion of United States Government securities—and in whose name millions of dollars' worth of daily transactions are carried out, has no budget and has no staff. This was characterized as peculiar and abnormal by the ad hoc subcommittee of the Open Market Committee, which stated in its report, November 1952:

It has no individual budget, nor does the act provide for one. There is no single person on its operating staff who is responsible to the Committee alone. Each of its officials is paid either by the Federal Reserve Board or by a Federal Reserve bank. Each would automatically cease to have any relationship with the Federal Open Market Committee the moment that connection was severed. No member of the Committee, nor of its staff, is charged to give exclusive attention to its concerns. Everyone connected with it wears also another hat. Even the manager of the open-market account, who comes nearest to devoting his full time to its functions, has heavy independent responsibilities in connection with the fiscal agency and other operations of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. (Hearings, United States Monetary Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, December 1954, p. 281.)

During the past 41 years of the existence of the Federal Reserve System, we have been told that each of the 12 Federal Reserve banks has been audited each year. It was not until 1952 that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System agreed to have its own accounts audited by an outside private agency.

In May of 1954 at my insistence and for the first time in the history of the System, an audit of the Board of Governors made by a private outside firm was filed with the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and the Senate.

This audit failed to make adequate or satisfactory disclosures as to the operation of the Board of Governors. It did not purport to cover an audit of the 12 regional Reserve banks, the Federal Open Market Committee, or the Federal Open Market Account.

It is not any reflection on the integrity of the outside accounting firm to point out that the quality of an audit of the Federal Reserve would differ substantially if instead of the auditors being selected by the Board of Governors and their receiving instructions from the Board, their selection and instruction came from the Congress.

I have introduced a number of bills requiring a complete audit of the Federal Reserve System by the Comptroller General. This is in line with approved industrial and commercial practice where auditors are selected not by the management whose accounts are to be critically examined, but by the shareholders. I have indicated that we could authorize the Comptroller General to employ by contract the professional services of outside firms, if that seemed preferable, or perform the audit with its own employees. The important point is that the Comptroller General rather than the Board of Governors would prescribe the scope and issue the instructions to be followed by the auditors.

The kind of audit that the Federal Reserve had been getting was one pretty much limited to counting the petty cash and verifying Government bonds. The Board of Governors was never audited until a few years ago by an outside concern. The Board stated in February 1952:

In 1950 a public accounting firm of national reputation was retained for the purpose of reviewing the Board's organization and procedures, including accounting and budgetary matters. While no major suggestions were made with respect to its auditing procedures, the Board has recently decided to have its accounts audited by qualified outside auditors in order that there be no question as to the independence of these audits. (Monetary Policy and Management of the Public Debt, 82d Cong., 2d sess. Joint Committee on The Economic Report, pt. 1, p. 309.)

MISTAKE COSTING $750,000 ANNUALLY DISCOVERED 40 YEARS LATER

Some 2 years later in 1954 the Federal Reserve officials came to Congress and asked to have section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act repealed. This provision prohibited one Federal Reserve bank from paying out notes issued by another Federal Reserve bank. It had some justification in the early years of the operation of the Federal Reserve System but soon became obsolete. So for nearly 40 years the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, for example, continued to bundle up and return to the other 11 Federal Reserve banks any and all Federal Reserve notes received by it which were not issued by the Richmond bank. It was estimated by the Chairman of the Board of Governors, when the Board finally decided to ask Congress to repeal section 16, that this useless and unnecessary practice had been costing three-quarters of a million dollars each year. If the Federal Reserve banks had been properly audited by its outside auditors such a useless and expensive practice would have been uncovered many years ago. The System would have been saved many millions of dollars which would have been returned to the United States Treasury and thereby would have benefited the taxpayers. We have no way of knowing at the present time whether other internal practices are resulting in wasteful expenditures. We know nothing about the efficiency of procedures employed by the regional Reserve banks in handling the tremendous volume of transactions they report annually. The magnitude of these transactions into which possible error or misfeasance might enter is indicated in the following table covering 1954:

Volume of operations in principal departments of Federal Reserve banks in 1954

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Discounts and advances	22.9
Currency and coin counted and received	29.2
U. S. Government checks handled	141.0
Other checks handled	883.0
Issues, redemptions, and exchanges of U. S. Government securities	469.2
Transfer of funds between banks	1,033.1

In 1954 the volume of transactions handled by the regional Reserve banks aggregated about $2.5 trillion.

The possibilities of error and waste are frightening to consider. As was noted in testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act required the expenditure of some $750,000 annually for a completely useless and unnecessary purpose. The prohibition against one Federal Reserve bank paying out the notes of another could have been removed in the second year of the System's operation. So for some 40-odd years, when the Federal Reserve banks were allegedly being audited, some $30 million were unnecessarily spent on a useless transfer of notes from one bank to another.

This is of course only a very small matter which I have used to illustrate why the lack of a satisfactory audit by an outside agency is harmful to the System itself.

The argument that the Federal Reserve System has its own audit is subject to the logical extension that National and State bank examinations are unnecessary. All that would be required is for these banks to assert as the Chairman of the Board of Governors has that they have a good private audit.

The most important single feature of the Federal Reserve System is the functioning of the Federal Open Market Committee. The Federal Open Market Committee through its financial transactions determines the price of United States Treasury securities; it immediately affects the value of securities in the operating portfolios of leading financial and business institutions, it sets the climate and tone of the money markets. Yet the Federal Open Market Committee and the Federal Open Market Account have never been subject to any budgetary or audit control. Financial transactions of the Federal Open Market Committee mount up to billions of dollars in the course of a year. Last year they ran over $11 billion. The Government securities market is an over-the-counter market. About 10 recognized dealers including banking houses that maintain a trading department in governments comprise the basic structure of the market. The volume of transactions in marketable Treasury securities runs on the average to several hundred million dollars daily. These transactions are typically made by dealers without commission who depend for their profit on the spread between the price at which they buy and the price at which they sell. Short sales are permitted in Governments. A spread of $\frac{1}{32}$ will yield $312.50 per million for long-term bonds. A spread of 0.01 in this yield on 90-day bills will net $25 per million. Transactions of good size are as much as $1 million or more for long-term bonds and up to $5 million for short-term bills. Success in trading in the Government securities market depends on the trader's ability to quickly and accurately anticipate changes in market conditions.

THE GREAT OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

The trading room at the New York Federal Reserve Bank is where the

transactions of the Federal Open Market Committee are carried out. It is equipped with direct lines to each of eight dealers in New York City. Several trunk lines handle outside calls. About five people are regularly assigned to maintain direct contact with the dealers. Instant contact can be made by anyone at the trading desk or by any 1 of the 8 New York dealers merely by pushing a key. Before the market opens each day meetings are held by personnel of the trading desk representing the Open Market Committee with representatives of recognized dealers. Although the meetings are held to get information about the market from the dealers' representatives the exchange is not one way.

There is no outside independent audit of the procedures governing the conduct of the Federal Open Market Committee in carrying out its financial transactions as an instrumentality or agency of the Government. As far as I know there is no legal prohibition of such an audit. The Federal Reserve has claimed none. On the other hand there is the express requirement of 31 United States Code, chapter 54, that "All establishments shall furnish to the Comptroller General such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business as he may require of them; and the Comptroller General, or any of his assistants and employees, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, paper or records of such establishment."

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD OPPOSES AUDIT

Congress never exempted the System or the Open Market Committee. It therefore must have intended to include it among the establishments subject to the terms of this section. But, as recently as June 22, 1955, the Chairman of the Board of Governors contended that the Comptroller General is without authority to audit the Federal Reserve or the Open Market Committee and that if such an audit is to be undertaken it should be authorized by an act of Congress.

It is my sincere belief that such an audit should be authorized in the public interest. We have before us evidence that there has been at least one instance of neglect in the audits conducted by the Federal Reserve's private auditors. We have seen the critical report of the ad hoc subcommittee of the Federal Open Market Committee concerning the structure and organization of the Open Market Committee, its housekeeping and its relationships with the dealers in Government securities.

It has been stated by the Chairman of the Board of Governors that the independent status of the Federal Reserve System would be jeopardized if it should be subject to budgetary and audit control by the Congress or another agency of the Government.

In answer to that I say that the White House and the President and the judiciary from the Justices of the Supreme Court on down depend upon annual appropriations by the Congress and their independence has not been destroyed.

ANOTHER AGENCY NOT AUDITED

There is another agency of Government which is not audited by the General Accounting Office. That is the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. All of the accounts of the Comptroller of the Currency are audited by a special internal auditing unit on a permanent and continuous basis. This unit reports directly to the Comptroller. It is charged with the duty of calling to the attention of the Comptroller all expense items which are beyond the limits of applicable regulations or other authorizations, inadequately supported, or otherwise irregular or questionable in any respect.

As an added safeguard, an annual comprehensive audit is performed by the Comptroller, at his request, by representatives of the Bureau of Accounts of the Treasury Department.

Apparently little or no attention is given to the efficiency of procedures, whether improvements in organization, procedures and management might be possible. On July 15, 1955, the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. L. A. Jennings, appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee to testify in behalf of a number of so-called Comptroller's bills. One bill, H. R. 6228, contained a section—104—which would amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes by eliminating the requirement that a national bank going into voluntary liquidation must publish notice of that fact in a newspaper published in the city of New York. This is what the witness testified with respect to the publication of notice section:

> Existing law which has not been changed since its original enactment in 1864 requires that a national bank going into voluntary liquidation must publish notice of that fact for a period of 2 months in a newspaper published in its locality, and also in a newspaper published in New York. The primary purpose of that requirement that publication must be made in New York was to inform the public insofar as possible that the bank was liquidating and that its circulating notes, which might be widely scattered throughout the country, should be presented for payment. As you know, circulating notes have not been issued by national banks since 1935. Therefore, there is now no reason why national banks located in various parts of the country should have to publish in New York City notice of the fact that they are liquidating.

It is my understanding that up to $200,000 a year had been expended in complying with a requirement that had been superfluous and obsolete since 1935. For 20 years such wasteful expenditures were required. I happen to think that small as this sum may be it serves as another illustration showing what happens when we have no audits.

FEW TEARS AS HOOVER COMMISSION EXPIRES—DOLLAR-MINDED GROUP USED VETERANS FOR TARGET PRACTICE—NEVER BEFORE HAS ANY GROUP SPENT SO MUCH, CLAIMED SO MUCH, AND ACCOMPLISHED SO LITTLE—PROTEST OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I see by the morning's paper—August 1, 1955—that the lobby known as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has begun its campaign to get the heat put on the Members as they return to their districts. This group tried hard during the 1954 election campaign to pressure candidates into support for the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission's task forces were very busy during the first session of the 84th Congress. The sum and substance of these reports amounted to a restatement of Mr. Hoover's philosophy of government. The American people repudiated that philosophy decisively more than 20 years ago. The attempt to carry out that philosophy cost us dearly. It nearly wrecked our economy and our form of government.

One group that has for some reason never received much sympathy from Mr. Hoover has been the American veterans. He did not seem to look kindly upon them back in 1931 and 1932, and in 1955 he again concentrated his fire upon this group. I am inserting an article at this point that appeared in the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly publication July 21, 1955. As the article notes the Hoover Commission has made extreme claims about prospective savings and improvement in Government operations since its inception. Its claims have not as yet been borne out. They have had the most experienced public relations counsel promoting the Hoover Commission. They have employed the experts from industry who have proved they can argue the industry point of view ably. They had the benefit of a friendly press.

Mr. Hoover has from time to time come up with recommendations that would not only provide the savings to balance the budget, but it sometimes appears that the savings would be substantial enough to operate the Government for some time in the future without taxes.

We had some very fine men serving on the Hoover Commission. They could not all devote their full time to the Commission's work, so we had the bulk of the work done by so-called experts with rusty axes to grind and crochety masters to serve. It was not a very good example to set for the so-called w. o. c.'s in Government agencies. Here were experts on the Hoover Commission making recommendations about Government policy not too distinctly severed from their private connections.

The Chairman of the Commission was a strong Chairman. He literally ran the Commission. He refused to permit a Vice Chairman to be selected, although the law definitely required a Vice Chairman. I am not criticizing any member of the Hoover Commission except its Chairman. Members simply did not have time to give to the Commission's work and naturally Mr. Hoover dominated the activities of the Commission.

In view of the fact that the legal requirement that the Commission func-

tion with a Vice Chairman was not met it might be said that it was not a legally constituted group—what people in Iowa and Texas used to call an outlaw group—that is, outside the law.

In considering the w. o. c. situation in Government today it should be remembered that Mr. Hoover selected to do the work of his Commission nothing but w. o. c.'s. He selected the members of the various task forces. He did not consider the recommendations of the Vice Chairman, since there were none. The first and only President to serve the United States as a w. o. c.—that is, without compensation—was former President Hoover.

It is as follows:

FEW TEARS AS HOOVER BOARD QUIETLY EXPIRES—DOLLAR-MINDED GROUP USED VETERANS FOR TARGET PRACTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Loved by few, scorned by many, and ignored by Congress on numerous occasions, an economy-minded "giant" died here of natural causes and few there were to mourn its passing. Officially, the giant's name was the President's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, but to the average layman it was more familiarly known as the Hoover Commission.

Created by an act of Congress 8 years ago, the Commission expired primarily because Congress felt it had long since outlived its usefulness as a "prowler through the Government's corridors," as one "obituary notice" expressed it.

THIRTY-DAY REPRIEVE ENDS

Actually, what Congress did was to refuse to extend the life of the Commission beyond a 30-day reprieve.

The Commission was due to go out of existence May 31, but Congress granted the 1-month stay of execution to enable the task force comprising the Hoover group to get out the last of its series of reports on how to save the taxpayers' money.

CRITICIZED AS REACTIONARY

Most of the criticism which was fairly general, particularly during the Commission's last days of life, stemmed from the conviction in the minds of many editors and newspaper readers that the former President and his group based its recommendations on one major premise, namely, that benefits and services to private citizens should be curtailed in an effort to return to the so-called "good old days" when the Government's principal function was to maintain order and provide defense.

"DISCREDITED," SAYS SOLON

One lawmaker, who declined to permit the use of his name, summed up the situation when the Hoover proposals, 1 by 1, were falling on deaf ears for the most part, as follows:

"I have never seen anything so completely and thoroughly discredited by both parties. It's just unbelievable."

FIRE CONCENTRATED ON VETS

Veterans' benefits were a favorite target of the Hoover group, and much of the nearly $6 billion which Mr. Hoover thought could be saved, were his recommendation carried out, was to be saved at the expense of former servicemen.

Beaten in all its earlier attempts to whittle down GI benefits, the Commission renewed its attacks on the several veterans' benefit programs in a series of reports issued the final months of 1954 and the early months of 1955.

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED CUTS UNLIKELY

Capitol Hill observers say there is little or no chance that Congress will adopt any of the proposals which call for slicing GI benefits. Most of these proposals, they point out, would have to be passed upon by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, where Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas Democrat, and an oft-decorated veteran himself, has indicated that the door is shut.

It was reported that only one of the Commission's proposals of any consequence had met with Mr. TEAGUE's approval. That one called for consolidation of all existing veterans' pension and compensation laws. (Mr. TEAGUE has introduced a bill to that end.)

ATTACK AIMED AT VA

The Hoover Commission had but few good things to say about the Veterans' Administration or veterans' benefits generally.

It liked VA's orthopedic manufacturing activities and suggested that they be expanded so that VA could provide artificial limbs and the like for disabled servicemen still on active duty.

The Commission urged suspension of VA's dental manufacturing and eyeglass manufacturing activities. It praised VA's supplies purchasing procedure but urged that most of VA's purchasing should be turned over to the General Services Administration in order that other Government agencies could take advantage of VA's discounts.

URGED REVISION VETERANS' BENEFITS

Comprehensive revision of veterans' benefits was urged by the Commission. It claimed that close to $300 million a year could be saved if Congress would cut GI benefit programs and make veterans pay for many services and benefits traditionally furnished to them free of charge.

UNFRIENDLY TO VETERANS' PRIVILEGES

There were some proposed changes that were not supposed to save much money, if any at all. It appeared as though the Commission simply objected to special privileges granted to ex-GI's.

A case in point was the Hoover group's proposal on the Federal civil service. It termed veterans' preference rights "undemocratic" and "inefficient."

FAVORED PREFERENCE CURTAILMENT

It urged that preference in getting Government jobs be limited to the physically disabled. It urged that veterans' special appeals rights be dropped altogether. It urged that veterans' preference in cases of a reduction-in-force be severely curtailed.

Of this particular report Mr. Hoover was quoted as saying: "It was nearest my heart's desire," meaning he liked it more than any of the other 30-odd reports his group filed during its 8-year lifespan.

VA MEDICAL PROGRAM ASSAILED

Under attack also was VA's hospital and medical-care program for disabled veterans.

To swell the dollar figures, the Hoover group tacked on compensation and pension benefits paid disabled ex-GI's, despite the fact such benefits are generally considered to be nonmedical.

The Commission urged that the compensation and pension rolls be reviewed periodically with an eye toward saving an estimated $180 million annually.

Tackling direct medical benefits head-on, the Commission recommended that service-connected disabled veterans hospitalized at VA expense for an ailment not proved to be service-connected be required to sign a "pauper's oath" affidavit as is now required of non-service-connected disabled ex-GI's who seek VA hospital care.

The group also urged that such veterans "assume a liability to pay" for their medical care "at some reasonable time in the future."

HOSPITAL SHUTDOWN PROPOSED

The Commission furthermore urged that Congress order VA to shut down 19 "uneconomic" and "poorly located" VA hospitals to "save" an estimated $5 million yearly. It accused VA hospital patients of "goldbricking" and recommended that all "surplus" hospitals be closed immediately.

In other fields of veterans' affairs, the Hoover group alleged that the administrative costs of GI loans, GI insurance and Farmers' Home Administration benefits are a "burden" on nonveterans and those ex-GI's who do not choose to take part in the benefit programs.

EX-GI'S SHOULD PAY COSTS

The Commission said veterans receiving direct benefits from the loan and insurance programs should be made to pay for the administrative costs themselves. It estimated that thereby a saving of $77 million annually could be effected.

A further saving of about $5 million a year could be made, according to the Hoover group, if its suggestion were adopted that the VA guardianship service for war orphans and mentally disabled veterans be terminated in all but 3 States.

It also recommended that VA, wherever possible, shut down the commercial-type bakeries, laundries, and dry-cleaning plants at its hospitals and domiciliaries and sign commercial contracts for bread and cleaning.

CONGRESSMEN CAUSTICALLY CRITICAL

Representative CARL ALBERT, Texas Democrat and party whip, said:

"For the first time in memory an agency of the Government has hung a dollar sign on the moral obligations of our people to the man who fought his country's battles in time of war."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, another Democrat from Texas, attacked Mr. Hoover personally. He charged that the former President "has demonstrated his antagonistic feelings toward veterans of wars" and added that "it is the duty of the Congress and the President to see that he is not permitted to unduly harm them."

An official report by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs called the Hoover Commission's medical care proposals unfair, unsound, unrealistic, and unworkable.

DAIRY FARMERS MAKE PROGRESS IN MOVING PRODUCTS INTO STOMACHS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the 84th Congress draws to a close, I should like to say a word or two about the progress that has been made recently by the dairy farmers of Wisconsin and the rest of the Nation, and the prospects now before the dairy industry.

We all recall that during 1953 and early 1954 the Government was getting into the dairy business at an alarming rate. Month after month milk production was booming to new seasonal records. The increased output was moving not into stomachs, but into the storage facilities of Commodity Credit Corporation. In fact, per capita consumption of butter and some other dairy products was moving downward because the Government would pay a higher price than the housewife would.

It was at this point that Secretary Benson, with over a billion pounds of dairy products in Government storage, was required under the law to adjust dairy price supports. Mr. Benson declared that the destiny of the industry lay with the industry itself, and stated that its problems would never be solved unless both Government and industry resolved to face them squarely.

The Secretary's announcement was not a popular one. Many of us did not

believe that lowering supports would completely solve the problems. But the dairy industry accepted the challenge. It launched a vigorous selling campaign. Many dairymen undertook an extensive culling program, eliminating from their herds the poor-producing cows which yielded no real profit, but contributed considerably to the milk surplus. And the factor of price, combined with promotion, began to work. Customers who had turned to substitute products became customers for dairy products again.

Within 6 months there was clear-cut evidence that the dairy industry was beginning to emerge from its more serious troubles, and in less than 16 months after the dairy price-support level was adjusted, the evidence was overwhelming that the program was functioning effectively.

During the marketing year ending last March 31, consumption of butter increased 9 percent over the preceding 12 months. Consumption of American cheese was up 14 percent. Fluid milk consumption was also rising. During the first half of 1955, production of milk totaled 65.5 billion pounds, about one-third billion pounds less than last year's record for the period.

The American Dairy Association has just announced the results of June Dairy Month. Consumption of butter in American homes for June 1955 was up 14 percent over June 1954. Consumption of American cheese increased from 14 to 16 million pounds. Consumption of domestic Swiss cheese increased from 3.6 to 4.1 million pounds, and the consumption of other natural types of cheese increased from 2.9 to 3.5 million pounds.

I think it can be said that the greatest proportion of the credit for this accomplishment belongs to the industry itself, which has had the initiative and the imagination to help itself. But Congress and the administration have helped also, lending important support to the industry's efforts.

Through an amendment to Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, included in the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to pay the reprocessing, packaging, and transportation costs on products donated to welfare agencies. This has made possible greatly increased utilization of dairy products under this program.

Other provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954 have made it possible for the Commodity Stabilization Service to work out an arrangement with the Defense Department to increase the consumption of milk by the Armed Forces. They also provided up to $50 million annually of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for use in increasing the consumption of fluid milk by children in schools of high school grade and under.

For the first 5 months of the Armed Forces program—November 1954, through March 1955—the four services report increased consumption of more than 50 million pints of milk by our fighting men. Through the school lunch program, consumption of milk this school year has increased by an estimated 400 million half-pints.

All these efforts, public and private, have had a healthy influence upon the purchase of dairy products by the Government. From October, 1953 through July 1954, almost 1¼ million pounds of dairy products were purchased by CCC. During the corresponding 10-month period just ended, Government purchases dropped to about 700 million pounds, about half as much. Purchases of butter were down more than one-half, from 322 million pounds to 142 million pounds.

CCC stocks since the end of July 1954 have been reduced about 50 percent or nearly 500 million pounds. Holdings at the end of July were around 600 million pounds, down sharply from the 1,200,000,000 pounds on hand last July. This not only means a large net reduction in CCC dairy products on hand but that rapidly expanding outlets have absorbed the 850 million pounds of dairy products purchased by the Government during this past year.

Mr. Speaker, our dairy farmers of Wisconsin and their colleagues all over the Nation deserve sincere congratulations for their accomplishments in helping themselves. Secretary Benson should be congratulated, too, for his bold determination to give private initiative a chance, working through the market place, to help solve problems that Government alone has been unable to solve.

We in Congress have done well in supporting these efforts of the dairy farmers, the American Dairy Association, farm organizations, State departments of agriculture, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of E. J. Albrecht Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION BRAVE

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with our distinguished colleagues, Mr. FORD, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Mr. JUDD, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. SIEMINSKI in a statement announcing Operation Brave.

Operation Brave is a plan proposed by Mr. George Brazier, Jr., of Kansas City, Kans., to strengthen the common bond which exists between the American veterans of the Korean conflict and their comrades from 22 nations who shared their sacrifice in that valiant struggle against Communist aggression.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that our joint statement commending Mr. Brazier and explaining his plan appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

OPERATION BRAVE

A plan to strengthen the bond existing between the men of free nations who served together in Korea has been proposed by Mr. George W. Brazier, Jr., of Kansas City, Kans.

It is a plan to direct the spirit of sacrifice shared by those veterans on the battlefields of Korea toward the continuing pursuit of peace in their own lands and in the world. Bound together as they are by the strong ties of common service under arms for a just cause, these men have the mutual understanding and profound respect which are the essential ingredients of cooperation for peace.

Mr. Brazier proposes that 22 outstanding American veterans of the Korean war form teams to visit their comrades-in-arms from the 22 nations who fought so bravely in the common effort to stop Communist aggression in Korea.

His plan is appropriately called Operation Brave in honor of that quality of courage universally admired in war and peace.

The American veterans would reestablish contact with other United Nations veterans to revive the spirit of friendship and comradeship that grew in common suffering and uncommon heroism.

They would convey to the living veterans, their families, the families of the honored dead, and to all citizens of each nation expressions of appreciaton and friendship from the people of America.

They would visit hospitals and shrines to pay tribute to the wounded and honor the dead of each nation.

They would impress upon the people of each country the determination of the people of the United States to defend freedom and justice in times of peace as well as war.

They would remind the men of the magnificent manner in which they fought to restore peace and encourage them to exhibit the same spirit away from the line of battle when their ideals are endangered.

They would invite their fellow veterans to visit the United States to further promote the fullest understanding and greatest cooperation possible.

Mr. Brazier is himself a veteran of the Korean war. He observed firsthand the spirit of comradeship between the men of many nations and their mutual determination to bring peace and security to the world. Mr. Brazier's sincerity of purpose has caused him to work tirelessly for the realization of Operation Brave as a contribution to true peace. We join in wishing him success and godspeed in his work.

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Second District, Kansas; FRED MARSHALL, Sixth District, Minnesota; WALTER H. JUDD, Fifth District, Minnesota; BROOKS HAYS, Fifth District, Arkansas; PRINCE H. PRESTON, First District, Georgia; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Fifth District, Michigan; JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26th District, California; ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, 13th District, New Jersey.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is an honor to be associated with these distinguished Members of the House from both political parties and from every section of our

great country in commendation of this proposal from an American veteran.

It is highly appropriate that this proposal should come from a young man who knows firsthand the spirit of comradeship which binds together the men of the free nations who served the cause of freedom so magnificently in Korea.

This shared experience, in the face of suffering and death, is a source of common understanding and mutual respect that needs to be preserved and strengthened in the continued efforts for peace. It is a realistic and genuine basis for practical cooperation between free men who have personally known what sacrifices are demanded in the cause of justice and freedom.

The preservation of freedom and the guarantee of justice is our greatest task at this moment. We are spending heavily of our resources to make our country the shield and the sanctuary of freedom. Realizing that we must be strong in material power, we are still quick to admit that a harmony of purpose between free people is our greatest weapon and best hope. No more fervent desire for peace nor firm determination to preserve liberty exists than among those men who saw the ugly fruits of Communist tyranny on the battlefields of Korea.

We know that Korea was a crucial test in the struggle between the free world and communism. Our forthright action reaffirmed our position of leadership and rallied like-thinking men of the world to our cause. No man can know how much this has contributed to the cautious hope for peace now expressed by our President and shared by most of the people of the world. There is strength in a just cause—sometimes more strength than we know.

The proposal advanced by Mr. Brazier to send 22 American veterans to visit their fellow veterans around the world is no grand scheme that promises miraculous results. It is a sober and sincere effort to mobilize the good will and dedication that grows between men of courage in time of war for the cause of peace.

It is a modest effort to again arouse in the many men from many lands who shared in the struggle the friendship and firm purpose that stood them so well in Korea. As we have pointed out in our statement, it is an effort to remind these men that peace often demands sacrifices greater than war. It is a reminder that the work of peace is never done.

The veterans of other nations know the formidable military force our Nation can muster. We want to again assure them that our strength is much more than military force. We want them to know that we have understood and appreciated their sacrifice and that our common devotion to the ideals of freedom and justice are still cause for true comradeship in the task of winning peace.

The outstanding American veterans who would be assembled under Operation Brave would presumably be ordinary citizens who shared what must surely be called an extraordinary experience. Under Mr. Brazier's proposal they would be men with outstanding war records as acknowledged by the awards of their own governments and the governments of our allies.

They would be men who had reason to make many contacts with soldiers of other nations and who may have maintained these friendships since their departure from Korea.

They would be men of similar ancestral and racial backgrounds as the veterans of other nations who fought in Korea.

They would be men who have compiled outstanding records as Americans outside the military service as well as in it.

They would be the true heroes of the Korean war, men who were captured by the enemy, subjected to physical and psychological tortures and who, in spite of all, remained true to the oath they took to their country and who refused in any manner to submit to the ideas of their captors.

They would be men, chosen without regard to rank, who best represent the real courage Operation Brave seeks to instill in all people who love freedom.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should all be grateful to citizens like Mr. Brazier, who give freely of their efforts and ability to take a personal interest in this most important work to which we can devote ourselves—the establishment of true peace. He has discussed his plan with Members of the Congress and the administration, and I am sure that all who met him are impressed with his selfless devotion to this cause. He has made a real contribution by inspiring all of us to work individually as citizens in the greatest task of our time. We hope this plan will be realized and that it will be a part of a successful effort to make the brotherhood of nations a reality.

THE RECORD OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 84th Congress is now drawing to a close. I think it would be well to summarize some of its accomplishments and omissions. The American public is gradually discovering that in no time in history has a national administration received such generous and bounteous cooperation from the press and certain subsidized radio and television commentators as the Eisenhower regime.

It is readily apparent that political speeches made by Candidate Eisenhower in 1952 and 1954 on various public issues, including labor, agriculture, and other problems proved to be nothing more than campaign oratory.

AGRICULTURE

When the President appointed Ezra Benson Secretary of Agriculture, evidently he was taking the recommendation of reactionary groups who wished to revert to the old farm policy of 30 years ago. Any average small American farmer can testify today on what the Eisenhower administration has done to the farm economy since January 1953. I wish to include with my remarks a statement made on the floor of the House on May 5, 1955, by Congressman USHER BURDICK, a Republican, and an active dirt farmer of North Dakota. In criticizing the Eisenhower farm program of flexible price support he said:

Quote from Congressman BURDICK, page 5772 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 5, 1955:

> Now, with this sliding scale about to be approved—and the 90 percent of parity defeated—there is one thing of which I am certain. That there will be distress in the farm belt, and many farmers will go out of business. The farm income has gone down since 1952 by over a billion dollars. That is not all.
>
> In order to keep down surplus, a drastic farm acreage program has been introduced and will eventually destroy the family-type farms of the country. Right now in Williams County where I live, farmers with 320 acres of tillable land have, in some instances, been reduced to 48 acres. Since wheat is the principal source of income, there is no farmer in America smart enough to support a family of 5 on 48 acres of wheat.
>
> The result will be that these farmers will sell out to the larger outfits, and move to the towns and cities and join the ranks of labor. Organized labor will increase, and many are alarmed now that organized labor will control the elections. In the last election we saw Michigan and Minnesota controlled by the labor vote, and if this present farm program is insisted upon, many more States will be in the same position.

I mention Congressman BURDICK'S words because in the 1920's, the bankruptcy of the farmer started the greatest depression in our history.

LABOR

The Members of Congress who are anxious to do something regarding necessary changes to the Taft-Hartley law have been waiting patiently to get some support from the White House. Candidate Eisenhower very specifically in speeches before the A. F. of L. and CIO national conventions, stated union busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley law must be repealed and amendments adopted that would make the legislation fair to both management and labor. When Martin Durkin was Secretary of Labor, he did everything within his power to persuade the President to carry out the promises which he made to the people on labor legislation. When Secretary Durkin was convinced that Secretary of Commerce Weeks of the manufacturing interests and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey of the banking interests were the brain trusters who were guiding the policies of this Republican national administration, he resigned. Since Martin Durkin's resignation, every move made by this administration in regard to appointments on the National Labor Relations Board and other legislative proposals concerning labor and consumers have been decidedly anti-labor. In 1947 President Truman's message vetoing the Taft-Hartley law, predicted that it would breed dissension, confusion, and bitterness between management and labor and his predictions have come true. One might only read the newspapers regarding the terrific loss of man-hours through slowdowns and strikes during the last couple of years, to realize that this administration

is truly riding herd on organized labor as well as on other working groups in our economy. Under Taft-Hartley legitimate collective bargaining on the part of big business has broken down. In certain cases where organized labor wins in wage dispute negotiations like big steel or General Motors, management immediately shoots up the price of its product, regardless of the fact that they are reaping the greatest percentage of profits in history.

Another startling example of this fact was in the legislative fight on the floor of the House of Congress to raise the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1. The advisers of the President insisted on an increase from 75 cents to 90 cents. The testimony before the Education and Labor Committee from organized labor and other sources revealed that $1.10 to $1.25 per hour would not be unreasonable considering the high cost of living. This legislation was along the same line as the fight which the Eisenhower administration, through Postmaster Summerfield, waged in order to keep the postal employees of the country from receiving their just and equitable increase in salary.

TAXES

Another example of the fact that big business is truly in the saddle during this administration was the opposition and successful battle made by Secretary Humphrey to prevent a $20 tax credit to the small-bracket taxpayers of the country. This fight was waged by the administration in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the tax bill which they enacted was a windfall to the high-bracket taxpayers who have been heavy campaign contributors and supporters of the Republican Party. The public should know that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey engineered the excess-profit tax repeal which was approximately a windfall of two billion. This administration, under the runaway-plant program to big business through tax concessions, has given handouts of about nineteen billion. Most of the thirty billion spent for new plants are in open-shop areas for the purpose of escaping union wages and union labor conditions. Hundreds of thousands of working men and women have been thrown out of jobs—in Northern States.

The Eisenhower administration, through Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, installed the "stock option plan," which meant billions to the high-bracket taxpayers. Humphrey's "future expense" writeoffs to corporation executives was a $3 billion "gimmick."

The Eisenhower tax brain trusters enacted the so-called rapid depreciation provision which allows corporations to charge off against taxes cost of new machinery, plant equipment, et cetera, which amounts to between 15 to 20 billion.

I mention these facts because the public is not fully informed when the tax reductions to the low bracket taxpayer are questioned by the forces of special privilege.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The Democrats in Congress also made a valiant fight to expand social security by lowering the age limit and other expansions which met with opposition at the White House and Republican leaders in Congress.

SCHOOLS AND HOUSING

The American people should also be reminded that Candidate Eisenhower in 1952 and 1954 made convincing speeches regarding the need for 350,000 more school units throughout the country and that the public school system in urban localities was in a highly critical condition. After 2½ years, there has been no support coming from the White House to persuade Republican Members of Congress to help enact legislation to carry out this campaign promise. Last week on the floor of the House, when the public housing legislation was under consideration, we discovered that Members of the President's own party were very active in curbing and discouraging the House from carrying out the President's campaign promises to the industrial areas of America for much needed public housing. It was generally admitted before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House by witnesses that public housing was necessary for slum clearance, but the records of the legislation in this session will reveal that the White House made no effort to line up members of its own party to support housing legislation which the President advocated in his campaign speeches.

It is indeed unfortunate that proper highway construction legislation could not be adopted this session. The program that was submitted by the President through Secretary Humphrey's cooperation would have called for the payment of 11½ billion dollars in interest on the sale of bonds which would be a windfall for the banking interests of the country. Secretary Humphrey's highway finance system would have called for a double bookkeeping manipulation in an effort to fool the American people that this expense would really not be added to our national budget deficiency.

I also opposed the other system of financing the highways which was advocated by most Democrats and some Republicans because it would lay, to my mind, an unjust burden on the highway transportation system of our country. I do hope in the next session of Congress that the Ways and Means Committee can work out an equitable, just and fair method of financing much needed cross-country double lane highways for the traveling public.

GAS AND TIDELANDS

One major bill supported by the White House and the Republican leaders in Congress as well as some Democrats was the so-called natural gas exemption legislation. I opposed this legislation in the Rules Committee and also voted against it on the floor of the House because I firmly believe that it will eventually bring about unreasonable increase of prices to the gas consuming public. Of course this bill is more or less of a duplicate blueprint of the famous tideland oil legislation which had the questionable distinction of being the first major legislation passed by the Republican Congress in the spring of 1953 and signed by President Eisenhower. It is now being revealed that large oil companies are receiving billions out of the oil reserves located beyond our coastline which the Supreme Court, in its decision several years ago, said belonged to the American taxpayer. I do hope when this session reconvenes in January, that immediate steps will be taken to carry out some of the necessary legislation which the people have been expecting from the campaign promises made by the Eisenhower administration.

POWER GRAB

Of course space or time does not permit going into detail regarding the alleged shady manipulations by some of the officials who are connected with this administration. The Dixon-Yates special privilege grab, the hearings which revealed Secretary of the Air Force Talbott has been using his office to promote private business, the mess which developed in the polio vaccine program and other glaring demonstrations of Republican misfeasance and malfeasance which have received very gentle treatment on the part of the press and certain Republican political radio and television broadcasters. The nonpolitical observer can imagine the headlines had the same acts occurred under the Truman administration. President Truman vetoed the tidelands and Kerr gas bill but we cannot expect help from the White House on the natural gas "plunder." I am satisfied as time goes on the true facts concerning the economic policies of the Eisenhower administration, which are directed by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks, will be known to the American people.

FOREIGN POLICY

On foreign matters, special credit should be given the President for overruling some of his party leaders and, in general, adhering and following the foreign policy program of the predecessor, President Harry Truman. It is surprising to find some of the Republican leaders in Congress denouncing the President on some of his foreign-policy programs the same as they denounced President Truman. I remember when the then General Eisenhower, and head of the European Military Defense, returned from Europe in 1950 and testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the Marshall Plan and other foreign-aid programs sponsored by President Truman had saved Western Europe from communism. During those days some of the Republican leaders in both bodies of Congress were making great political capital that the Democratic Party was soft on communism. General Eisenhower at that time knew well and applauded the great program which the Democratic administration of those days had inaugurated to curtail communism. We are beginning to find evidences now that the Soviet economy is not as strong as the leaders behind the Iron Curtain would have us believe through their insidious propaganda. It is my hope that this apparent change of heart and willingness to negotiate on the part of the Kremlin leaders is sincere. As chairman of the Katyn Forest Investigating Congressional Committee and also as a member of the congressional committee investigating Communist aggression in

the last session of Congress, I cannot believe that the Kremlin leaders seriously intend to keep any promises or agreements they make at this time or any other time. Ex-President Hoover testified before our committee in New York in December of 1953 that the Communist leaders had made 36 separate agreements with their captive satellites from World War I to 1939. When Stalin decided to aggress and conquer, these agreements were thrown in the wastebasket. Several weeks ago the U. S. News & World Report, in an article, stated that in the last 20 years the Kremlin made 52 pacts, agreements, and treaties with the free democracies of the world and have broken, nullified, and violated all except 2.

BROKEN TREATIES

Judging from the record of the Communist conspiracy since World War I, I firmly believe that any pacts, agreements, or treaties made with their leaders are worthless. Any pacts or treaties entered into by them are only for the purpose of reestablishing their economy and strengthening their hold upon their captive satellite nations until they get ready to continue their fight for world domination. Our country along with our allies and all free countries must forever be on the alert and profit by our knowledge of the duplicity and sabotage which the Kremlin used upon Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia, and other smaller nations. The Geneva Conference was an ideal platform for western delegates to demand the release and restoration of freedom to all captive nations. In failing to raise this issue President Eisenhower entirely forgot his campaign promise to the people now under the heel of Communist slavery. The words that Lenin uttered 40 years ago that communism and capitalism cannot live together is the true and only policy of his followers in the Kremlin today. The United States and the free nations can well profit by the experience of the nations who innocently negotiated, compromised, and made treaties with the Soviets during the last 35 years. As of today, millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are sabotaging and actively fighting communistic tyranny. Every aid and comfort we give to the Kremlin during these years will hamper the patriots who today are successfully undermining the Communist economy and weakening their power both behind and outside the Iron Curtain. The fight of the free countries must continue, regardless of the sacrifices, in order to save the freedom of the world for future generations.

NEED FOR A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for some years thinking people have been conscious of the effort of the Russian Communists to subvert, occupy, and control all the nations of the world. Almost everyone is now aware of the disturbing gains made by the Russians toward their goal of world conquest.

The cold war serves as a clear recognition on the part of free men of what the Russian Communists are up to and a reflection of the determination of free people to defeat the efforts of the Russian Communists. While the cold war was not officially recognized until about 1948, the hard, cold facts are that the entire world has been the target of a ruthless cold war since the Communists seized control of the Russian Republic in 1918. Moreover, we Americans have also come to realize that the United States is the No. 1 target of the Russian conspirators because they recognize their goal of world domain can never be won so long as we, as a nation, remain strong, vigilant, and dedicated to our free institutions.

There are some today who claim that the cold war was ended at the Geneva Conference. Such false prophets remind us of former British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, who naively proclaimed an era of peace for a generation with World War II made certain by the act of free nations making concessions to the tyrant Hitler. If the Geneva Conference of the Big Four did anything, it provided conclusive proof that the leaders in the Kremlin could not change the criminal and conspirational nature of communism even if they wanted to. We should recall that the Russians shot down one of our naval planes cruising over international waters just a few days before the Geneva Conference opened. Only a few days ago, immediately following the end of the Geneva Conference, the Bulgarian Communists shot down in cold blood, an Israeli commercial airliner killing 57 innocent people. What more evidence would anyone want to demonstrate that even the leaders in the Kremlin cannot control the monster they have created?

Communism is a hard and fast doctrine. It allows little or no room for disagreement. The only chance it leaves for disagreement is the question of how to accomplish the never changing goal of world domain, and the room allowed for this tactical disagreement is comparable to the point of a pin.

The rapid advances made by man in the field of mass communications has added a new dimension to the relations among and between nations. It has reduced time and space to a remarkable degree, but in a sense this progress has done something even more consequential because it has added a new dimension to warfare.

Propaganda has now become as important and in some cases more important than entire divisions of soldiers or the most powerful of destructive weapons. This is a fact the Russian Communists have recognized and capitalized on for a great many years. This is a fact that we have not as yet fully awakened to, but which nevertheless continues to confront us in various parts of the world where tensions are the sharpest.

Propaganda, if skillfully and relentlessly employed, is capable of destroying the will of an enemy to fight just as it is capable of destroying the will to resist subversion and even enslavement.

The full scale use of propaganda is not a new art of warfare. It was employed with great skill by Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, Atilla the Hun, the Manchus, and others who sought to conquer or were required to defend their homeland. It is a fact of history that Genghis Khan was able to take over entire areas without loss of one soldier by the skillful propaganda of his advance runners. His advance men used a combination of fear growing out of a proclaimed invincibility of Genghis Khan, together with a promise of safety and peaceful life for all those who did not resist the invading hordes of Genghis Khan. History also teaches us that after entire cities and villages would surrender without exercising an iota of resistance, Genghis Khan would immediately disarm the men and then proceed to slaughter them so that upon leaving the city or village only the womenfolk and children were left alive.

Scientific advances in the field of mass communication have created tremendous possibilities for good or for evil. It is possible now to carry out worldwide radio programs. Some scientists say it will not be long before we will be seeing worldwide television programs. It is quite possible that before very long other means of mass communication will be developed which will make the present-day radio and televisions appear elementary and cumbersome. The tyrants seek to use these advances to serve their goal of world domain. We are just beginning to learn how we must use these means of mass communication for the protection of our way of life and for the advancement of our never-ending goals of peace with freedom and prosperity for all mankind.

The technical advances in the field of mass communication, as I have said, hold tremendous possibilities for good. They provide us with the capability of preventing a hot war. I say this because of my firm conviction that no aggressor can carry out a successful war without the loyal and continued support of the people. If we pursue to the fullest extent our campaign of truth and keep alive the hopes of the millions of people enslaved by communism, the Kremlin will not dare to start a hot war.

We also have the capability of preventing the internal subversion of nations by the conspiracy of communism. This we can do by exposing the objectives and techniques of the Communists and make them known to all the people of the world. It appears that the Russian Communists are now putting major emphasis on the take-over of free nations by internal subversion methods, which should urge us on to use more fully this capability which we have.

We have the capability of winning a great many more friends around the world than we now appear to have. We can do this by getting across to them what we stand for and by demonstrating to them that they can best attain their national and legitimate aspirations

by associating their future with the cause of freedom and the efforts of the United States to advance the natural rights of all nations, large and small.

The struggle of freemen against the Russian Communists is essentially a struggle of ideas. That struggle is a conflict between the ideals of peace with freedom which we as freemen hold to be as precious as life itself, and the concept of a super-state based strictly on material values in which man is an easily expendable item. These cogent facts have been universally recognized and indeed acclaimed by practically all the statesmen of the free world.

Former President Harry S. Truman in recognizing these facts which I have cited, called for a crusade of truth as the only certain way to maintain and extend human freedom throughout the world. The call of former President Truman for a crusade of truth caused the creation of the Voice of America, then an integral part of the Department of State.

President Eisenhower lost no time, after assuming office, in endorsing the need for a crusade of truth when he called for a strengthened United States information program and recommended the creation of an independent agency now known as the United States Information Agency. President Eisenhower has made a most significant contribution by urging the creation of such an independent agency.

Many leaders in public life, recognizing the basic issues involved in the political struggle that now grips the entire world, have called for various courses of action to meet the situation. For example, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., shortly after his visit to the Soviet Union, called for an era of competitive coexistence between the enterprise of freemen and the regulated existence in that part of the world controlled by the Russian Communists. This was the answer he suggested we give to Bulganin and Khrushchev who were even then attempting to smile when they urged upon us their desire for an era of peaceful coexistence which everyone knew to be nothing more than an old-fashioned Russian bear trap.

Not so long ago General Sarnoff, in a special memorandum to President Eisenhower, expressed grave concern that we were not taking full advantage of all the means of mass communication to expose the big lies of communism and to espouse the cause of human freedom. General Sarnoff urged upon the President the development of an all-out political offensive against the conspiracy of communism.

The Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, in its final summary report made public on January 3, 1955, recommended that the United States embark upon a bold, positive, political offensive against the conspiracy of communism and on behalf of all the nations and people enslaved by communism as the only practical course of action giving hope of avoiding world war III.

The select committee made a very careful study of the conspiracy of communism, exposing its fallacies and vulnerabilities, which should serve as a permanent caution to all those who believe that the smiling Russian bear has lost his teeth or has had his claws removed.

We have all the ingredients necessary to undertake a winning political campaign against the criminal conspiracy of communism. We have those fundamental, moral, and political principles which stand as the foundation of our free way of life. We have a free people enjoying the most abundant life ever known to any civilization, as a demonstration of what a truly free people can accomplish. We have no desire for the territory or possessions of other nations. We wish only that all the people of the world may have the same opportunities that our own people possess, and that a way will be found to bring a just peace to this world based upon a family of nations in which all members stand as equals.

We possess all the scientific and technical means of communicating these ideals and what we stand for and what we sincerely wish for all other people of the world.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that we have all that it takes to win the political struggle against the conspiracy of communism and that many of our leaders in public life have called for the full utilization of all these capabilities. The fact remains, however, that we are not, by any means, using even the minimum of our capabilities in the political struggle which now grips every single nation and person of the world.

But let us look for a moment at what the Russian Communists are doing.

It is conservatively estimated that they spend over $1 billion a year on their propaganda, and it is possible that they spend as much as $1½ billion dollars for this purpose.

The Russian Communists have established extensive research institutes and facilities for the study of all aspects of mass communication. They are never satisfied that their efforts in this direction are perfect.

They have special institutes for the training of professional propagandists who are brought from nearly every country of the world to the Soviet Union for this training. These people return to their homelands where they become an integral, if hidden, part of the international Communist conspiracy.

The Russian Communists plan and carry out propaganda campaigns with the same detail and precision as our Joint Chiefs of Staff would plan and carry out a military mission.

They rate propaganda equal in importance to well-trained armies and all types of destructive weapons. They have been convinced by their own evil experiences as well as those they learned from the tyrant Hitler that the big lie, if told often enough and if dressed up in various hats, will appear as truth to a remarkable number of people.

There is no doubt but that the Russian Communists have made great progress in the study and application of new methods of mass psychology and in the use of all media of information in their never-ending war against civilization.

What we have done and are attempting to do by comparison, in my opinion, represents a half-hearted, if not puny, effort. On the one hand we proclaim that the political crisis which grips the world will be won only by winning the minds and hearts and the allegiance of mankind. On the other hand we do very little, compared to what the Russian Communists are doing, to use the scientific advances and capabilities that are ours to accomplish the mission we all agree upon.

Only 10 years ago we were ushered rudley into the atomic age. There was no public preparation whatever for this new era. The first reaction to public knowledge concerning the atomic bomb was fear—fear for the destructive uses to which such a weapon could be put. This fear was followed by still another fear that such a powerful weapon might fall into the hands of those who might be tempted to abuse power, or worse still, into the hands of those who constantly seek total power over their fellow men. One Member of Congress, the late Honorable Brien McMahon, also saw other uses for atomic energy. He foresaw the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the great possibilities for good it offered for mankind. Consequently he called upon Congress to establish a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make certain that the tremendous power represented by the fission of the atom would not fall into the hands of those who might abuse it and, at the same time, to open wide the doors to the development of peaceful uses of this new form of energy.

The results of the leadership exercised by Brien McMahon speak for themselves. It is safe to say that without the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we would not today be in the commanding lead which we now enjoy in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes as well as for defense.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Congress has a tremendous responsibility in connection with the launching of a political offensive against the conspiracy of communism and that this responsibility can best be met by the creation of a Joint Committee on International Information Programs. I have talked with a great many Members of Congress and have sought their advice on how best Congress can meet its responsibility in the political crisis that now grips the world. Almost everyone I have talked to agreed that the joint committee which I am today proposing represents a step in the right direction and that the creation of such a joint committee will permit Congress to meet fully the responsibilities which I believe it has for such programs.

Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 433 calling for the creation of a Joint Committee on International Information Programs. While I recognize that there is not sufficient time for the proper consideration of this resolution during the present session of Congress, nevertheless, I feel the overriding importance which attaches to the purposes of such a joint committee impels me to take this action. I earnestly invite each and every Member of Congress to give my proposal careful consideration and I invite an expression of views and suggestions of Members of Congress and all interested organizations

and individuals on this matter. By this process I hope that public opinion will be developed on the issues which I have here presented today and that Congress when it convenes in January will thus be prepared to take early action on my proposal. The following is House Joint Resolution 433:

House Joint Resolution 433

Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs

Resolved, etc., That (a) there shall be a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "joint committee").

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(1) Nine Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, one from the majority and one from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

(B) Three at large from the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority party.

(2) Nine Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, one from the majority and one from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

(B) Three at large from the House of Representatives, two from the majority party and one from the minority party.

(b) No person appointed by the Speaker of the House under section 2 (A) shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee of the House of Representatives of which he was a member when appointed to the joint committee, except that a member who has been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as a member of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(d) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members, and the chairmanship and vice chairmanship shall rotate between the two houses with each session of Congress.

(e) Subject to applicable provisions of law, the joint committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall—

(1) conduct public hearings on, and cause studies to be made concerning, the extent and effectiveness of all United States international information programs;

(2) cause studies to be made of the technique, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda, including methods used to penetrate information media of the free world with such propaganda;

(3) inquire into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications have progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by the United States international information programs; and

(4) provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States international information programs, counsel with executives and policymakers of such programs, and promote a better public understanding of the objectives of such programs.

(b) As used in this joint resolution the term "United States international information program" means any program operated by or financed in whole or in part by any department or agency of the Government utilizing media of communications or other psychological or informational means to inform or to influence opinion among people of other nations.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Congress twice annually (beginning on July 1 or January 1, after the effective date of this act, depending upon which date is nearest) on the extent and effectiveness of United States international information programs and at such other times as the joint committee deems necessary; and shall recommend to the President and to Congress steps considered necessary to improve the quality, coverage, and impact of all such programs.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this joint resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

HIGHWAY BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sorry to see the House adjourn before certain legislation is passed. I feel very strongly that the House should not adjourn and the Members should not leave Washington before we pass the highway bill. I know the Members say, "Oh." But, no one is more anxious to get away than I am. I feel that it is vitally necessary for the welfare of all the country and it means very much for the welfare of our section of the country. If by chance we should be engaged in a hot war, it is extremely vital to have this great network of roads for our national defense. If a recession should come it would be very helpful in employment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I cannot have the chance to address the House tomorrow, to thank everybody personally for all of the courtesies they have shown—the telephone operators, the telephone clerks, the Clerk of the House, the stenographers of the House, the pages, the messengers, the incumbent clerks, the Sergeant of Arms, the doorkeepers and the guards.

I would like, too, to thank the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders for all their courtesies and patience with us. I know it has been a trying time for all of us. Underneath it all our hearts are heavy because we do not know whether this cold war may break out into a hot war at any time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I want to compliment the gentlewoman in thinking of everyone in these closing days of the session, including the Members, the Speaker, the leaders on both sides, the doorkeepers, the pages, and all the people who work so assiduously here in our interest. I think it is a very fine thing that the gentlewoman mentions these things.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know all the Members feel that way about it. I know in my own impatience with people sometimes when I cannot get a telephone call through, and I know that those telephone calls have saved lives many times and thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of contracts, and so forth.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. May I say to the gentlewoman that if she will put the statement she has just made in the form of a resolution, I will be very happy to vote for such a resolution. I am sure it is one resolution that will pass the House unanimously in the closing hours of this session of the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is there any way I can present such a resolution now without having it in writing? We are all complimenting the Speaker and the gentleman from Connecticut asked if we might put what I have stated here, and others have said, expressing our deep thanks to the Speaker and all of the leaders and personnel and the chairmen of the committees and the staffs of committees and all connected with the running of the Capitol in the form of a resolution, and if I may have such a resolution considered without putting it in writing, I would ask unanimous consent to do so. What would be my next move?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman has the floor.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is unanimous that we consider the resolution as passed.

REPORT ON SPECIAL STUDY MISSION TO CENTRAL AMERICA ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include related materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1955, there was submitted House Report 1155, report of the Special Study Mission to Central America on International Organizations and Movements. This report was filed by seven members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who had undertaken a special mission to Central America early in June. I was privileged to serve on that mission along with Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Chairman; Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON, Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, and Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO. Four of the five Central American Republics were visited by the group: Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

The primary purpose of the study mission was to check on the relations between the Central American Republics and the United States and also the relations between themselves. Conferences were held with the President, Foreign Minister, and other leading officials of each of the Republics as well as with the United States Ambassador and Embassy staff, and Foreign Operations Administration personnel in those countries.

The report points out that the visit of the seven members of the Foreign Affairs Committee making up the special study mission was widely heralded in the Central American press. The members were guests of the Legislatures of Nicaragua and El Salvador. The chairman of the group, Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, addressed the legislative bodies of the two countries, and his remarks were delivered in Spanish by Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO. The translations by Mr. MORANO created considerable enthusiasm in those countries. The report points out that these speeches and translations marked the first time Members of the United States Congress had taken part in such ceremonies before those legislative bodies in special formal session.

Although the area of Central America is small, we must not for one moment minimize its importance. The five Republics of Central America—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua—form an essential area in hemisphere defense and good will. It is an unfortunate thing that at times we must be confronted by a critical situation in a country or an area before we realize the importance of that country or that area. This has been illustrated by the recent events which transpired in Central America. I refer specifically to the dangerous situation of hostility which existed between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and which constituted a grave threat, not only to the rest of Latin America, but also to vitally strategic United States interests in the Panama Canal. The Organization of American States took quick action to bring this situation under control and we fervently hope that such difficulties will not arise again. The most glaring example of how conditions in a country, though a small one, can nevertheless loom large in strategic and political significance is the case of Guatemala. Happily the Communist menace in that country has been removed—and I hope this will be a permanent removal—and Guatemala is now engaged in the great task of rebuilding its institutions along democratic lines.

The report of the Special Study Mission points out that the visit created considerable good will between the Central American republics and the United States. The congressional visit coming as it did soon after the good will tour of Vice President NIXON demonstrated continuing interest on the part of the Congress in the people of Central Amerilca. The good will created by the visit of the study mission is evidenced by certain communications addressed to the Chairman of the Special Study Mission and to the chairman of the full committee from our diplomatic representatives in Central America. Because these communications indicate the important impact which a congressional visit to our close neighbors to the south can have on United States-Latin American relations, I insert at this point these communications which appear in the report:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
San José, Costa Rica, June 15, 1955.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I believe your visit to Costa Rica came at a particularly fortunate time. It made an unusual contribution to mutual understanding and good will because it served to dramatize the ease and rapidity with which groups of officials from the United States can visit Costa Rica, and therefore the corresponding ease and rapidity with which Costa Rican officials can visit the United States. Never before has a group of distinguished officials traveled between Washington and San José, the capitals of the two countries, as rapidly as did your study mission. In fact, if your trip had not been made at just the time it was the condition of the new airport at San José would not have permitted this unprecedented flight. I consider it a very happy circumstance that this new closeness in the relations of the two countries should have been underscored by the visit of a group of United States Congressmen.

The fact that you devoted your visit to Costa Rica primarily to a serious examination of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences made a most favorable impression here. Costa Rica is predominantly an agricultural country and there is great interest in improving and expanding agriculture through the kind of research which is being conducted at the Institute. If you had been selecting an object of interest for its popular appeal, you could not have done better.

Of course, the kind of friendly discussions which you held with President Figueres, members of his cabinet, and with the President and members of the Costa Rican Congress, are the best possible method of promoting true international understanding, and obtaining an authentic sense of conditions abroad. Since this kind of personal relationship is indispensable, I am greatly encouraged by the increased ease with which visits can now be made by improved air transportation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. WOODWARD,
American Ambassador.

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Managua, Nicaragua, June 16, 1955.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: Because of absence from Managua I have not written to you before. I have just returned from an interesting 4-day visit to the towns in the north of Nicaragua with President Somoza, members of his government, and members of the diplomatic corps. The occasion for the trip was the inauguration of a number of public works, including public schools and highway bridges.

During the trip, the President, cabinet ministers, and diplomats commented on the visit of the Special Study Mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Consequently, I wish to thank you personally and through you all members of the mission for visiting Managua and for the mutual understanding and goodwill which resulted from your visit.

Since your stay in Managua was brief, you may not realize that the mission's visit brought home to the President of Nicaragua, to members of the Nicaraguan National Congress, and to the Nicaraguan people the fact that the United States Government has neither forgotten nor does it overlook the importance of Nicaragua and other Central American countries in these times of greater international pressure in other areas. You may not realize that this part of the world has tended to feel disregarded and neglected in view of the greater attention paid by the United States to Europe during the crucial years after the war and now, seemingly, to Asia, where even more serious conditions prevail. As you and I know, there is no actual basis for the feeling of neglect in Central America; nevertheless, it exists. The mission's visit helped to correct such impression and to emphasize the United States Government's interest in Nicaragua and neighboring countries, thus resulting in deeper mutual understanding and goodwill.

The appearance of your committee and your address to the joint session of the Nicaraguan Congress was very beneficial to us. The translation of your address by your bilingual member, Representative MORANO, pleased everyone.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. WHELAN,
American Ambassador.

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Guatemala, June 16, 1955.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: The information section of the Embassy has just brought to my attention the impressive amount of coverage given to the visit of your group by the Guatemalan press and radio. * * *

I would very much like to add my own favorable impressions to those contained in the press. The visit of the committee was most timely and served as a very definite indication of the interest which the Congress has in the people of Guatemala. As you probably well know, the task of President Castillo Armas in guiding his country out of the economic chaos which the previous Communist regime left has been a difficult one. The committee's discussion with President Castillo served to emphasize the sincere and deep interest which the American people and their representatives in Congress take in his efforts to establish good government

and to bring about economic development and better living standards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. MANN,
Chargé d'Affaires ad interim.

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
San Salvador, El Savador, June 8, 1955.

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: It has been my great pleasure to have received seven members of your committee, headed by Mr. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, chairman of the International Organizations and Movements Subcommittee. Their brief stay in El Salvador was extremely helpful to the American Embassy in maintaining contact and cordial relations between our two Governments. The committee members were tireless in their efforts to know everything possible about El Salvador during their 1-day visit. I hope they have conveyed to you the Embassy's appreciation that they came to visit us at this time.

I would be grateful if this letter could be incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an expression of appreciation for the efforts made by your committee to assist us in accomplishing the United States mission in El Salvador.

With kind personal regards,

ROBERT C. HILL,
American Ambassador.

Among the major conclusions reached by the study mission was the fact that in each of the countries there is manifested growing movements toward better health, better sanitary conditions, better communications, better and wider education, improved agricultural techniques, and better housing.

Last year Guatemala returned to a democratic form of government. This was achieved despite 10 years of increasing Communist activity and effort to control the government, which culminated in the election of President Arbenz in 1951. With respect to Guatemala, the study mission found that it is the showcase of Latin America and has become a political, social and economic laboratory. Guatemala is the first country in world history which has been successful in throwing off its Communist masters. It is now engaged in what has been termed "the Guatemalan experiment," in proving that it can meet the needs and best interests of its people through democratic processes. The study mission stressed the fact that it is important that there be demonstrated in Guatemala the ability of that democratic government to succeed in meeting the needs of the people where communism promised to fulfill those needs but never could, and never intended to accomplish. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, along with the other members of the mission, that the $15 million development assistance for Guatemala, recommended by the study mission, was authorized and appropriated in full by the Congress. This sum should materially assist Guatemala in meeting her pressing economic needs.

One of the major conclusions of the study mission was that communication is the key to the future economic development of Central America. No major program in economic development can take place in Central America, however, without the existence of an efficiently managed Inter-American Highway. In order to accomplish this it will be essential for the Central American countries to pool their efforts for the common good so that uniform regulations may be agreed upon governing the maintenance and use of the highway. I am happy to report, Mr. Speaker, that all the countries which the study mission visited fully recognize the importance of this principle and that they are more than anxious to work together on this important project. The operation of the Inter-American Highway will bring about substantial benefits both to the Central American countries and to the United States, through the exchange of visits between our citizens and the citizens of those countries and through the facility with which American goods will be funneled through our main arteries directly to the people of Central America. In addition we must not overlook the military and strategic advantages provided by overland communications from our country directly to the Canal Zone.

Finally, the report points out—and I believe this to be most significant—that the Central American countries are another example of the fact that the contributions of a country to the constructive strength of the free world is not determined by the size of the country but rather by the ideals and principles by which it is guided.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the study mission, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CARNAHAN, and to the other members of the group, Messrs. GORDON, DODD, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, CHIPERFIELD, and MORANO. Seldom have I seen a harder-working group of individuals who in a spirit of complete cooperation and nonpartisanship made possible a very successful mission.

REPORT ON NATO PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE IN PARIS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to be the chairman of the delegation to represent the House of Representatives at the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris last week. Also in that committee were the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER]. We have prepared a report on that meeting.

The report follows:

The NATO parliamentary delegation of the House of Representatives submits the following report:

The delegates arrived at Paris on Sunday, July 17, and immediately upon arrival, the chairman went to a meeting of the steering committee where rules and procedure were drawn up.

The Conference opened on Monday the 18th and each nation was called upon alphabetically to lay before the Conference any matter that it might consider pertinent. The meeting on the 18th at 10 was spent actually on organizing the Conference and electing officers. After which at 11, the briefing was given by Lord Ismay on the general organization of the Atlantic alliance, followed by a question period. After Lord Ismay's appearance, he was followed by General de Chassey on the military organization of NATO. This was followed by questions. At 12:30 a film was shown of previous NATO meetings. After lunch the delegates heard from Mr. Lowell Weicker, Assistant Secretary General for Production and Logistics. This was followed by a question period and then the delegates were briefed by Sir John Hodsoll, senior civil-defense adviser on the subject, Civil Defense—the Role of Parliaments and the Role of NATO. This was followed by a question period, after which the delegates heard from Ambassador Wilgress, Chairman of the Committee on Information and Cultural Relations. The morning session of the second day was taken up by a trip to SHAPE headquarters and a briefing by General Gruenther, Field Marshal Montgomery, General Brisac, and Air Marshal Dawson. The remainder of the time up to and including Friday afternoon was given over to general sessions and committee meetings. Many subjects of interest to the nations of NATO organization were discussed and a resolution was adopted unanimously on the subject of future meetings of members of parliament from NATO countries. That resolution read as follows:

"RESOLUTION ON FUTURE MEETINGS OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FROM NATO COUNTRIES

"This meeting of members of parliament from NATO countries:

"Recalling that the aim of the North Atlantic Treaty is both to encourage the defense of member countries and to contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the people united within the framework of the Atlantic community;

"Considering that achievement of the latter aim would be facilitated by closer relations between the members of the representative assemblies of the different countries and considering that this is particularly desirable in the case of the legislative branches of the member states who have by solemn treaty pledged themselves to the mutual defense and welfare of their respective peoples through the far-reaching initiative in international relations that is NATO;

"Believing that these discussions between members and the NATO authorities and between members themselves have already been of great value;

"Invites the speakers of the various parliaments concerned, according to the procedure which they think appropriate, to send delegations to a similar meeting each year;

"Expresses the wish that the governments of the countries here represented facilitate through NATO Council further meetings;

"Considers further that before we separate, a continuing committee should be selected, composed of the present officers and other members of the steering committee, 15 in number, to include one from each NATO nation and with the right of substitution to make arrangements for the next meeting;

"This meeting further considers that such a continuing committee would require some secretarial assistance of its own. This should be, for the time being, on a part-time basis. The necessary finance, which should be quite small, should be provided by the participating governments or parliaments concerned on a basis to be mutually agreed."

The delegation from the House of Representatives unanimously felt that the interchange of ideas and problems among the members of the parliamentary bodies of the 15 NATO countries was indeed very beneficial. The committee believes the United States should participate in the future meetings

and should not only participate but should also encourage and do everything it can to make these meetings worth while. Your committee believes that such future meetings will be mutually advantageous to the nations allied in NATO and will be productive of great good in the interchange of ideas. It was very obvious during the sessions that the airing of common problems and the effort made by the delegations from various countries to understand the problems of the associated nations would be valuable in the conduct of future consideration of the many questions faced by an organization such as NATO. It was pointed out by not only the committee from the United States but by others that it is the belief of many that NATO has been largely responsible in deterring armed aggression and an outbreak of the third world war and that NATO can be as useful in the cold war as it has been in preventing a hot war.

The chairman of the United States delegation appointed the ranking minority member, Mr. LEROY JOHNSON, of California, as a member of the committee, consisting of one member from each country, to consider the resolution which has already been set forth in this report. Decisions and actions of the United States delegation were bipartisan in character and unanimous in all aspects. The final paragraphs are from a speech made to the Conference by the chairman of the United States delegation, Mr. HAYS of Ohio; which generally represents the sentiments of your committee:

"I also think that the United States Congress and the people of the United States are becoming more and more aware of the time that it is impossible for a nation to exist in isolation. I was interested in discussing this matter just before I left for this meeting with some of our people. The point was made, and I think it is a cogent one at this time, that democracies stand together very firmly in times of military danger, but in times of economic stress, and I would like to say parenthetically that I am not predicting economic stress in the immediate future in the United States or anywhere else, the point was made that in times of economic stress the democracies have a tendency not only to not stand together, not only to fall apart, but also to blame each other for their plight, and it seemed to some of us that were discussing this, that the economic aspect of this exploratory convention might be very worth while. It has occurred to me, and I am expressing only my own personal opinion, not that of the Congress or even of my own delegation, that perhaps an approach can be made to the problems, some of them at least, through this meeting, and other meetings of this type which we hope and believe will follow.

"It seems to me that it is most important that NATO not only continue, but that it be strengthened, and that it function more efficiently. We feel that a lessening of tension, which we think is very desirable, might have as one of its designs the collapse of this organization, and we certainly feel that that would be, and when I say this organization I am thinking of NATO, not this particular body meeting here, we think that would be a tragedy. We are prepared, I believe, to support NATO as we have in the past, to strengthen it and to show the world that democracies do have common interests, that they can sit down around a table and work out their problems, although there may be differences which at the moment of presentation might seem almost insurmountable. I was interested in what the gentleman from the United Kingdom just said about the evacuation of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe. Many of us feel that a concession of that type from the Soviet Union would be a concession in name and not in fact, because if America—and Canada and the others—were to evacuate their forces from Europe it would be a terrific task to replace them on short notice, whereas, if the Soviet Union were to evacuate her forces it is a matter of almost hours, at least days, to get them back into position again. So, we think that that would be a concession that would mean very little.

"I was also interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Denmark about Spain, and while we from the United States delegation do not wish to indulge in a full-dress debate on that subject, I would merely point out that the resolution was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives under a device known as 'unanimous consent,' whereby, one person by standing up and saying 'I object' could have killed it, and that the resolution itself calls for the President to explore the possibilities of bringing Spain into NATO. I am sure that the gentleman from Denmark was not aware of it, and it is a peculiar coincidence, and I assure you it is a coincidence only, but it so happened that I was the author of the resolution which passed the House of Representatives. And it was my thought, and the thought of the sponsors, and there were 30-odd who sponsored a similar resolution, that NATO should not be an exclusive organization, but that it should work to bring its ideas to other nations and that it should hope, not immediately perhaps, not tomorrow, perhaps not next week, but that it should hope eventually to extend its benefits, and I think there are many, to all nations in the Atlantic community. Thank you, Mr. President."

It is the unanimous belief of your committee from the House of Representatives, which attended the first NATO parliamentary meeting, that the United States should participate in the future meetings.

WAYNE L. HAYS.
VICTOR L. ANFUSO.
FRANK J. BECKER.
LEROY JOHNSON.
S. J. CRUMPACKER.
STEWART L. UDALL.

UMBRELLAS FOR RAIN, NOT APPEASEMENT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, now that we have gotten away from the subject of flammable fabrics I want to bring up an equally flammable subject; I want to refer to the unfortunate remarks of Vice President NIXON at the time of welcoming our President on his return from the Geneva Conference.

You will recall it was raining when the plane landed at the airport, yet he is alleged to have indicated that he did not want any umbrellas to be used because of the insinuation that they were a sign of appeasement.

On behalf of the umbrella industry of New York City I rise to protest those remarks.

We have 3,000 people in New York City employed in the umbrella industry. We all know how bad the weather has been for this industry; we have had so little rain, and now this administration comes along and adds to our troubles, by telling people not to use umbrellas.

I do hope that the people of the country will not take Mr. NIXON too seriously and if it rains they will continue to use umbrellas.

All the umbrella manufacturers wish is to keep you dry. Let our Government officials indicate in more forceful terms their dislike of appeasement.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORAN of New York in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KILDAY and to include an editorial.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. GRANAHAN in two instances.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Washington in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG.
Mr. CEDERBERG.
Mr. BENTLEY.
Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. CANNON.
Mr. TUMULTY.
Mr. ASPINALL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 46. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.;

H. R. 482. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former O'Reilly General Hospital, Springfield, Mo., to the State of Missouri, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. de Mocskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Karlis Abele;

H. R. 1423. An act for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruthe Graves Messer;

H. R. 1552. An act for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz;

H. R. 1599. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1958. An act for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Walling;

H. R. 2112. An act to amend the Act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service;

H. R. 2149. An act to increase the annual compensation of the Academic Dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School;

H. R. 2553. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950, relating to the use of corporation property by a shareholder;

H. R. 2559. An act to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers;

H. R. 2619. An act to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt;

H. R. 2791. An act for the relief of Ofelia Martin;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice;

H. R. 3235. An act to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Demopolis Lock and Dam, Alabama, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Richard Ruffo Hanson;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams);

H. R. 3628. An act for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider;

H. R. 3635. An act for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4394. An act to amend section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 4410. An act for the relief of William E. Ryan;

H. R. 4468. An act for the relief of Margarethe Bock and her son, Robert Harald Bock;

H. R. 4663. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws;

H. R. 4672. An act to increase the annuities of certain retired civilian members of the teaching staffs of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School.

H. R. 4744. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of the Federal Government;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein;

H. R. 5546. An act for the relief of Francisca Alemany;

H. R. 5647. An act to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on motorcycles;

H. R. 6066. An act authorizing modification of the project for flood protection on the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California;

H. R. 6232. An act to include as Spanish-American War service under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration certain service rendered by Stephen Swan Ogletree during the Spanish-American War;

H. R. 6417. An act to revive and reenact the act "Authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939;

H. R. 6585. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6590. An act to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who participate in or assert the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6600. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6727. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.;

H. R. 7024. An act to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus and for other purposes;

H. R. 7095. An act to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to certain athletic events held for the benefit of the United States Olympic Association;

H. R. 7278. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7300. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of income received from patent infringement suits;

H. R. 7628. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the White House office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7684. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 276. Joint resolution to authorize the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation to convey certain land to Kerr County, Tex.; and

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 38. An act for the relief of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois);

S. 56. An act authorizing construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen;

S. 85. An act for the relief of Rosetta Ittner;

S. 86. An act for the relief of Wilhelmine Schelter;

S. 92. An act for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman;

S. 100. An act for the relief of Hermine Lorenz;

S. 119. An act for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea;

S. 141. An act for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Ernesto DeLeon;

S. 176. An act for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella;

S. 181. An act for the relief of Manhay Wong;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 214. An act for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Mary Freida Poelti Smith;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker;

S. 238. An act for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto);

S. 239. An act for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas;

S. 240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek;

S. 254. An act for the relief of Giussepina Cervi;

S. 293. An act for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman;

S. 326. An act for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofblad;

S. 346. An act for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischer;

S. 352. An act for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru;

S. 388. An act for the relief of Petre and Libitza Ionescu;

S. 394. An act for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Panchert;

S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;

S. 464. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River;

S. 466. An act for the relief of Capt. George Gafos, Eugenia Gafos, and Adamantios George Gafos;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch;

S. 474. An act for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas;

S. 476. An act for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout;

S. 503. An act for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen;

S. 535. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried;

S. 541. An act for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier.

S. 707. An act for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas;

S. 843. An act for the relief of Gerda Graupner;

S. 884. An act for the relief of Gabor Lanyi;

S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Edward Naarits;

S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended;

S. 1105. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic);

S. 1167. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act;

S. 1187. An act to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks;

S. 1210. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia;

S. 1266. An act for the relief of Helene Margareta Jobst;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil;

S. 1340. An act to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.;

S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton;

S. 1367. An act for the relief of Antonio Jacoe;

S. 1391. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States;

S. 1395. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954;

S. 1397. An act providing for the conveyance of certain lands to Saint Louis Church of Dunseith, Dunseith, N. Dak.;

S. 1496. An act for the relief of Ruriko Hara;

S. 1512. An act to amend section 107 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to eliminate separate divisions and reduce the number of places holding regular terms of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian;

S. 1522. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis;

S. 1706. An act for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis;

S. 1974. An act for the relief of Rosa Birger;

S. 2081. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training;

S. 2168. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other purposes;

S. 2197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to distribute equally to members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians certain moneys to the credit of the tribe in the United States Treasury;

S. 2253. An act to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

S. 2260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the apportionment of the waters of the Red River and its tributaries;

S. 2269. An act for the relief of Mualla S. Holloway;

S. 2270. An act for the relief of Nadia Noland and Samia Ouafa Noland;

S. 2277. An act authorizing the administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for park and recreational purposes, for an amount equal to the cost to the United States of acquiring such lands from the city;

S. 2297. An act to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 2312. An act for the relief of certain Korean war orphans;

S. 2351. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects in the city of Norfolk, Va.;

S. 2566. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving as isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes;

S. 2573. An act to amend the rice-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 2575. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols;

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a certain contract with the Toston Irrigation District, Montana; and

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey*.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 2, 1955, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1058. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 302. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; without amendment (Rept. No. 1612). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 305. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 304, 84th Congress; with amendments (Rept. No. 1613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 299. Resolution providing further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 20. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our Capitol"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 307. Resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 73. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MACDONALD: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4090. A bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. H. R. 191. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1619). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 434. Joint resolution to provide appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7718, a bill to authorize the Capital Transit Co., under certain conditions, to surrender its franchise, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7786. A bill to permit a resident of Hawaii employed by the Federal Government in Hawaii to accumulate a maximum of 45 days a year annual leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7787. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis Reservoir, the San Luis-West Side Canal, the Avenal Gap Reservoir, the Antelope Plain Canal (West San Joaquin division), and the Santa Clara-San Benito unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7788. A bill to provide for the uniform grading and labeling of butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7789. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 7790. A bill for the establishment of a Department of Peace and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 7791. A bill to incorporate the George Washington Boyhood Home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7792. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 7793. A bill to amend the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 7794. A bill to amend subparagraph (A) of subparagraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7795. A bill to provide for the closing of certain commercial-type enterprises operated by civilian departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7796. A bill to transfer to Federal Prison Industries all functions of the Post Office Department with respect to the manufacture and repair of mailbags, cord fasteners, and locks; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7797. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of the fertilizer research facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7798. A bill to provide for the termination of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7799. A bill to provide for the termination of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7800. A bill to create through a system of contests, programs, and scholarships a reservoir of civil personnel trained in all phases of aviation to meet civilian needs and to provide standby personnel for needs of national defense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7801. A bill to provide for the closing of certain commercial-type enterprises operated by civilian departments and agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7802. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of the fertilizer research facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7803. A bill to transfer to Federal Prison Industries all functions of the Post Office Department with respect to the manufacture and repair of mailbags, cord fasteners, and locks; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7804. A bill to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 7805. A bill officially designating the first earth satellite; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE (by request):

H. R. 7806. A bill to provide health care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7807. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 7808. A bill to provide free barber services to all Armed Forces personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7809. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7810. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7811. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration of the practice of architects and professional engineers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 7812. A bill to grant the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7813. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to review all cases in which the employment of a Federal employee has been suspended or terminated under any loyalty or security program of the United States, including any summary suspension or termination of employment permitted by law to protect the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7814. A bill relating to the reconstruction and improvement of an existing bridge and the construction of an adjacent new bridge by Washington Toll Bridge Authority extending across Port Washington Narrows at Bremerton, Wash., and grouping and operating said bridges, and the imposition of tolls in connection therewith; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 7815. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and plowing contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in September 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 7816. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the institution of Labor Day; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7817. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7818. A bill to permit the interment of the last survivor of the Union Army and the last survivor of the Confederate Army within the Gettysburg National Military Park, and to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 7819. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7820. A bill to provide that the transportation of mollusk shells (including clam and oyster shells) from the point of extraction to the dockside shall be taken into account in computing percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 432. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of organizations engaged in the manufacture of tobacco products in order to determine whether collusion exists among such organizations to maintain at a low level the prices of unprocessed tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 434. Joint resolution to provide appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Memorial of the State of Illinois, 69th General Assembly, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, requesting the Congress of the United States to make provisions permitting recipients of old-age assistance to supplement their old-age assistance benefits by earning an amount equal to that permitted recipients of old-age and survivors insurance benefits without a loss of such benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7821. A bill for the relief of John Picos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 7822. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Hornauer Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 7823. A bill for the relief of Wong San Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7824. A bill for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai) and Moy Chun Ngan (Edith Moy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7825. A bill for the relief of 16 customs inspectors employed at the port of Honolulu, T. H., from liability for certain amounts paid and demand for refund thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7826. A bill for the relief of Chong Hyun Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 7827. A bill for the relief of Chuzo Tamotzu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7828. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hsun-Tiao Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 7829. A bill for the relief of Oscar Beregi, Sr., and Oscar Beregi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7830. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Leiss Laimburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7831. A bill for the relief of Maria V. Beregi de Pataky and Coloman de Pataky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 7832. A bill for the relief of Sueko Oshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Daniel Souang and Michele Souang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 7834. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Kensdel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 7835. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7836. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Kondoleon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

360. Mr. HORAN presented a petition of 150 residents of the State of Washington urging that Congress exercise its powers to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of Interstate Commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Parliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on the date of July 12 you paid me the honor of appointing me 1 of the 6 Members of the House of Representatives to attend the First Parliamentary Conference of the NATO countries to be held in Paris, France, from July 18 to 22, inclusive.

The other members of the delegation appointed were Congressmen HAYS, of Ohio; ANFUSO, of New York; UDALL, of Arizona; JOHNSON, of California; and CRUMPACKER, of Indiana. In accordance with the resolutions adopted by the House, we left for France on Saturday, July 16. Starting on Monday morning, July 18, we attended the first session held at the Palais Chaillot.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it very important that Members of the Congress know what took place and the results of this Conference, as well as the feelings and individual reactions of the six Members of the House of Representatives who attended.

The Conference was called to order and selected Senator Wishart Robertson, of Canada, as president.

After the meeting was organized in the conference room where the 15 NATO countries were represented, the Conference got underway with a discussion of the amount of good arising from such meetings of the parliamentarians of the NATO countries.

It was agreed that no particular subject matter would be discussed other than this until such time as an approval could be had by the various parliaments and Congress to set up a permanent parliamentary conference to meet once a year.

After listening to these discussions for several days and having the opportunity of off-the-record discussions after the formal sessions were over, I came to the absolute conclusion that a permanent organized conference of this kind would serve a great purpose, as all matters affecting NATO could be discussed by the members of parliaments and Congress, and a report made to the Congress by the delegates rather than the second-hand reports that we are now receiving.

I also had the opportunity to meet in a friendly way with the members of the various parliaments, putting everything on a very friendly basis.

One whole morning was spent at the headquarters of SHAPE where a complete briefing was given us by the following:

The Supreme Military Commander of NATO: Gen. Alfred Gruenther.

The deputy commanders: Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery, Gen. Pierre Brissac, Adm. Georgio Gay.

I could not help being extremely satisfied that this is a competent military defense organization for the free countries of Europe and the United States and that great strides have been made to prevent any aggression. I believe the organization of NATO and its military organization SHAPE under NATO is doing a very competent job of preserving the peace as well as promoting the economic welfare of the countries involved.

The final windup of the Conference was to adopt a resolution making the parliamentary conference a permanent organization. This resolution is to be submitted by the various delegates to their parliaments and Congress. Quite a discussion arose for the admittance of Spain into the NATO organization, and there was much favor in this regard.

The delegates of Portugal were going to press this point and there were several other matters the delegates believed were important to discuss, just as it was my firm intention to take up the matter of article VII of the Status of Forces Treaty whereby the agreement permits the prosecution of American GI's in foreign courts. However, due to the unanimous opinion of the parliamentarians that no discussion take place on matters affecting the treaty until a permanent organization was established, the other delegates and I agreed to set these matters aside.

In private discussions, however, I explored the matter and hope that sometime in the near future this matter will be discussed and some favorable action can be taken so that our GI's serving in foreign lands will have the full protection of the United States Constitution to which they are justly entitled.

I am sure this has the backing of the American people.

All 15 countries of NATO were represented by large delegations of their members of parliament, and there is no doubt in my mind whatever when I say to you in all sincerity that as members of legislative bodies everyone spoke very frankly. As the Conference developed, one could readily observe that any slight tensions that may have existed at the beginning of the Conference had completely disappeared. One could readily see that there was understanding and appreciation of the various parliaments of the member countries.

During the course of the week a special committee was appointed with one member from each delegation to draw up a resolution requesting their various parliaments to form a permanent NATO parliamentary organization, and several different resolutions were introduced. Out of these the committee reported unanimously a resolution which was adopted by the 15 delegations present. I am incorporating this resolution at this point:

This meeting of members of parliament from NATO countries:

Recalling that the aim of the North Atlantic Treaty is both to ensure the defense of member states and to contribute to the economic, social, and cultural development of the peoples united within the framework of the Atlantic Community;

Considering that achievement of the aims would be facilitated by closer relations between the members of the representative assemblies of the different countries and considering that this is particularly desirable in the case of the legislative branches of the member states who have by solemn treaty pledged themselves to the mutual defense and welfare of their respective peoples through the far-reaching initiative in international relations that is NATO;

Believing that these discussions between members and the NATO authorities and be-