

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1955

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

God of all grace, Thou has ordained that not in cushioned seats of safety and ease, but in danger and stern conflict and in contending for the things which are more precious to us than life itself, shall we find our strength and our triumph in these days when all mankind stands in the Valley of Decision. For a part and a place on the side of human dignity and truth and decency in the raging struggle against the powers of darkness and the principalities of evil, God of freedom and of justice, we give Thee thanks.

Make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world. Arm us with the sword which is the might of Thy love, and with the shield which is Thine invincible truth, against which all the spears of hate cannot ultimately prevail. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 1, and Monday, April 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 5, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 465) for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford.

PUBLIC UTILITY RELOCATION INCIDENT TO HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 127)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the follow-

ing message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 5, 1955.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Secretary of Commerce was directed by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 to make a study of problems posed by the relocation of utility facilities resulting from improvements under Federal highway programs, and to submit a report to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

I am transmitting herewith a report entitled "Public Utility Relocation Incident to Highway Improvement," which has been submitted to me by the Secretary of Commerce.

Respectfully yours,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to order of the Senate of April 1, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on April 2, 1955, he had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4436) relating to the use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 1, 1955,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 12, 1955, reported favorably with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 136) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Refugees of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make before I suggest the absence of a quorum. I plan to ask unanimous consent for the consideration today of the bill making appropriations for the

Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States. If that unanimous consent is granted, and if action is concluded on that bill, it is planned to take up Calendar No. 125, a bill to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent; Calendar No. 126, a bill (S. 460) to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers; Calendar No. 132, a bill (S. 800) to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay"; Calendar No. 133, a bill (S. 35) to permit the transportation in the mails of live scorpions; Calendar No. 134, a bill (S. 1137) to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army; Calendar No. 135, a bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; and Calendar No. 136, a bill (S. 1600) to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit.

It is also possible that if word is received from the Senator who objected when the bill was reached on the calendar, and if it is agreeable with him, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 121, a bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

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

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I ask unanimous consent that after the Senate completes its morning business it proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 137, a bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is, of course, rather unusual to bring up such a bill at this time and take immediate action, but the Treasury-Post Office bill is so general that the Senator from New Hampshire, as the ranking minority member of the committee, would have no objection to having it taken up for consideration today. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], spoke to me earlier about the matter. I see no reason why the bill should not be taken up today.

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

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 10 years ago this week the greatest man of our generation was laid to rest at Hyde Park, and the whole Nation went into mourning.

A pall of gloom spread over the country and crossed the seas to far distant lands where American soldiers, sailors, and airmen were fighting for freedom. The whole free world felt a sense of shock. Only dictators and tyrants rejoiced.

A decade later, this is still one of the most melancholy of our anniversaries. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was fashioned from the stuff of greatness, and his passing left an empty, lonesome space against the sky.

The problems with which he struggled were mighty, and he met them as only a great leader can. Sometimes he made mistakes—great mistakes—but only a man who avoids great problems altogether can avoid great errors altogether.

It is difficult in this mid-decade of the 20th century to recall the feeling of hopelessness and helplessness that held our country in bondage at the time he first assumed the Presidential office.

Our people could see no hope; no confidence; no future. Around us there was nothing but foreclosures; idle factories; food and fiber rotting in the fields while children went hungry and unclad. Poverty had ceased to be a spur to achievement, and had become merely an incentive to lethargy.

Into this welter of gloom strode a man with confidence in America—a man who could speak the true voice of courage and hope. In his inaugural address, he told the country that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

It was a trumpet call to action. A nation prostrate rose to its feet and began to march. The wheels of industry turned once again—sometimes grinding and clashing, but still turning. Our soil became a blessing which could produce food and fiber instead of mortgages and foreclosures.

The years that followed were hectic and sometimes feverish. The great social reforms of the New Deal burst upon the Nation at an unprecedented rate. A new principle was written into the country's philosophy, a principle best stated by the President himself.

We have always known that needless self-interest was bad morals—

He said—

We know now that it is bad economics.

He also said that:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

The spirit that bested the depression also conquered the Axis Powers, even though the architect of victory himself passed away before the victory was con-

summated. But in a real sense, the spirit never died, because it was compounded of the courage and the determination of the American people.

Ten years later, Franklin Delano Roosevelt is still a controversial figure. He is still a man about whom much is argued and little is settled. But it is a real test of his greatness that even now there are those who feel compelled to descend into his grave to debate endlessly the questions of his times.

As one who was close to him, I myself do not believe that he would carry on such debates. He always met the problems of the present with the zest and enthusiasm of a true leader. The problems of the past he left to those whose sole concern is kicking over the ashes of long-dead fires.

Although I frequently disagreed with Franklin D. Roosevelt—in fact, I cast one of my first votes as a Member of Congress against him—I always recognized in him the greatness of his leadership. His role in history we cannot determine now. But we know it will loom large.

It is fitting and proper that we commemorate the anniversary of his passing. In so doing, we will be in tune with the millions of Americans who never swerved in their allegiance to him despite the detractors and the muck rakers of history.

But the greatest tribute we could pay would be to dedicate ourselves to the problems of the present. The greatest honor we could bestow would be to resolve that we shall face the enemies of America in 1955 in the same spirit he displayed in facing depression and the Axis powers. As united Americans, we could once again demonstrate to the world that we have banished fear from our hearts and resumed our role as the confident leaders of the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the April 12 issue of the New York Times.

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

AFTER 10 YEARS

It is 10 years today since Franklin D. Roosevelt died. His memorials are not in bronze alone, nor in stone. They are in international policies which grew out of those he followed. They are in the United Nations, to which he gave the name and to whose principles, forecast in the Atlantic Charter and outlined at Dumbarton Oaks and in what was good in the Yalta agreements, he subscribed. They are ironically outstanding in the very fact that after 10 years he is still a center of controversy and that some of the things he did and said at Yalta are as hotly debated as though he were likely to be again a candidate for the Presidency.

It would be futile, at this time, to compare Franklin D. Roosevelt with other Presidents. But the truth is, because of the very nature of this generation's historical trends, that he remains in the current of events. He is alive as few men, however influential, have ever been 10 years after they passed from this earth.

He is alive because his principles and his hopes are still at stake. He did not invent the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan and its successors, the North Atlantic Treaty

Organization, point four, technical assistance, or the policy which now attempts to turn Germany and Japan from beaten enemies into allies in defense. Yet the union of the free world was his dream and his conception of necessity.

He had his moments of error. He was sometimes overconfident. Circumstances compelled him to look at the future out of the confusion of an armed struggle. He did not live to see the final victory. He did not live to see the Communist betrayal of that victory. He never had to face the full implications of the atomic age. Today's schoolboy could tell Mr. Roosevelt things he did not know.

Nevertheless the influence of this man persists. Let anyone who finds himself within sight of mid-Manhattan's East River skyline lift up his eyes: there, against the light, are buildings constructed out of the faith for which Mr. Roosevelt in his high moments eloquently spoke. There stands the visible United Nations: imperfect, echoing discords as well as harmonies, providing a forum for the world's disputes, carrying on almost in silence a great struggle against hunger and disease. There it stands, and he helped build it. This is his monument, quite as much as that humble slab at Hyde Park where many pilgrims pause, day in and day out, to do him honor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. Few men of history have made such an impact on the people, the Nation, and the world as did Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He was chosen by the people to lead at a time when they faced despair, hunger, and frustration. He warned against fear, and through forcefulness and action he turned away fear and brought hope to the people.

He led them out of the morass of depression, and spoke for them as they faced the tyranny of fascism.

As stated by the majority leader, there are some who would try to detract from Franklin Delano Roosevelt's deeds and his memory. But he will live on in posterity.

It was a great Kentuckian who said:

If I were to read, must less answer, all the attacks made on me, this shop might as well be closed for any other business. I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out all wrong, 10 angels swearing I was right, would make no difference.

Historians will continue to record the greatness of our 32d President long after his critics fade from this life and even as they, themselves, fade from the pages of history.

As we pay honor to this great American here today, we rejoice in the announcement of the Salk vaccine, which may well conquer another of the dreaded diseases—a disease which Roosevelt fought and conquered and which he worked so hard to see conquered in all others. This is fitting, for he would have it this way. We have conquered fear again, and in his memory we look forward to a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion, there has never

been a greater American than Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He came upon the scene in the United States at a time when we were not only on the verge of sinking out of existence, but in danger in every field of activity. Senators may think that today we are in danger of communism. On March 4, 1933, we were in much greater danger than we are in today. President Roosevelt faced that situation in the right way.

Let us consider some of the things he did. All the banks in the United States were closed. Today there are upon the statute books laws which protect every depositor. I give Franklin Delano Roosevelt credit for that. I also remind Senators that he was the one who had placed upon the statute books of the United States our social-security laws. At that time there was a great deal of opposition to placing upon the books laws for the protection of the common people.

In the field of labor, the wage and hour law was enacted at the insistence of President Roosevelt. Until he came into office the farmers of the United States had practically no protection. Today we talk about floors and supports under the prices of various commodities. Until Roosevelt came upon the scene and did something for the farmers of our Nation, there were no supports.

Turning to another field, unemployment compensation is a great backlog to protect us in the event of large-scale unemployment. If it had not been for unemployment compensation, social-security legislation, and increased retirement allowances, in my opinion, we would have suffered a depression long before this.

Mr. President, I believe that Franklin Delano Roosevelt will go down in history as one of the greatest men who ever lived in the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we are returning to a session of Congress which bids fair to be heavily controversial. We are returning from an Easter recess which should have impressed upon every one of us the value of peace, quietude, restraint, consideration of others, and cooperative endeavor, and the value of mutual respect, each of us for the others. At this moment it is peculiarly fitting and timely that we make brief mention of the anniversary of the passing of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was an exceedingly controversial figure, and always will be such, in the annals of our history. However, the fact remains that when he assumed the Presidency, he had courage to lead us through unknown fields and in untried directions, in the effort to solve problems which bore down tragically upon the Nation.

We have such problems now, Mr. President. I am hoping that there may come a challenge and an inspiration to us, as we resume this session, to attack these problems in somewhat the same way that Franklin Delano Roosevelt attacked the problems of his day, upon a nonpartisan basis. Many Members of Congress acted upon such a basis at that time.

I recall that one of the distinguished Senators from Florida at that time, Senator Duncan U. Fletcher, was known as a lifelong conservative. At the express

invitation of the President he abandoned the chairmanship of a committee which would have been his own preference, to become Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because so many of the reforms which were apparently needed lay in the field of the jurisdiction of that committee. I recall that he stated to some of us who were his dearest friends in Florida that he felt that it was a time for conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, and indeed all Americans to get together and try to solve the problems which then bore so heavily upon the hearts and consciences of the people of this Nation.

From that committee came some measures which have not survived the test of time. Many more came from that committee which are now a permanent part of our economy and of our American way of doing things. I refer to such measures as the Securities and Exchange Commission legislation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act; and such measures as those which very largely reorganized our entire banking system. I refer to such measures as the Home Owners Loan Corporation Act, which afforded to many millions of our citizens of all creeds and all varieties of political persuasion an opportunity to save their homes. I refer to such measures as the Federal Housing Administration Act, which later succeeded the Home Owners Loan Corporation, which was more or less of an emergency agency designed to meet the terrible problems of debt which weighed upon home owners as an incident of the depression.

As we survey the number of measures which have become a part of our American system and our American way of life, measures which came from a committee headed by a life-long conservative who gave up his own earnest desire of a lifetime to serve as chairman of another committee in order to furnish the kind of leadership which was needed, we should all take renewed inspiration at this time in striving to meet the challenge of our day.

In addition to furnishing leadership in the economic fields which I have mentioned, and in other fields which have been mentioned by my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and by the distinguished majority leader from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], this Nation should never forget the great hope which President Roosevelt inspired in those who were afflicted, those who had been visited with grave disease or infirmity. He came back from the devastating blow which was dealt to him by polio, to become a great Governor of New York and then a great President, at a time of unparalleled crisis in the history of our Nation.

I doubt if there is a Member of the Senate who was not called upon in those early days, either as Governor of his State, or in some other capacity, to take some part in the leadership of the March of Dimes campaign, or the campaign to establish and maintain the Warm Springs Foundation. I know that every other Member of the Senate must have felt deeply, as did the Senator from Florida, the exaltation of spirit resulting

from the announcement made yesterday of the discovery of what appears to be a cure or a preventive of polio, which gives renewed hope to millions of our children and young people in American homes which have been endangered each year by that devastating disease.

In this time of rejoicing because of that discovery and its tremendous impact on the lives of our people, we should not forget for a moment that that great development has come out of the shadows which beset the life of Franklin Roosevelt, and that in a very real way he was the leader from whose inspiration and from whose example our people, working together, without thought of politics or any other differences of any sort, have made it possible for this tremendous discovery to be made, which discovery is of such great import to all of us, as it will be of equally great import to all the peoples of the earth. Therefore, at this time of apparent victory over polio, I do not believe that we should forget the part that Franklin Roosevelt played in that unceasing battle against disease and death.

Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, and other Senators, in commemorating this 10th anniversary of President Roosevelt's death.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the majority leader and with the other Senators who have spoken with kindness and with truth of the life of that great man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I recall very vividly the night before President Truman recognized Israel as an independent nation. At that time I made some remarks at a meeting held in Madison Square Garden, in New York, before an assembly of approximately 25,000 or 30,000 people. They realized that the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt still lived.

The impact of his life on those who knew him best and those who had worked with him was well known.

Because of Franklin D. Roosevelt the American people are happier and in better condition. Because of him the farmer is better off, the home owner is in better condition, and the laborer is in better shape. More social and economic progress was made under his administration than in the 100 years prior to his taking office.

Let us not forget that his spirit is still with us. We cannot say too much about him. We can entertain the hope that the way of progress he pointed out, the American way of life he brought to millions of people, and what he did to improve the American standard of living, will continue.

I am proud of the fact that I participated in a small way in bringing about all the legislation that has been referred to today—legislation providing for rural electrification, hospitalization, home security, good wages.

I know what I am talking about. I have seen human beings work for \$1.25 for 12 hours. I have seen the conditions under which miners worked. We think about the miners when there is an explosion in a mine in West Virginia or Kentucky or Illinois. Unless there is

some emergency we do not think about them or about the wages they used to receive.

I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last evening, as I watched the Edward R. Murrow television program, which featured the announcement of the discovery of the highly effective serum which will be used in the battle against polio, I was very vividly reminded of the striking example of human courage which was afforded in American history by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was stricken at the height of his physical powers and thereafter subjected to extreme physical limitations for the remainder of his life. In spite of that he became President of the United States not only once but several times, during some of the most critical days of our country's entire history. To carry on with fortitude and courage of soul and heart and mind as Franklin D. Roosevelt did is a striking example to all of our people, particularly our youth. He is a splendid illustration of a courageous man with a steadfast purpose, the type that has always been necessary in our Nation, and which is even more necessary today than ever before.

While thinking along that line I thought, too, as the Senator from Florida did, of those days in March and April and May of 1933, when I lived in a small town in Mississippi. My office was in the county courthouse, and daily I saw people with their problems. I saw on the faces of those people, not only in my county but in other counties as well, their expressions of despair and almost hopelessness. I had active connection with a small bank, which brought me into contact with their financial problems. I saw the establishment of the FDIC, largely brought about in those dark days through the efforts of President Roosevelt. It immediately affected the people and their problems. They felt like trying again.

It resulted in helping to stabilize our economy and restore confidence. It helped small banks as well as large banks to take a new start. This program has been of the most far-reaching consequences, and continues right on to this day.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to join in the expressions of appreciation of some of the contributions which our late President made in those difficult times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the American people cherish today the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt and are grateful for his life. I venture to predict that they will continue to be grateful for many decades to come.

HIS COMPASSION THE RESULT OF GRAVE ILLNESS

As we look back upon the career of Franklin D. Roosevelt, after a decade, it now seems that the crippling effect of polio which he suffered in 1921 was the turning point in his life. Facing death and permanent paralysis, he was transformed from the charming young man of fortune into a courageous battler who could fight death and a crippling disability with a smile. It made him unafraid. Having looked death in the

face and what might be worse than death, and having conquered both by efforts stimulated by courage, it gave him also a fellow feeling for all those who were in trouble, for the sick, the needy, and those who were bowed under life's heavy load. That fellow feeling is sometimes difficult for a Hudson River squire to appreciate.

THE NATION'S PERIL WHEN ROOSEVELT BECAME PRESIDENT

When he came to the Presidency he found the Nation in greater trouble than ever before in our history, with the possible exception of the period of the Civil War. There were nearly 16 million persons unemployed. Industry, agriculture, and commerce had broken down. Starvation threatened our land, despite all of our great productive power. The leaders of industry, and the bankers had lost confidence in themselves, and the tinder of discontent was heaped high and could have turned into a blaze which would have destroyed our democratic institutions. Almost like a bolt of apocalyptic lightning and thunder most banks were closed on the eve of his taking office.

ROOSEVELT'S MEASURES FOR RECOVERY AND REFORM

Roosevelt largely reversed all of this. The Government stepped in to protect the people from starvation, offering work wherever possible. The Public Works Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Works Progress Administration, and the National Youth Administration, so bitterly criticized at the time, not only gave work and life, but also resulted in the construction of a myriad of useful public buildings and works which have enabled Federal, State, and local governments to be of much greater service to the people. If we could know all the works which were constructed during that decade, if there were appropriate plaques placed upon them, we would vividly realize that they have more than paid for themselves. A major degree of recovery was effected, and the people and the country were saved.

At the same time a series of far-reaching and long-delayed reforms were started. The banks were reopened. Small depositors were protected in their deposits. Those whose farms and homes were about to be foreclosed were given new hope. Issue houses were compelled to tell the truth about the securities they floated, despite the statements of certain Wall Street men that this would ruin the investment banking business. Some of the worst abuses in connection with the manipulation of the stock market were prevented. The hold of the private banks upon the Federal Reserve System was reduced. Investment in housing for the middle-income groups was encouraged by the creation of Federal Housing Administration.

Farmers were protected from the disastrous fall in farm prices and were helped to their feet. For the first time a modern program of soil conservation was placed in operation. Electricity was brought to farms. The Tennessee Valley Authority was started.

In the field of labor the wage earners of the country were largely protected against the difficulties of old age and unemployment by the Social Security Act. In the same year, 1935, workingmen were given the effective right to join unions without fear of being discharged, and the right to bargain collectively if a majority of the workers in a given factory or unit so decided.

In 1938 the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed fixing the minimum wage at 25 cents an hour. Even this was bitterly opposed.

I may say, Mr. President, that the crucial battles which were the prelude to the passage of that act were largely won by the victory of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the primaries of that State in 1938, and on the same day there was a similar victory in the State of Florida. These were great achievements, and they admitted the wage earners of the country to first-class citizenship.

So, Mr. President, a great program of both reform and recovery was carried out in the period from 1933 to 1938.

ROOSEVELT LEADS AMERICA FROM ISOLATION TO THE PROTECTION OF LIBERTY

In the same period the war clouds in Europe were gathering. The totalitarian party came to power in Italy in 1922. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria and, despite the efforts of a great American who was then Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, the hands of the United States Government were tied so far as active prevention was concerned.

In 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany, and the dictators soon launched a program of aggression. Ethiopia was invaded by Mussolini in 1935. The Rhineland was reoccupied by Hitler in the winter of 1936. Civil war broke out in Spain in the same year. Austria was taken by Hitler in February and March of 1938. The first partition of Czechoslovakia occurred in the fall of 1938; the second partition took place in the spring of 1939.

What was America to do under those circumstances? Was she to hold herself aloof and wrap herself in isolation? To have done that would have meant that a sea of tyranny would have engulfed Europe and the world. America would have been isolated. Ultimately it would have been necessary for the United States to engage in a war in which we would have fought alone, with our backs to the wall, and with the future of the Nation and the people at stake and with the odds against us.

Two great statesmen saw this danger: Winston Churchill, in Great Britain, who never ceased to criticize the appeasement policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain from the floor of the House of Commons; and Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the United States.

I remember standing in Chicago in October 1937, when President Roosevelt dedicated the outer bridge and said that in the future aggressors should be quarantined. That was a profound, statesmanlike declaration, but it was greeted with opposition from most of the people and the press of the country, and also from the opposing political party. It was

clear that America had not yet recognized the danger.

But as surrender followed surrender, and finally when Great Britain and France, at the very last minute, recognized the danger which was close upon them, the United States began to be more concerned.

Then came the fall of France and the seizure of Western Europe in May and June of 1940. Russia, we all remember, was at the time leagued with Nazi Germany. Hitler was supreme over the European world, with only the English Channel barring him from Great Britain.

In the summer of 1940, with a presidential election impending, Roosevelt took a courageous step. He gave to Great Britain 50 over-age destroyers in return for bases in the Caribbean and in other parts of the new world. He sent to Great Britain large quantities of obsolete small arms adapted to British use, which gave Great Britain the physical means of resistance.

Then came the election of President Roosevelt to a third term. In 1941 he proposed lend-lease, and the United States began to furnish arms and equipment to our allies on a large scale.

ROOSEVELT A GREAT WAR PRESIDENT

On December 7, 1941, came Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt threw the full resources of the Nation into a struggle for liberty. He drew no party lines. He had already brought into the Government two of the most eminent men in the Republican Party to head the Department of War and the Department of the Navy. My friend and fellow Illinoisan, Frank Knox, headed the Department of the Navy, while the noble Henry Stimson became Secretary of War.

Roosevelt was a great war President. With tremendous energy, he secured the 50,000 planes a year which he had said would be needed and which some people had said it would be impossible to get. He brought us victory. He had the discernment to appoint George Marshall, who was 33d on the list, to be Commanding General of the Armies; and he picked out an obscure lieutenant colonel and made him commander of the forces in the field in Europe, thus starting Dwight D. Eisenhower on the road to fame. He made a multitude of military decisions, most of them have proved right. He gave precedence to the struggle for Europe. He decided Russia would not give in. He insisted on an offensive. He developed the atom bomb. In a multitude of other cases he was also right.

A man who has been President of the United States for more than 12 years, who has had tens of thousands of important decisions thrust upon him, inevitably makes mistakes. It should not be pretended that Franklin Roosevelt did not make mistakes. I think the NRA was a mistake, and I believe President Roosevelt himself thought so in later years.

I think the manner in which he tried to change the face of the Supreme Court probably was a mistake; although it should never be forgotten that closely following upon that attempt came the famous switch of Mr. Justice Roberts which transformed what everyone

thought would be unfavorable decisions in the minimum wage, social security, and Wagner Act cases into favorable decisions; so, to use baseball parlance, Franklin Roosevelt may have made a sacrifice hit and bunted in three runs.

It is true that Roosevelt probably overestimated the desire of Russia for peace and that he made certain concessions which perhaps should not have been made. I do not intend to discuss the Yalta papers at great length today, because to do so would take too much time. I can only say that, in the main, the steps which were taken in Europe and Asia probably would have been about the same no matter what was agreed upon at Yalta, because Russia already was in military possession of Eastern Europe and was ready to move into Manchuria and Korea.

We do not say that Roosevelt was a perfect man. Of course, he was not. He was handicapped, as all of us are handicapped, by certain elements in background and training. But, taking all in all, he was a noble American, and I think one of the handful of truly great American Presidents.

While there may be elements in society who would dance upon his grave and traduce his memory, as even now some are carrying on a campaign against him, I wish to say, that, with the passage of time, his name will stand out.

Mr. President, a grateful people pay tribute to Franklin Roosevelt today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the basic characteristic of Franklin D. Roosevelt was confidence in his country and its people.

Mr. Roosevelt believed in forward-looking policies and a dynamic America, economically as well as politically. He believed such policies were essential for our future, and were essential to the prosperity and security of both the United States and the rest of the free world.

Of even more importance, Mr. Roosevelt was able to implant his brilliant optimism into the minds and hearts of the people he represented. There was no faltering, no retreat.

Under his leadership America fought and won the war forced upon us at Pearl Harbor. At the same time, his leadership gave to the people the highest standard of living ever known in any land.

Franklin Roosevelt worked against ignorance, by striving for ever more education for all the people. He worked against tyranny by striving for individual and national freedom—economic freedom as well as political freedom.

He worked against poverty, in all countries, because he knew that poverty is the breeding ground of the greatest of all dangers to those who would be free—ideologies which turn man into but a servant of his state.

In the abiding optimism of Franklin Roosevelt lies the future of our country. If we falter, if we let events form policies, instead of creating policies which form events, there is little chance of maintaining the American way of life. But if we follow the star of his abiding confidence in America, we will pass on

to our children an even greater heritage than the one bequeathed to us at the time of his death.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished majority leader upon the very eloquent, timely, and deserving tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt which he has delivered.

One could say so many things, one could characterize in so many different ways, the elements of greatness of the late President that is impossible to undertake a comprehensive treatment of his character, work, and record in a brief time.

By his vision, courage, and leadership, Franklin Roosevelt brought hope to millions of despairing, depressed, and despondent souls. Because of his boldness, America today is ahead in atomic development. Having had some small connection with that program, I know something of the decisions which President Roosevelt made, the chances he took, the courage he displayed, and the boldness of his vision that led to the atomic weapons which saved so many hundreds of thousands of lives of Americans.

Mr. President, there is a little story I wish to tell. In 1945 I had dinner with General Stilwell on Okinawa. The war in the Pacific was then in its crescendo. General Stilwell told us in general terms about where the landing was expected to be made in Japan. He gave us an indication of the date when the assault would be undertaken. It was imminent. Across the Pacific we had witnessed the gathering of the fleets and the marshaling of men and armaments. While in the quonset hut the air-raid signal screamed, and General Stilwell told us that it would be a very costly assault, but he thought it would be successful. I shall never forget the shudder I felt when he said that we could expect 500,000 American casualties from an assault upon the Japanese islands.

Mr. President, on the return trip of the congressional committee of which I was a member, when we landed in Hawaii only 5 days after General Stilwell had given us that estimate, the headlines all told about the dropping of the atom bomb. Two days later, when we landed in California, the headlines in the papers proclaimed the efforts of Japan to bring about her surrender.

I think of those 500,000 American boys who were not casualties. That weapon which ended the war with Japan was a product, in a very realistic sense, of the boldness of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was one of the great leaders of America, one of the great Presidents of our country, and one of the men in all of world history who has indelibly imprinted himself upon the minds, the hearts, the consciences, and the memories of all his contemporaries and upon the history of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his very generous remarks.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for his very beautiful and timely tribute to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have this morning been

engaged in a meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, during which we talked of the recent epochal development in the prevention and cure of poliomyelitis, the marvelous vaccine given to us through the inspired genius and devoted efforts of Dr. Jonas E. Salk.

We know the story of Franklin Roosevelt, stricken down with polio, of his long and determined struggle to win against that dread malady, and of the victory which he won, but we were impressed this morning by the thought that he was not satisfied to win just for himself. He was not satisfied that he might be restored to health and strength; that it might be made possible for him to go forward and lead a useful and great life. Franklin Roosevelt continued the struggle that all the sons of men—that all our children—might some day be protected from this dread disease, and that those who were so unfortunate as to contract the disease might be able to defeat it, save their lives, keep whole their bodies, and not have to go down the road of death or down life's highway with crippled and broken bodies.

It was the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, founded by Franklin Roosevelt—an association which came into being as a result of his vision, faith, resolution, and leadership—which provided the funds and the resources which made it possible for Dr. Salk to carry on his great work and searching experiments and to develop the marvelous vaccine which has just been tested and proven true. The founding of this organization illustrated the heart and the character of Franklin Roosevelt, the humanity of the man, how his great heart and strong arms reached out wherever there was suffering, wherever people were in distress, and how again and again he sought to bring them relief and the help which they so desperately needed. He was seeking always to serve his fellow man.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs during the late World War, and in that position I had an opportunity to see the magnificent and inspired leadership of Franklin Roosevelt. It would not be possible to enumerate all his contributions to the winning of that war for the United States and for all people who cherish liberty and love freedom. In fact, he was our great leader in the winning of two wars. The first, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so eloquently described, was the war against economic distress, economic suffering, and economic collapse here at home.

The distinguished majority leader spoke of the day when Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated, when he proclaimed to the Nation that we had nothing to fear except fear itself. At that time our American system—yes, the capitalistic system of our America—stood on the brink of disaster. Confidence was shattered. Hope had left the hearts of men. When Franklin Roosevelt, the brave, the bold, the dauntless leader, sounded the battle cry to go forth to win this war for America, a new light came into the faces of the Ameri-

can people. They were inspired, they responded, and they rallied, and under his gallant leadership and the great programs that he gave us we restored America's strength, her power, and her dynamic spirit.

Mr. President, at the end of World War II I happened to be 1 of 4 Senators—along with Senator Ball, of Minnesota; Senator Burton, of Ohio; and Senator Hatch, of New Mexico—who joined in the submission of the first resolution calling for the United States to take the lead in the formation of an international organization for law and peace. The encouragement, support, and faith of Franklin D. Roosevelt moved us to press for the adoption of that resolution, and resulted in having this body take action leading to the creation of the United Nations.

Mr. President, today I pay my tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt as a friend and as a mighty leader—a man of faith, of vision, of courage, of resolution, of wisdom in great affairs.

As the distinguished majority leader has said, today it is not possible for us to determine the exact place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in history; but we do know that he will stand as one of the foremost men in all the history of the world.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in complimenting our distinguished majority leader upon his timely and eloquent tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt knew well the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Early in the career of our distinguished majority leader, President Roosevelt recognized in LYNDON JOHNSON the qualities of leadership, of statesmanship, and of high political morality and purpose which have so markedly characterized his public career since that time, and which now bring into fulfillment his gift to our party and to the country, as majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. President, LYNDON JOHNSON knew well Franklin Roosevelt. Although LYNDON JOHNSON was then a very young man, between the two there existed a very deep and warm friendship and a mutually shared affection. So it is, Mr. President, that some of us who in those days served in the House of Representatives know that when the distinguished senior Senator from Texas speaks of Franklin Roosevelt, he speaks with a full heart.

I also wish to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in his impressive and eloquent tribute to Franklin Roosevelt, speaks with great knowledge and as a result of close association. As I recall, he had the honor of being selected by the then President Roosevelt to nominate him at the convention of the Democratic Party in 1940, in the city of the distinguished Senator from Illinois—Chicago.

Of course, Mr. President, in the limited time available today, it is utterly impossible to begin to portray or properly eulogize or describe the life, works, and qualities of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. President, the triumphant announcement yesterday of the tremendous success of Dr. Salk's antipolio vaccine experiments came most appropriately and

fittingly on the 10th anniversary of the death of our beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt—the one man who, more than any other American, was responsible for our acute consciousness in recent years of the ghastly ravages and devastating waste in human resources of the fearful disease from which he suffered. This newest scientific conquest is but one more laurel, Mr. President, to be added to the memory of that great American whose historic role it is still too early, perhaps, to evaluate completely.

But, Mr. President, regardless of political differences, I believe that no American, of whatever political faith or persuasion, can fail to recognize, nor can he refuse to acknowledge, the indomitable courage of Franklin Roosevelt and his imagination, translated into action, in freeing the Nation from the paralyzing stranglehold of one of the worst depressions the world has known and in successfully insulating us against the inevitability of recurring depressions by inaugurating far-reaching measures and securing the enactment of more social legislation than has any other President, either before or since. Nor is it too early to recognize and acknowledge his great leadership in bringing us through the worst war of all time, or his vision in creating the United Nations as our most effective weapon against another world war and our most hopeful instrument for securing international peace.

Today we are grateful, and we pause to give thanks to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt for his part in promoting our victory over polio, and for the hope and inspiration he provided, not only to the victims, but to the research scientists in their efforts to conquer that disease. I am confident that the ensuing years will continue to augment the glorious laurels to his credit, and our eternal indebtedness and everlasting gratitude to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the majority leader for the very excellent statement he has made and for giving the first of the tributes today paid to the great Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and I desire to join all my colleagues who have paid their tribute to the memory of that great President, one of America's greatest men—in fact, one of the world's greatest men.

Mr. President, most of the things we usually think of in connection with President Roosevelt have already been said today by Members of the Senate, and I do not care to burden the Senate by taking the time to repeat them. But if there is one outstanding characteristic of President Roosevelt, I believe it is that he, perhaps more than any other person, succeeded in banishing fear and developing hope in the hearts of men.

The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], spoke a few minutes ago about all the work which President Roosevelt did to change the thinking of a world which had more or less drifted into a defeatist attitude. His work was effective not only in the economic field, but in the political situation of practically the entire world. He was never one to be a defeatist. Instead, he worked and

spoke and did everything he could to drive away fear and build up hope.

I shall never forget his first inaugural address. I remember very well where I was. I was a practicing lawyer in my hometown of Huntsville. I remember stopping in the street outside a business place on my way from the courthouse to listen to the inaugural address. It greatly impressed me. If I correctly remember, it lasted 12 minutes. I believe it was the shortest inaugural address which had been delivered up to that time, and perhaps was even shorter than any since delivered. The thing in that address which impressed me was the challenge to people not to be afraid, to work to abolish fear and build up hope. Somehow or other we could sense the spirit of those who heard that address. They walked away with a new feeling of hope, a feeling that there was someone who could give them hope and lead them out of their difficulties. We know the magnificent work which President Roosevelt did in that connection.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], spoke of some of the programs of President Roosevelt. The Senator from Florida mentioned one particular program to which I think sometimes we do not pay enough attention. Perhaps we are prone to forget it. I refer to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, a daring program, one which I dare say few people would ever have been willing to conceive or put into effect. That program did a great deal to support our crashing economy and to hold it until a positive plan could be devised to underpin it.

In a small way I had a connection with the Home Owners Loan Corporation, at the county level. I was one of the two men in our county who administered the program. I used to visit the homes of the people who were making application for loans. I was a field appraiser. I would check the property to ascertain the conditions, not only from a physical standpoint, but with reference to the arrearages in payments on mortgages. In many of those homes I saw little besides despair. Yet we were administering a program which was coming to their relief, a program to give them hope once more, and to help raise them up.

I could detail many other programs which Franklin Delano Roosevelt dared to put into effect. I might mention the many things which he did in connection with the war, but I do not wish unduly to extend these remarks. Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought hope to the people in time of great economic distress. It has been stressed here today many times that he brought hope not only to polio victims, but to physically handicapped persons everywhere, who saw the tremendous physical handicap which he had mastered. He gave hope to a world that was on fire. Even after the time came when it was apparent that the fire would be put out, he offered hope against a recurrence.

The greatest monument that could be erected to any man stands today to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, not only in one spot, but all over the world where freedom-loving people live.

I was in Alabama when President Roosevelt died. I went there to make a Jefferson Day speech. I remember coming into the hotel the afternoon when he passed away, and hearing the announcement on the radio. That was the first indication I had received of his death. I remember the feeling of sadness and sorrow in the hearts of the people.

We all remember the story of the journey of his funeral train as it came back from Warm Springs. People gathered silently along the tracks, not merely at the railroad stations, but everywhere. The people were weeping because they knew that the greatest friend the ordinary man had had in a long time had died.

Franklin D. Roosevelt lives today in the hearts of the people everywhere. That is the tribute which the people paid to him—the greatest tribute that can be paid to anyone.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to speak of Franklin D. Roosevelt at the very time when one of his great hopes and aims has been fulfilled, namely, victory over the dread disease which struck him down in the day of his greatest strength. I know that the winning of the fight against poliomyelitis was nearer his heart than almost anything else save the security, prosperity, and welfare of his country.

I shall not try to write a biography of Franklin D. Roosevelt today on the floor of the Senate. I wish to make my remarks in a personal vein, because I believe I knew Franklin Roosevelt better than did anyone else who is a Member of this body today.

Franklin Roosevelt was, above all things, my friend. As I recall, I first met him during the First World War, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and I was, for a time, associated with the Navy Department.

The friendship that began then deepened and grew stronger through the years as the broad stream of public service brought us closer and closer together.

My first political mentor in New York was Al Smith, whose follower and supporter I was for many years, dating back to the first decade of the century. But in 1928, when I ran for the first time as a candidate for public office—for Lieutenant Governor of New York—my running mate, the head of the ticket, was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I saw in Franklin Roosevelt, during those years, the great inspirational qualities of leadership, the vibrant courage, the endless ingenuity, and the bold and adventurous spirit which came to characterize his historic administration as President of the United States.

He was a man who could—because he had to—shed some of the heavy cares of office once he had made a decision in regard to those cares. Someone once asked him, while he was Governor, how he managed not to show the tensions of some of the problems which confronted us in those days. He said, as well as I can recall, "Well, I have made the decisions and I let Herbert do the worrying for me." I was the Herbert in this case. I was privileged to share his problems with him, but I did not share his capacity

for throwing off the worry that followed the responsibility.

Actually, this characteristic of Franklin Roosevelt was more apparent than real. His great heart was frequently heavy with the cares of office. He had one of the most remarkable physiques, in spite of his physical handicap, that I have ever seen. But the burden of 12 years of the Presidency, added to 4 years as Governor of New York, during the most difficult period in all history, proved, in the end, too great even for him.

He was a man who could be fervently loved, as he could be violently hated. Millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of people throughout the world loved him deeply and passionately, and mourned him as one of their own when he died.

There is no way of precisely describing the hold he had upon people—and upon his friends. He had his faults. There is no human being without them. But he was a leader of the people of a greatness which only history can precisely measure. Of course he was the most controversial President of our time. I believe, with all my heart, that he will be recorded as one of the greatest of our entire history.

I served 4 years as F. D. R.'s lieutenant governor. It was one of the great experiences of my life. It was my great privilege, in 1936, and again in 1940, to second his nomination for the presidency. I am proud of that distinction.

I was privileged to be selected by the people of New York State to succeed Franklin D. Roosevelt as Governor of New York. During all the years I was Governor of the great Empire State, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States. We worked closely during those years—almost as closely as we had while he was Governor and I was lieutenant governor. It is an interesting circumstance that once he had become President, he showed little or no partiality for the State of New York as against other States. He had, of course, a very deep concern for New York State, which was his native State. All his memories and all his family associations were identified with New York. Yet it was frequently not an easy task to gain from him the support we had to seek for projects and undertakings of special concern to New York State until he was convinced that they were fair to all the other States of the Union.

I had my differences with him in those days—differences we always resolved for the best interests, I am sure, of my State and of the Nation. That was one of his great talents—his ability to improvise and compromise, not on principle, but among contending forces so as to bring out of him a result which was acceptable, if not entirely satisfactory, to all.

In speaking of differences, I recall vividly the only time I had a great public break with him. I could not go along with his Supreme Court packing plan. I opposed him publicly. I thought he was in the wrong. I am sure he did not cherish my opposition to him, but his was such a warm, all-embracing nature, comprehending objects far beyond the present moment, that our differences

were soon all forgotten in the broader medley of common beliefs and common principles that we shared.

Above all, Franklin Roosevelt was an apostle of freedom. He believed in freedom as a goal and as a way of life. He believed in the practice, as well as in the preaching, of freedom. He held up freedom as a shining goal for all mankind. He helped lead the world to that goal. He helped forge the coalition of freedom-loving nations which saved the world from the forces of evil which threatened to overcome us at that time.

There is little that I can say to add to his stature. There is nothing that was said at the time, or that can be said now, to detract in the least degree from that stature.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I desire to commend our distinguished and able majority leader for his beautiful tribute to that great American leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The tributes by my other colleagues have been most appropriate. I should like to add a few words to the comments being made here today about the late President.

History has recorded the stories of but few men who accomplished so much on behalf of their fellow men in so short a time as did President Roosevelt. History has recorded virtually no story of accomplishment against such odds. The odds which Franklin D. Roosevelt had to overcome were fantastic in every respect.

He had the tremendous problem of his personal health. As the real fighter he was, he fought valiantly for his country in spite of his braces and wheelchair. Until his death many Americans were not aware of the great physical handicap under which Mr. Roosevelt had worked throughout his years as President.

No other Chief Executive had ever faced a more serious domestic situation in our country than he did when he took the oath of the Presidency. Millions were jobless, homeless, and hungry. There was little prospect of better times.

Although we did not know it at that time, we were soon to realize the seriousness of the world situation—the danger of the dictators. Gradually that shadow of responsibility was to envelope President Roosevelt and place upon him even greater burdens than those of physical handicap and domestic crisis.

But Franklin D. Roosevelt was a man of decision and a man of action. He sought and obtained measures appropriate to those days of domestic crisis to relieve the common man and to provide him an opportunity for the future. The President drafted the experts of Government and business to work out with him the multitudinous problems of the early thirties. His programs took Americans off their backs and put them back on their feet. He designed programs to meet the need of a particular time.

Although President Roosevelt had hoped the nations of the world would be able to quarantine aggressors, he was decisive in his actions to protect our Nation and our allies when he realized we had to fight for peace or lose it.

It is true that President Roosevelt was a controversial figure even before his death. Even his closest adherents did

not agree with all his policies, which were conceived in the heat of economic battles at home and military action abroad.

Only history can make the final estimate of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his contribution to his fellow men, but none can doubt that the age of Roosevelt will always be recorded as one of the most important periods in the growth of our Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the career of that illustrious President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As one of the newest Members of the Senate, I cannot say that I have had the honor, as the majority leader and many of my colleagues have had, of having had my career commingled with the career of this distinguished American.

However, I do know what his career and his great work have meant to my region of the country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was not born in the Pacific Northwest, and he was not brought up in the Pacific Northwest, but I doubt that few natives of the Pacific Northwest ever did more than was done for our region by Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was born and brought up 3,000 miles away on the far side of the continent, in New York State.

I dare say that Senators who are far more experienced in politics than I, and whose careers are much longer than mine, remember the campaign of 1932, when Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke in Portland, a city where I was born and raised. He said that the next great Federal hydroelectric development to be undertaken by the United States Government would be on the Columbia River.

He kept that promise. As a result of that promise, the people living on the farms in our area received the blessings of electricity. Mrs. Neuberger's family are northwestern dairy farmers. They never had electric lights on their farm until Franklin D. Roosevelt brought about the construction of Bonneville Dam and the Rural Electrification Administration was established.

Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity of participating in the Pacific Northwest in a hearing concerning issues relating to that subject. My distinguished senior colleague also participated in those hearings, as did the distinguished senior Senator from Montana. We heard people, particularly women from the farms, testify concerning the rural electrification program and the power program, which were both started by President Roosevelt.

Regardless of any criticisms made of him, I think the tangible things Franklin D. Roosevelt did will live long after him and long after any criticisms of him. I believe that what he did will linger in the hearts of the people of the Pacific Northwest because he brought them a better life, a fuller life, and a higher standard of living.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, because I had the opportunity of serving in a minor role during the first year of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I feel that I should add a word to the tributes which have been paid to him

today, so truthfully and so deservedly, by other Members of the Senate. Everyone recognizes his courage, his insight, his service, his leadership, and his devotion to American principles.

I had the opportunity of sitting at the Cabinet table during the discussions which took place in the formulation of policies during the year 1933. I marveled over and over again at the intimate and detailed grasp he had of the problems which came up from every department and from the new agencies of Government. He was the leader, he was the formulator of policy, and his were the decisions.

As I look back upon those days, Mr. President, I think of Franklin D. Roosevelt in terms of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, and I feel that the session today would be incomplete if, as a part of this tribute, there were not read into the Record the noble words with which the framers of the Constitution laid that instrument before the people of the Colonies. They constitute the keynote of our Government.

I read, though I have known this preamble by heart for years:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

President Roosevelt made that preamble an instrument of his policy. In the Nation and throughout the world he sought to make this Government an agency of service to the people. He sought not only to provide tranquillity and to establish justice; he sought not only to provide for the common defense and to promote the general welfare, but he also threw all the weight of his great personality, of his genius, to make our Government an effective world leader in the effort to secure the blessings of liberty to people here and all around the globe. He was thinking of people not only in the United States but throughout the world. Every single step of the way all this man's service as President of the United States was dedicated to the people; it was dedicated to the purpose of so directing public policy as to give new life everywhere to all these great fundamental humanitarian objectives for which this Government was established.

The tasks still remains to be finished, Mr. President, here and throughout the world. The objectives of this preamble, the objectives for which President Roosevelt fought, are now facing another great crisis, because there is a government in this world which has no thought for the humanitarian objectives of a government of, for, and by the people, but which would use force to end human freedom and make people the pawns of dictatorship.

Mr. President, in paying my tribute today to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt, I feel that I should lay particular emphasis on this spiritual and patriotic factor in his career. I remember so well the first statement he made

in launching the campaign of 1932, in his reference to the forgotten man. It was service to the forgotten man that was his purpose. Service to the forgotten man here in the United States and throughout the world should be the objective of the people of the United States, just as it was when the framers of the Constitution established our Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that pressing duties in connection with the Committee on Appropriations this morning prevented my being present to hear what I know were eloquent tributes paid to that great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I wish to associate myself with all that has been said in praise of him as a man, as a public servant, and as a great leader of men.

We cannot add to the stature of Franklin D. Roosevelt by the words we utter here. There are able men in the Senate, but I doubt that any of them will occupy a place in history that would enable them to add to the stature of Franklin D. Roosevelt as it will loom across the pages of the history of the period in which he lived and made his great contribution to the welfare of mankind.

I would, however, Mr. President, be remiss to my duty and to the people of my own beloved State of Georgia, which he chose to call his second home, and where he was visiting when the final summons came, did I not add my poor flower to the beautiful tributes which have been offered here. I should likewise be remiss to a personal association which is one of the prized possessions of my life.

It so happened that I was Governor of the State of Georgia at the time Mr. Roosevelt was Governor of the State of New York. I was privileged to entertain him in the executive mansion as he would go to Warm Springs, Ga., seeking treatment to help to relieve him from the agony and the handicap of the dread paralysis which afflicted him. I was with him at the Governors Conference at Richmond, Va., and at the sesquicentennial ceremonies at Yorktown. President Hoover entertained the Governors at the White House.

As the chairman of the Georgia delegation, I was privileged to second his nomination for President at the 1932 Democratic convention. I traveled with him for several days on his campaign tour that fall.

At that time I was the youngest Governor in the land and I still thrill as I think of those days and my associations.

I came to the Senate, filling an unexpired term, and took my seat here some 6 weeks before Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, March 4, 1933. He was the last man to be inaugurated in March, before the amendment to the Constitution sponsored by the late Senator Norris became effective changing the date to January.

I was privileged to be the youngest Member of this body during the thrilling 100 days of the extraordinary session of the Congress which President Roosevelt assembled to attempt to deal with the

grievous economic problems which confronted this Nation.

I doubt very much whether the political and economic order of the United States was in any greater danger of dissolution in the darkest days of the War Between the States than it was in the early spring of 1933. Privation and suffering were so great that chaos impended.

I well remember being in yonder cloakroom when one of the best known Members, Senator Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, of "share the wealth" fame, and father of the illustrious junior Senator from Louisiana, walked back and addressed Senator Ed Smith, Senator Pat Harrison, and others who were there, saying, "Men, it will not be long until there will be a mob assembling here to hang Senators from the rafters of the Senate. I have to determine whether I will stay and be hung with you, or go out and lead the mob." That statement evoked very little laughter, because the situation was exceedingly grave.

If Franklin Delano Roosevelt had made no other contribution to civilization as we know it today than when he pulled the Nation back from the verge of dissolution in 1933, he would have assured himself of a place among the immortals of history.

His courage, his high purpose, his faculty for speech, yes, his voice, which seemed to intrude itself in to every living room in the country, and into the homes of those who did not have living rooms, told the American people they had nothing to fear but fear itself. He caused them to attack their problems with renewed courage. He inspired confidence.

Of course, Franklin Roosevelt, being human, made mistakes, as do all other human beings. But he was truly a great man. Our country was passing through a dark hour when, in March 1933, he assumed the office of Chief Executive of the United States. It is a singular fact that providence has blessed America by always giving us great leadership in our darkest and most trying days.

Jefferson was a controversial figure. George Washington was a highly controversial figure when he was President of the United States. If we examine the records of the past we can find some of the old cartoons lampooning those Presidents during their terms of service. They were denounced for practically everything they did. Lincoln was a highly controversial figure, as we all remember.

But, Mr. President, how many of us could sit down today and give the names of the outstanding critics of Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln? Indeed, even among the closest students of history, who could name three of the sharpest critics of any of those great men out of hand.

In my opinion, history will place Franklin Roosevelt among the great leaders of America. I believe firmly that in the years to come he will stand alongside the other three whom I have mentioned in the making and the preservation of the United States we all love. In the years to come he will loom above

his critics, just as mountain peaks rise above the plains. His good works will continue to bless mankind after the last of them is forgotten.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to have the opportunity to join with the distinguished majority leader and my other colleagues in commemorating the passing of the late great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Roosevelt was not infallible. He had his weaknesses, as all men do. But he had great strength and great courage. While there are many who will disagree with him, even at this date, none will deny that when he faced an issue, he was able at the time to render a decision.

As the eloquent Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said, men like Roosevelt, and other great Presidents, as well, are always the objects of criticism. But that is only because of their courage. If they arouse enmity, it is only because of what they did, which, in some respects, may have made some people afraid of them.

But I go back to the Montana of the 1930's. At the time President Roosevelt came into office in 1933, I know what had been happening to the farmers, the ranchers, the miners, and the businessmen of that State. What happened in Montana also happened in every other State of the Union. President Roosevelt did a great amount of good to benefit the workingman and to help him to organize and to prosper. He did a tremendous amount of good for the farmer, because he introduced new concepts which gave security to the farmer and, by the same token, to the Nation, as well.

Furthermore, Mr. Roosevelt did much to stabilize big business in our capitalistic economy. I think the Nation owes him a great debt for the many contributions which he has made, and the Nation also will have as a remembrance the many monuments which he has left behind in the form of pieces of fine legislation which will be beneficial to all classes of our population.

I know the free people of this country and of the world will always have a warm spot in their hearts for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who practiced what he preached, a man who was not afraid of fear, a man who did what he could, in the best way he could, for the benefit of all the people.

It is uniquely coincidental that on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin Roosevelt there has occurred the retirement of another great statesman, Sir Winston Churchill, a man who worked with the late President.

Likewise, the anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's death is coincidental with the announcement that the Salk polio vaccine is almost an assured success. This is a tribute to the attitude of the late President in his fight to overcome polio and to his efforts to encourage the people of the United States to contribute money so that research could be conducted toward the elimination of this scourge, which affects, almost always, children or persons in their teens.

We meet today to honor a great man, one whose memory will live so long as

there is a United States of America; and that will be for many, many centuries to come.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am very happy to have an opportunity to speak in connection with the observance today of the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I recall that I had been State chairman of my party in the 1928 campaign in my State. By the time the 1932 campaign was rolling around, we were looking for a leader who might bring victory to our party.

During the period of 1930-31, I wrote many times to Mr. Roosevelt, who was then Governor of New York, urging that he read a book written by T. E. Lawrence, entitled "Revolt in the Desert," and that he realize that Lawrence had solved his problem by setting Arab against Arab, finally working out a solution which enabled him to emerge victorious.

Out of that correspondence there developed a friendship that was and still remains very precious to me.

I have been steadily collecting books dealing with the Roosevelt period. I came to Congress in 1941, at the time the present distinguished majority leader was a Member of the House. He and I were among the first to serve as National Youth Administrators, trying to bring young people to realize that there were still opportunities in this country.

I remember very well the convention of 1932, which I attended. I recall the dramatic flight which Franklin Roosevelt made to that convention, and the great appeal which he made.

I recall my activities in the early days of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Works Progress Administration.

I can say truthfully that I have come to regard Franklin Roosevelt as one of the great figures in the life of America. I am very happy and proud that a portion of my life was dedicated to service in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with deep humility that I rise to join with the distinguished majority leader and other Senate colleagues in paying honor to the memory of a great American—Franklin Roosevelt. I wish to commend the majority leader for his leadership in writing this chapter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in honor of Franklin Roosevelt. I think when we all have become dust, and students of American history, in research, study the chapter of history which is being written on the floor of the Senate today, they will reach the unanimous conclusion that truly it was a great man who, 10 years after his passing, could elicit on the floor of the United States Senate the comments which have been made today about his life, his work, and his service to the people of our country.

Mr. President, any words that I could speak, as one American, are inadequate to portray the feeling I have for the record of Franklin Roosevelt. As I have studied his life's work, I find in it much evidence of his putting into action the challenge which I think confronts all public servants in executive or legislative posts. It is the challenge of con-

stitutional liberalism. Franklin Roosevelt's record is a record of constitutional liberalism. By that, Mr. President, I mean that he sought to put into practice the most cardinal principle of the Constitution of the United States, namely, the general welfare clause. It was referred to so eloquently a few moments ago by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] when he spoke of that great keystone of the Constitution, the promotion of the general welfare.

As a constitutional liberal, Franklin Roosevelt had caught a great vision that needs to be seen by all the American people these days, and by all our leaders of government of all parties; namely, that the wealth of America is to be found in a great spiritual wealth. That spiritual wealth takes the form of human beings, created by a Divine Being in His image, and, I am satisfied, designed for and dedicated to good causes and good things.

In a democracy such as ours, a government by the people should seek to promote human values; and I think that is the epitome of the political philosophy and of the record of action of Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. President, it is true, as has been said on the floor of the Senate, and as the record itself discloses, that Franklin Roosevelt made mistakes. He, being human, made his fair share of mistakes; but they were human mistakes, they were honest mistakes, and they were honorable mistakes.

In 1944 I opposed the reelection of Franklin Roosevelt. I campaigned in opposition to his reelection. I stand on the record I made at that time; but in no way did that diminish my high respect and regard for Franklin Roosevelt. One of the many reasons which caused me to oppose him was that I thought it was a great mistake for him to be a candidate for reelection for a fourth term. To me it was perfectly clear that in a democracy it was important that new leadership periodically be brought into the White House, and that presidential leadership not be vested for too long a time in one man, no matter how great a man he might be.

Then, too, it was obvious, I thought, that the physical strain of the White House could not be borne by any human being for a great length of time. I have always felt, and feel now, that the campaign of 1944 hastened Franklin Roosevelt's death, and that he became a casualty in the service of the people of the country years before it would have been true had he not been a candidate in 1944. His counsel, wisdom, and advice were needed by the American people, and are still needed by our country. Would that we had him as a living ex-President today to advise with our Government and with our people on the critical issues of our time.

Mr. President, I think one of the most beautiful eulogies I have read in recent days about Franklin Roosevelt appeared on last Tuesday morning in Drew Pearson's column.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

F. D. R. PRAISED 10 YEARS AFTER DEATH

A lot of things have happened since that day 10 years ago when F. D. R. passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach. And then his body came home—came back on a flag-draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue, up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President. The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, F. D. R. hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again—then back to Washington to lie in the east room of the White House—silent and alone. But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers, seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he was working for them and they knew they had lost a friend.

The little man who took his place, a humble man, was in SAM RAYBURN'S office late in the afternoon when he got a phone call to come to the White House immediately. White faced and grim, he left. He knew what the call meant. At the White House later Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States. The Cabinet stood by, shocked and shaken. Miss Perkins, who had known F. D. R. since their early reform days in Albany, broke down and wept. Henry L. Stimson, a Republican who had served in three Cabinets and who once had battled against young F. D. R. in New York State, also wept—unabashed.

Times change

The funeral train that carried F. D. R. to Hyde Park was crowded with Cabinet members and old friends. They stayed awake most of the night. Outside as the train passed were bonfires, people standing, waiting to pay homage to the last visible remains of their dead leader. All night through Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, New York, people stood along the tracks. At Hyde Park the Cabinet and the Supreme Court stood on one side of the rose garden, opposite the grave. The new President stood on the other side. With him were Mike Riley, of the Secret Service, Mrs. Truman—and Jimmie Byrnes. Jimmie, who had left Washington, supposedly for good, just 2 weeks before, had hastily flown back to board the funeral train. Taps were blown. A West Point cadet handed Mrs. Roosevelt the flag which had been draped over her husband's bier. She bore up well. The dead President was lowered into his grave.

That night as the special train rolled back to Washington, Harry Truman spent most of his time with three men—Jimmie Byrnes, Ed Pauley, George Allen. Of these, only Pauley, the California oil man, continues close to him. Byrnes, whom Truman appointed to the highest Cabinet post, has fought him bitterly, tried to carry South Carolina for Eisenhower. George Allen, who was given high honor by Truman and a lush job in RFC, is now Eisenhower's partner in the farm at Gettysburg and in a Howard Johnson restaurant.

Churchill erred at Yalta

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office; the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name. In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more, to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory.

F. D. R. did not promote me to high office, did me no favors. He fired my father, a Republican-appointed Governor of the Virgin Islands by Hoover, and once in the heat of battle he called me a liar. However, I rise to defend some of his great qualities. When he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. He knew war was inevitable and began preparing for it. When people were hungry, he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. Sometimes he made mistakes. The NRA he recognized as one of his mistakes. Sometimes he did things that were illegal. When Hitler threatened England in 1940, after France fell, and the British lost most of their arms at Dunkirk, F. D. R. emptied our arsenals. In one bold stroke he sent all our arms to England. He knew what the political consequences would be if his gesture failed. For he acted without an O. K. from Congress. But he also knew the consequences to the free world if England fell. He acted illegally. But he acted. And England was saved. I remember in 1933 how poverty-stricken veterans came straggling into Washington, a few at a time. Herbert Hoover let them pile up—until an army of 20,000 was driven out of Washington by tanks and cavalry. F. D. R. collected them as they came to Washington, a dozen at a time, took them to Fort Hunt, fed them, sent them back home to WPA officials to get jobs. Veterans continued to straggle in during the early days of his administration, but he never let a bonus army pile up in the Nation's Capital. That was one great difference between F. D. R. and some other Presidents who occupy or have occupied the White House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to read two excerpts from that column, because they express, with greater verbal beauty and greater eloquence than my lips are capable of uttering, the feelings in my heart today. Pearson wrote:

A lot of things have happened since that day 10 years ago when F. D. R. passed away. It was an April day, full of hope and sunshine. A great war was about to be won. Everyone could feel it. Peace was just around the corner. The big things he had fought for were almost within reach. And then his body came home—came back on a flag-draped caisson from Georgia, came slowly down Pennsylvania Avenue, up which he had driven four times to take the oath as President. The town seemed empty after that. And a little numb. Actually, F. D. R. hadn't been around much that winter. He was in Warm Springs after his election, in Hyde Park for Christmas, then to Yalta, then back to Hyde Park, then to Warm Springs again—then back to Washington to lie in the East Room of the White House—silent and alone. But even though he had been away, people always felt that he was here, that he had his hands on things, and so the town was empty. Even the guards around the public buildings, the folks who sit on park benches, the elevator operators, the taxi drivers seemed a little lost. For Roosevelt was their President. They felt he

was working for them and they knew they had lost a friend.

Then later in his beautiful eulogy, Pearson wrote:

So times have changed. The man who succeeded Roosevelt is now out of office, the man whom Roosevelt made commanding general in Europe is in office; and when the Yalta records were released, few people whom he had befriended, few he promoted to high office, rose to defend his good name. In contrast, Winston Churchill, who was equally, perhaps more to blame for the mistakes at Yalta, retired last week in a blaze of glory.

F. D. R. did not promote me to high office, did me no favors. He fired my father, a Republican-appointed governor of the Virgin Islands by Hoover, and once in the heat of battle he called me a liar. However, I rise to defend some of his great qualities. When he was President, he ran the show. He made decisions. He did not pass the buck. He looked far ahead, saw events before they happened. He knew war was inevitable and began preparing for it. When people were hungry he tried to feed them. When people were jobless, he found them work. He set up machinery for protecting the public which has not been and will not be changed today. Sometimes he made mistakes.

Mr. President, sometimes President Roosevelt made mistakes. But he never made a mistake based upon a bad motive. He never made a mistake which was not motivated by what he considered, as a constitutional liberal, to be sound judgment in promoting the general welfare of his people. In the disturbing hours in which we in the United States are living, with partisan conflict and controversy bombarding the minds of the American people, when there are some who still would seek to besmirch the name and memory of the great Franklin Roosevelt, I wish to say today that I do not think history will record that he made a mistake at Yalta. But, Mr. President, as we read the record of the world situation that existed at the time of Yalta, President Roosevelt had before him the great problem—as was pointed out earlier today by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—of determining what course of action American military policy should follow in respect to the expected invasion of Japan. He knew that such an invasion would have cost American mothers and fathers the lives of tens of thousands of American boys. It is said now, by way of hindsight, that we were then on the verge of the dropping of the atomic bomb, and that the President had been advised that the atomic bomb would be completed and ready in a short time for dropping. However, Mr. President, there was no certainty that the bomb would work as hoped. There is no evidence submitted by his critics that any scientific report was submitted to President Roosevelt, or could have been submitted to him at the time, giving assurance of the success of the dropping of the atomic bomb. He was in a great international conference with the foreign ministers of other nations. He was confronted with the justification of trying to get Russia to open up an Asiatic front against Japan in an endeavor to save American lives that he feared would be lost if we invaded Japan alone. So I think it is perfectly clear that, as our Commander in Chief, he was

impelled by a sense of moral obligation to the American people to bring into that war common enemies, at the time, of imperial Japan; and one of those common enemies of Japan happened to be the Russian Soviet Union.

Mr. President, as one who listened to President Roosevelt's report to the American people at the joint session of Congress following the Yalta Conference and as one who on that occasion watched the great war President, obviously broken in health, I am convinced that he demonstrated clearly that to the very end he kept the faith with his moral obligations to the American people. It is my opinion that the judgment of history will be that at Yalta he did what he could in an honorable way to bring into the war the common enemies of Japan, in the interest of first destroying that tyranny. Also I think it is clear that he held to the hope that when the end of the war came, in some way, somehow, the peaceful nations of the world would succeed in persuading the leaders of Russia to understand that they had everything to gain by joining in setting up peaceful procedures for settling international disputes. Franklin Roosevelt stood for such a goal based upon a system of international justice through law as the great Arthur Vandenberg so frequently stated it. The great ideal of such a goal became monumentalized in the San Francisco Charter.

Mr. President, I close by saying that in my judgment the greatest monument to Franklin Roosevelt is one which was erected shortly after his death; and it was erected, insofar as our Nation is concerned, under the leadership of another great President—Harry Truman. That monument is the San Francisco Charter. I think historians will cite it as the befitting last lines of the last chapter of the great life-book of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I congratulate our great leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, upon his eloquent words of tribute to President Roosevelt. I have enjoyed all that has been said here today in tribute to that great man, and in memory of him.

I am reminded that 2,000 years ago the most flaming personality of all times gave utterance to one of the most inspiring sentences I have ever read:

I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

Those words have been echoed and re-echoed through the centuries, giving hope, inspiration, and courage to all people. Those words come to us from One who, divine in origin, frequently was human in achievement. When we reflect upon that noble statement of His purpose, Mr. President, I wish to state that in my judgment no man of our generation has done more to make it a living reality in this day and time than has Franklin D. Roosevelt.

As has been said here this afternoon, Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt made mistakes; but they were the mistakes of a big man and a brave man. He never permitted himself to shrink from taking the responsibility of making decisions.

He had a great faith—a great faith in God, a great faith in his country, and a great faith in his fellow man. Of that faith was born a courage which enabled him to strip the mask from the specter of fear, and to expose it to public scorn.

Mr. President, if people had a need, Franklin Roosevelt knew that he, as President, had a responsibility. Human welfare was more important to him than temporary fiscal balance. When a choice had to be made between the welfare of the people and the saving of a dollar, his decision was in favor of serving the welfare of the people. Thank God he was not afraid to spend money to relieve human suffering. He kept faith with the common people. If he made a promise, he kept it in letter and in spirit. He brought economic improvement and progress to the worker. He helped make it possible for the common laborer to lift his head in pride in a home that was his own, and by a fireside where his family found the greatest economic welfare it had ever known. He brought prosperity to the farmer. He brought American farm families out of economic bondage just as effectively as Lincoln had freed the slaves from physical bondage. Franklin D. Roosevelt helped reinforce the foundation of American business, by building greater purchasing power for all the people. He knew that if the farmer and the worker prospered, there was no way for business to suffer.

Yet he never forgot that if workers and farmers suffer there is no way for business to prosper. He fought, above all, for the American people, for their prosperity, their security, and their happiness. Then he fought and died to help build a better world for all people everywhere, as he himself so eloquently said, in order that all men in all lands might live out their lives in freedom from fear and freedom from want. We honor ourselves and our country today when we pay tribute to one of America's greatest sons.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in thanking our outstanding majority leader, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, for taking this occasion, on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to observe some of the great contributions he made to his times and to the world.

I think it is fitting and proper to gain strength now, as dark clouds seem to hide the sun, by looking back on the disasters, the tumult, the squalls, and the hurricanes through which we passed under the steady guiding hand of one of America's greatest Presidents.

We have heard his record spoken of today, running the gamut from caring for crippled children and the establishment of a polio foundation which, fittingly, on the anniversary of his death, seems to have found a vaccine to prevent this disease from ravaging the children of the future, to the grand conception of earmarking funds to search for atomic energy for the benefit of civilization, a conception to which his magnificent daring and ability led. We have already witnessed the power of atomic energy. Someday we may see its glory.

It is difficult to think of President Roosevelt as a President of a single type because of the many situations through which this country has passed. The administrations of other Presidents have been marked by war or characterized by other particular situations. It is difficult to realize the four great stages through which President Roosevelt guided us.

He was President during an economic crisis which led to deepest despair. Through his indomitable courage and faith in America he taught us to have faith in America and brought us out of the worst economic crisis any nation had ever seen.

He was a President of recovery. In the strong drive for recovery he respected our capitalistic and free enterprise system, and first made secure those bastions of capitalism. But he did not stop there. He knew that only a broad base of prosperity, shared by all the people—by the farmers, the workers, and the little people of America—could finally insure the prosperity of the great temples of our capitalistic system. So he placed the accent on human values as he guided the Nation to recovery.

Again his spirit captivated all America when he gave us the leadership and the courage to supply the free world with armaments and munitions, but, above all, the moral leadership of the world, through which President Roosevelt, with his great personality and great ideals, was able somehow to impart courage to free peoples around the seven seas.

We saw him through those three eras, down to the winning of the great war. I think more than anyone else, he contributed to that victory. The leadership of President Roosevelt was perhaps a greater factor than any other.

Then we saw him live long enough to launch what, in the future, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, will be his greatest monument, namely, peace through collective security and justice.

We have witnessed the fulfillment and realization of the goals of the first three periods in which he provided leadership. We must have faith to believe that through the cooperation of the free nations of the world in striving for a just and lasting peace, we shall see the dawn of a new age in which we can vanquish the threat and fear of war.

So it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues, and particularly our illustrious leader, in observing this day. We should face the difficult times of the future with confidence in ourselves, because of our successful passage through other great difficulties through which President Roosevelt led us.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I was on the floor of the Senate today and heard the beautiful encomiums which were paid to a former President of the United States, F. D. R. I do not think anyone could listen to what was said without seeing a page of history unravel before him. I remember very well those years, 1933-45. Although I never was intimate with President Franklin Roosevelt I did have a slight acquaintance with him. I re-

member his smile, his voice, and his gracious manner on meeting him. I remember his attendance in this Chamber, in the services for a departed Senator. I can see him at the inaugural from the porch at the White House in 1945. He was a very sick man then, but he carried on.

I remember the appeal he made in 1933 when he said that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. I remember the impression which that statement made on the country at large. I would classify him, first, as a master salesman of ideas whether when speaking to a joint session of the Congress or over the radio. Second, I think, in spite of his great physical handicap, he demonstrated the ability to do the almost impossible. I did not agree with much of his philosophy. I find, however, as the years go on and as I look back that much that he stood for has influenced our times tremendously. What has been said so eloquently today by many of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle, regarding his fearlessness, his hope and his willingness to adventure in new fields to meet the problems, is correct.

This willingness to take a risk is exemplified in his setting aside several billion dollars to seek to get the atomic bomb.

If we had not got it first one might well ask what would have been the course of history.

If he made a mistake, he never dwelt on it, but diverted attention by another move.

He utilized the talents of men of both parties in the interest of the Nation.

So, Mr. President, I express my personal appreciation for the life that has been lived among us, the life that has spread inspiration and courage to countless persons, the life which was much misunderstood, the life which stood for many new adventures in politics and economics, but, nevertheless, a life that saw the Nation through many a crisis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in tribute to the late great President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT, APRIL 13, 1955

Whenever the name Franklin D. Roosevelt is mentioned anywhere in this troubled world, it carries a single meaning—democratic leadership in its finest sense.

The effective, courageous leadership which President Roosevelt gave this country was not by accident. It sprouted and thrived in his unflinching conviction that people must govern themselves if they are to remain free. This Nation learned under the guiding hand of President Roosevelt that empty words and colored optimism is no substitute for courage and conviction when man's freedom is at stake.

The contributions President Roosevelt made toward the cause of the free world will live forever in the minds of man and the annals of time. It is fitting that we take time out today to look back upon his work. All of us would do well to ponder the

Roosevelt thesis in seeking out the solutions of today's perilous problems.

Each of us could spend many hours discussing the work and life of President Roosevelt, but we could never find words that would justly describe the indebtedness the free world owes to this man of the ages, this leader of the generations. In his work, we all can find courage to carry on, even in the darkest hours. In his spirit we must never waver in our unending fight for the American way.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader and others of our colleagues who have spoken on this occasion in memory of Franklin Roosevelt, whose great courage gave hope to the American people in their darkest economic hours.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are Senators who wish to transact routine business, I ask unanimous consent that such routine business may be transacted at this time, with the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND THE TREASURY (S. Doc. No. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1955, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1955, for the General Services Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS (S. Doc. No. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions relating to appropriations of the Department of Defense—military functions, for the fiscal year 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF PROPOSED PROVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955, for the Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bank-

head-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation allotment under administrative regulations and procedures promulgated by that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national industrial reserve, dated April 1, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 13th semiannual report on the International Educational Exchange Program, Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUTHORIZATION TO CARRY FIREARMS BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States to carry firearms (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONVEYANCE OF SITE IN COLON, PANAMA, TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colon, Republic of Panama (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CEASE-FIRE IN STRAIT OF FORMOSA—LETTER OF MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY, TAIPEH, TAIWAN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a message addressed to

the Congress of the United States, by the Municipal Assembly of the City of Taipei, Taiwan, relating to a proposed cease-fire in the Strait of Formosa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Logistics and R. and D.), Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property disposal, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government of American Samoa, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (pt. II) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "TRANSPORTATION" BY COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on "Transportation," dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "LEGAL SERVICES AND PROCEDURE," COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission entitled "Legal Services and Procedure," dated March 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, CANYON DE CHELLY NATIONAL MONUMENT, ARIZ.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession contract in Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Ariz. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMITS IN CERTAIN NATIONAL PARKS

Four letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed concession permits in Glacier National Park, Mont., Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tenn., and Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nev. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASED PUBLIC BENEFITS FROM NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to increase the public benefits from the National Park System by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NEGOTIATIONS FOR SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on negotiations for settlement contracts with the Indians of the Crow Creek and Lower Brule Reservations, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIBERALIZATION OF PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIGHTS REQUIRED TO BE CARRIED BY MOTOR-BOATS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission as of February 28, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS, CERTIFYING OFFICERS, AND PAYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve disbursing officers, certifying officers, and payees with respect to certain payments made in contravention of appropriation restrictions regarding citizenship status, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIE C. PICKETT, GEORGE WILLIAMS, AND HERMAN L. LOONEY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service, for the year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WINSTON BROS. COMPANY ET AL. v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 343, 82d Congress, 2d session, a copy of that court's opinion in the case of *Winston Bros. Company and the Utah Construction Company; Roy L. Blair & Company and James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc., and T. E. Connolly, Inc., v. The United States* (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CERTAIN APPLICATIONS FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT, COMPENSATION, AND POWERS OF BAILIFFS IN DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Legislative Resolution 21

"Resolution re acquisition of land around shores of Gavins Point Reservoir

"Whereas the Gavins Point Reservoir, which lies between Nebraska and South Dakota, and the shores thereof is ideal for public use and public access and for wildlife; and

"Whereas in order to have the full benefit and use thereof for such purpose acquisition of public land for such use should be obtained; and

"Whereas the Gavins Point Development Association and the Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission have requested the Army Corps of Engineers to purchase

certain lands adjoining the reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 67th session assembled:

"1. That the Representatives in Congress from Nebraska be urged to expedite the acquisition of adequate public land for public use and public access and for wildlife around the shores of Gavins Point Reservoir, which lies between Nebraska and South Dakota.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution memorializes the President of the United States, the Nevada congressional delegation, and others to do their utmost to effectuate the construction of a four-lane highway over the Sierra Nevada mountain ranges as a matter of public defense and necessity

"Whereas the severe winter of 1952 has revealed to the Nation what many have long suspected, that the Sierra Nevada mountain passes on the main traffic and trucklines of the central transcontinental routes across this country are woefully inadequate and can be blocked for long periods of time by forces of nature as effectually as they could be blocked by an atomic bomb, enemy military action, or sabotage; and

"Whereas the military commitments of this Nation in the past two decades have expanded greatly in the Pacific Ocean areas and the lands adjacent thereto, and much of the military personnel and material is shipped from the San Francisco Bay area as the principal Pacific coast port; and

"Whereas this great and strategic port cannot function unless the materials are brought over the Sierra Nevada Ranges and, as a primary target for enemy attack or sabotage, in case of an emergency it would require supplies and reinforcements over the central transcontinental route; and

"Whereas weather conditions or unforeseen difficulties on the narrow and obsolete central routes, functioning with the same limited capacity of 20 years ago, could jeopardize and impair the safety and fighting ability of the entire United States; and

"Whereas more than 20 major Department of Defense supply depots, tactical establishments, and experimental installations are located in the intermountain areas and served only by the transcontinental routes; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada and all other Western States have continually clamored for the improvement of these routes and have beseeched governmental officials to rectify the intolerable condition of these Sierra Nevada highways in order to facilitate normal travel for business and pleasure as well as the mandatory need for civil and military defense measures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby memorializes and requests that the Nevada congressional delegation in Congress take every action available to them, collectively and individually, to bring about and effectuate the immediate modernization of a major Sierra Nevada highway by promoting, proposing, instigating, and insisting that it be widened to four lanes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to include this project as one of the main objectives of his highly commendable and necessary highway program; and be it further

"Resolved, That if the necessary funds are not made available immediately for this essential project of making a transcontinental highway over the Sierra Nevada Mountains four lanes, that the Nevada congressional delegation and those from other Western States be memorialized to request the utilization of defense funds in order that the security of the vital San Francisco Bay area can be assured at the earliest possible moment to insure the availability of supplies and reinforcements in the event of enemy action or sabotage; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, directed to promptly transmit certified copies of this highly important resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Governors of Nevada, California, Utah, and Idaho, and the esteemed Senators and Representatives in the House of Representatives from Nevada."

—
"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning the Congress to amend present laws so as to enable a highway to be constructed as part of the interstate highway system between Utah and Colorado without regard to present mileage limitations

"Whereas at the present time no proper link exists between Utah and Colorado in the interstate highway system; and

"Whereas in case of an enemy attack the present highway system is not adequate to evacuate urban areas and to transport the military forces to defend this vital area rich with natural resources; and

"Whereas one of the main impediments to the desired route is the statutory limitation on mileage in the interstate highway system: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializes and requests the Nevada congressional delegation to join in petitioning Congress to amend the present law by extension of the mileage limitation in an amount sufficient to permit a highway to be constructed between Utah and Colorado as part of the interstate highway system; or, as an alternative, to recommend that the law be amended to permit the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Commerce, by joint agreement, to decide where inequality and need exists and thus enable them to add any route that they consider as being necessary without regard to the present mileage limitations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and he hereby is, directed to promptly transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Nevada congressional delegation, and the Governors of the States of Utah and Colorado."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 37

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to facilitate national centennial celebrations in commemoration of the 1857 act of Congress allowing the creation of the Pacific overland mail route; urging local agencies and groups to cooperate therein; commending the American Association for State and Local History; and other matters properly relating thereto

"Whereas by act of Congress of the United States, dated March 3, 1857, the Postmaster General of the United States was, for the first

time, authorized to contract for the conveyance overland from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, Calif., of all letter mails; and

"Whereas prior to the passage of this act, letter mail was carried to the Pacific coast by the long, slow, and arduous ocean route fraught with danger from storm and sea and totally dependent upon the vagaries of the wind and weather; and

"Whereas the opening of this overland mail service route was the culminating event of a series of events of prime importance, not only to the development of the West and the State of Nevada, but also to the development of the entire United States, and it enabled the word to be spread of the richness of this region and hailed the outstanding discovery of the Comstock Lode in Nevada during the year 1859; and

"Whereas centennial celebrations of these events should be fittingly observed throughout the length and breadth of this Nation in order to memorialize this historical event and to show the developments from the 'four horse coaches, or spring wagons suitable for the conveyance of passengers, as well as the safety and security of the mails,' as specified in the original 1857 act, to 1957; and

"Whereas the modern development of mail transportation and our systems of communication have greatly aided the binding together of the East and the West into one great Nation; and

"Whereas the American Association for State and Local History has undertaken the national sponsorship of centennials and has established regional committees to plan centennial celebrations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to insure the cooperation of the Federal Government in the celebration of the centennials commemorating the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully urges that all State and local governmental units, public schools, civic, patriotic and historical societies, and all agencies of communication in this State participate wholeheartedly in the observance of the celebration of the various centennials along the route of the Pacific overland mail by cooperation with the committees now organizing the Pacific overland mail centennials in 1957-58 in commemoration of the accomplishment, efforts, and achievements of those sturdy pioneers who engineered the beginnings of the overland communication; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada does hereby congratulate and pledge its support to the American Association for State and Local History for its action in undertaking on a national scale the sponsorship for the centennial observances of the opening of the Pacific overland mail; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be, and hereby is, directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the governor of this State, the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, the Nevada Historical Society and the board of directors of the Nevada State Museum, to the Senators and Representatives of this State in the Congress of the United States and to the governing head of the American Association for State and Local History."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 45

"Whereas some large industrial areas in this State are presently suffering from exces-

sive unemployment because of curtailed production; and

"Whereas many large contracts for defense materials, such as M-48 tanks, which could have been manufactured with existing facilities in such areas of surplus labor in this State, have been awarded to large companies in other States; and

"Whereas it is the declared policy of the Office of Defense Mobilization to encourage full utilization of existing production facilities and workers in preference to creating new plants or moving workers and also to award negotiated procurement contracts to industries in labor surplus areas provided no price differential is paid therefor; and

"Whereas the requirement that no price differential be paid in order to award such contracts to firms in labor surplus areas has, to a great extent, defeated the purposes of the before-mentioned policy which was designed to relieve unemployment in distressed areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature hereby urgently requests the Federal Government to bring about an immediate amendment to Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 so that labor surplus areas may be given consideration for Government contracts, even where some price differential is involved, provided that in the opinion of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization the requirements of the distressed area justify the additional cost involved; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That this legislature also requests the Federal Government to revise its present policy of concentrating the production of certain defense items, such as tanks, in the hands of a single large producer and provide instead that such items shall be manufactured at a number of different facilities throughout the country with special consideration being given to facilities located in areas suffering from critical unemployment; and be it further

"Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to take all necessary steps to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Secretary.

"In assembly, April 2, 1955, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 38, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes

"Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Wisconsin industry, and provide a market for the agricultural and manufactured products of the State; and

"Whereas lack of package freight shipping has adversely affected Wisconsin agriculture and industry, and has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries of the Great Lakes area; and

"Whereas package freight shipping will contribute to the reduction of such unemployment; and

"Whereas package freight service will provide a stepping stone to the maximum use of the facilities of the Great Lakes ports of Wisconsin for international trade when the

St. Lawrence Seaway has been completed; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes at the earliest practicable date; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States Maritime Commission, to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"W. P. KNOWLES,

President of the Senate.

"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"CLARK CATLIN, Jr.,

Speaker of the Assembly.

"ARTHUR L. MAY,

Chief Clerk of the Assembly."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Appropriations:

House Joint Resolution 20

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1938, authorized the construction of a dam on the Kaskaskia River at Carlyle, Ill., with auxiliary structures above and below such dam, in accordance with a report of the Corps of Engineers, for the purpose of flood control, with other incidental benefits; and

"Whereas the 2d session of the 83d Congress of the United States appropriated a sum of \$50,000 to commence detailed planning of said dam, which planning is now being performed by the Corps of Engineers, and there is now a request before the Congress of the United States for additional funds to continue such planning; and

"Whereas subsequent to the aforementioned authorization the Corps of Engineers, at the behest of the Congress of the United States, made a comprehensive study and survey of the entire Kaskaskia River Basin, with a view to submitting a report outlining an economically feasible flood-control plan for the entire basin, and now have that report in its final stages before submission to Congress; and

"Whereas said report is expected to recommend the expansion of the original authorization to include the construction of a dam and auxiliary structures at and below Shelbyville, Ill., on the Kaskaskia River; and

"Whereas the Kaskaskia River services and drains 22 counties, representing approximately one-fourth of the State of Illinois; and

"Whereas water is now universally recognized as our most valuable and limited natural resource, and the need for water conservation and control is both a local and national problem; and

"Whereas the Kaskaskia River is noted, not only for its disastrous and costly floods, but also for its extremely low levels during the dry seasons, thereby causing the Kaskaskia Valley Basin to be annually threatened with the prospect of disastrous floods, followed by prolonged and dangerously low water supplies which now endanger the welfare of the people and acutely increase the economic necessities of the area; and

"Whereas completion of the comprehensive plan of flood controls on the Kaskaskia River in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers will control floodwaters, eliminate flood damages, and will hold and conserve floodwaters for use during seasons when the area normally suffers acute water shortages, and will, thereby, encourage and increase the economic and social development of southern and central Illinois, and, in addition, will operate to alleviate flooding and improve essential nav-

igation downstream on the Mississippi River; and

"Whereas the benefits to be expected from completion of the Kaskaskia Valley project will exceed the estimated cost thereof and the State of Illinois is ready and willing to assist in this project; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to:

"(a) Give immediate and favorable consideration to the recommendations in the survey report of the Kaskaskia Valley project, as soon as such report is submitted to Congress by the Corps of Engineers; and

"(b) Appropriate sufficient funds in the current session of Congress to continue and complete the detailed planning of the Carlyle Dam; and

"(c) Appropriate funds to commence detailed planning of the Shelbyville Dam as soon as the Corps of Engineers indicates it is ready to commence such planning; and

"(d) Appropriate construction funds for both dams at such times as they can be economically used by the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution and its preamble be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman and minority leader of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the chairman and minority leader of the House Appropriations Committee, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Illinois in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house March 16, 1955.

"WARREN F. WOOD,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FRED RUEGG,

Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Concurred in by the senate, March 22, 1955.

"JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,

President of the Senate.

"EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,

Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

House Resolution 82

"Resolution relative to the establishment of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif.

"Whereas a dependable and adequate supply of uranium is vitally necessary for the defense of the Nation; and

"Whereas many valuable deposits of uranium ore have been discovered in those portions of California and Nevada in the vicinity of Doyle in Lassen County, Calif.; and

"Whereas the establishment by the United States of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif., would provide centrally located facilities, thereby expediting the processing of the uranium ore from the surrounding area and at the same time providing a relatively safe and dispersed location for such facilities in case of war; and

"Whereas the location of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif., would be in convenient proximity to the Sierra Ordnance Depot; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the assembly respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States that provision be made for the establishment of a uranium purchasing and milling depot at Doyle, Calif.; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the

President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of California."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Senate Joint Memorial 14

To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior; the Secretary of Commerce; the Congress of the United States; the Governor of Alaska; the Auditor of Alaska; to All Territorial Department Heads; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas it is the avowed policy and firm purpose of Federal and Territorial agencies to promote and sustain the development of Alaska through the encouragement of private investment and enterprise; and

"Whereas the 22d session of the Legislature of Alaska, by virtue of its passage of Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, opposing Government competition with private enterprise, has forthrightly declared its intention to inspire and protect private ventures; and

"Whereas owners, operators, and lessees of taxicabs, rental vehicles, drive-yourself cars, drayage, transfer, parcel delivery, contract hauling, and similar types of vehicles pay all prevailing fees imposed by all taxing agencies for registration, licensing, and operation of such vehicles in addition to all other taxes applicable to private business enterprises; and

"Whereas Federal and Territorial agencies are in direct competition with such privately financed and taxpaying enterprises by transporting passengers and cargo between air, rail, and steamship terminals in Alaska, and particularly in transporting Government officials and other employees who are authorized to patronize private carriers and be reimbursed for proper charges incurred.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully urges that all Federal and Territorial agencies within Alaska be directed to order all employees of such agencies to cease and desist the unfair practice of infringing upon and competing with the legitimate private carriers whose license fees and taxes comprise a valuable contribution to the appropriations upon which such Federal and Territorial agencies survive.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 13, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,

President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,

Chief Clerk of the House."

House Memorial 19

To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the provision of section 27 of the Jones Act, excluding Alaska from the enjoyment of the benefits of through routing over Canadian lines, the same as is bestowed upon every other part of American territory,

is a vicious discrimination against and a great injustice and injury to our people; and

"Whereas we believe that said discrimination is in violation of the spirit of section 9, article 1, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another;" and

"Whereas the Alaska Steamship Co. has in the past challenged Alaska by threatening to discontinue operation of ships from Seattle if the Territory opposed any rate increase proposals; and

"Whereas previous stoppages of service have resulted in groundwork having been laid for establishing other means of transportation at lower costs primarily by making Canadian service available.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully urges that section 27 of the Jones Act be amended to permanently remove the discrimination against Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 23, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Joint Memorial 23

"To the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable B. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 22d session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the economic development of the Territory of Alaska has been severely handicapped by the high costs of transporting virtually all of its materials and supplies into the Territory and of its own products out of the Territory; and

"Whereas the costs of railroad transportation within the continental United States represent a substantial part of the total transportation bill; and

"Whereas the American railroads penalize the Territory of Alaska by charging higher rates on freight moving to the Northwest ports for shipment by vessel to Alaska than they do if the shipment is going to the Territory of Hawaii or foreign countries in the Pacific. This penalty is as much as 100 percent in some cases. The same penalties exist on shipments of Alaskan products into the continental United States; and

"Whereas the Administrator of General Services has filed a complaint with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which requests that Commission to require the railroads to discontinue this grievous practice; and

"Whereas the relief sought by the Administrator of General Services on behalf of the Federal Government as a shipper would greatly assist commercial and other interests in Alaska and thereby benefit its whole economy.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that the attention of the Congress of the United States be directed through the Delegate from Alaska, E. L. BARTLETT, to support the efforts of the Administrator of General Services so as to assure the vigorous prosecution of this complaint to a successful conclusion, and to this end to request holding of hearings within the Territory of Alaska so as to permit the Alaskan community and commercial interests of the Territory an opportunity to be heard.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate March 20, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the transfer of 11,223 acres of land located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has had a revocable permit from the Government of the United States since September 23, 1946, for the use of 11,223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, title to which property is vested in the United States of America; and

"Whereas a civilian subcommittee of the Land Use Committee operating under provisions of Presidential directive dated October 1, 1946, to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments for the purpose of examining all land acquired by the Departments of War and Navy for military purposes in Hawaii with the object of promptly releasing to the civilian economy that which was not necessary for the national security, recommended in its report to the Interior Department return to the civilian economy of the above area under revocable permit (Folder XIX, Tax Map Key 9-17-19-35, area 11,209 acres, acquired by Civil 724 et al.); and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has used the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit to provide domiciliary care for tuberculosis patients from 1946 to 1949; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has, since October 12, 1949, utilized the land and buildings covered by the revocable permit as a hospital for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has, by Public Law 411, undertaken full responsibility for the costs of care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Hansen's disease program in the Territory of Hawaii is outstanding in its modern medical and sociological approach to the problems involved and has made definite progress toward the eventual eradication of this disease from Hawaii, and has been commended by various authorities, including officials of the United States Public Health Service, the Leonard Wood Memorial Foundation, and health authorities of both private and public health agencies in foreign countries, as being sound and effective; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has improved and renovated the grounds and buildings covered by the revocable permit referred to above for its special use in the care and treatment of patients with Hansen's disease; and

"Whereas the stability and effectiveness of the Hansen's disease control program in the Territory of Hawaii would be enhanced by the transfer of the title of the land and buildings from the Government of the United States of America to the Territory of Hawaii, and the 27th legislature of the Territory in 1953 requested such transfer by the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress of the United States, but the Congress has not yet taken the requested action: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will transfer title to 11,223 acres of land, more or less, located at Waimano, Ewa, Oahu, T. H., known as the Waimano Civilian Housing, to the Territory of Hawaii, title to which property is now vested in the United States of America.

"SEC. 2. Upon its approval, authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, to the Commissioner of Public Lands, and to the President of the Board of Health.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 5th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the continuation of appropriations for the Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the retention at its present location of the Naval Supply Base at San Pedro, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Minutemen of America, New York, N. Y., signed by Francis A. Adams, director general, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Trade Agreements Act for 1 year with the assessment of duties determined on American valuation of comparable articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Russell Smith and sundry other members of the Paton Methodist Church, Paton, Iowa, relating to disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners 34th annual convention at Chicago, Ill., opposing world government, Atlantic union, or any form of supergovernment, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Gabriel Valley Retail Petroleum Distributors' Association at Los Angeles, Calif., relating to competition and practices in the sale and distribution of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Holy Name Society, Immaculate Conception Parish, Astoria, N. Y., signed by Anthony G. Paretti, president, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Defenders of the Constitution, Forest Hills, N. Y., signed by Thomas J. Quinn, president, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Our Lady of Fatima Council, No. 3263, Knights of Columbus, Bellerose, N. Y., praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Morris Park Council, No. 566, Knights of Columbus, Richmond Hill, N. Y., signed by Walter Kowalczyk, recording secretary, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Loyola Council, No. 477, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Maris Stella Council, No. 378, Knights of Columbus, Far Rockaway, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Baron DeKalb Council, No. 1073, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Joan of Arc Council, No. 1992, Knights of Columbus, Port Jefferson, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Bayview Republican Women's Club, San Diego, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Veterans of Military Intelligence Service, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the appointment of Ben M. Tashiro to be judge of the Circuit Court of the Fifth Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Elizabeth Kiernan, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to reject passage of the reciprocal trade bill which would lower tariffs on textiles to the detriment of the people of the United States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration H. R. 1, commonly known as the reciprocal trade bill; and

"Whereas under the terms of the reciprocal trade bill the President would be authorized to further reduce tariffs on textiles for an additional 15 percent over the next 3 years; and

"Whereas such reduction in tariffs would permit this country to be flooded with textiles produced in foreign countries, chiefly Japan and India where the average wages are one-tenth or one-twelfth of the prevailing American rate; and

"Whereas the textile industry of the United States could not possibly dispose of its products in competition with such foreign textiles and would be forced to liquidate and throw hundreds of thousands of textile employees out of work; and

"Whereas such reduction in tariffs would not only be disastrous to the textile industries of the United States but also to the carpet industry, the ceramics industry, crabmeat producers, and other industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That Congress is memorialized to reject passage of the reciprocal trade bill which would be disastrous to the textile and other major industries in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and each Member of the House of Representatives to Congress from South Carolina."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Department of Agriculture to retain the classing office at Charleston, S. C.

"Whereas the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture is considering closing the cotton classing office at Charleston, S. C.; and

"Whereas Charleston is the only South Atlantic port with approved warehouses for delivery of cotton on contract, and local cotton classing service is vital to both Charleston firms and mills in South Carolina; and

"Whereas every farmer in South Carolina is affected by the classing office in Charleston because mills will pay farmers better than delivery price as long as they can deliver cotton on contract; and

"Whereas the State ports authority states that if the classing office is closed, Charleston could lose the importing of Egyptian cotton; and

"Whereas the total annual appropriation is only \$16,000, which is a relatively small amount for any Government agency and certainly a minor consideration as to the needed service at the port: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That the United States Department of Agriculture be memorialized to retain the classing office at Charleston, S. C., to insure orderly and efficient marketing of cotton handled at the port of Charleston; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, the South Carolina commissioner of agriculture, and to each of the Members of Congress from South Carolina."

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, to allocate and permit the planting of 1 acre of cotton for each acre of peaches destroyed by the recent unseasonable weather

"Whereas the recent unseasonable weather has destroyed the peach crops in the State of South Carolina; and

"Whereas such destruction will be a disastrous financial blow to the peach growers of the State; and

"Whereas there is still time to permit such growers to plant cotton as a substitute for the destroyed peach crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, is requested to allocate and permit the planting of 1 acre of cotton by any peach grower for each acre of peaches destroyed by the recent unseasonable weather, regardless of the fact that such grower may have had no prior allocation for cotton; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra T. Benson, and to each of the United States Senators and Members of the United States House of Representatives from South Carolina."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid the farmers, peach growers, and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and other counties in the State who have suffered so disastrously from the recent unseasonable cold weather

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina:

"The House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, now in regular session

at Columbia, S. C., wishes to call to the attention of the Congress of the United States that from the 26th through the 28th of March of this year, the State was visited by a cold wave unprecedented in the past 50 years. According to the records in the office of the United States Weather Bureau, a temperature as low as that which prevailed during the dates above mentioned was recorded only in the year 1894. Preceding this unusual cold wave the State had about 2 weeks of unusually warm weather. Peach and other fruit trees budded out profusely. As a result of the cold wave it is estimated that the 1955 peach crop will be a total loss to the farmers and fruit growers of Spartanburg and other counties in South Carolina. Expressed in money, this loss will range from \$12 to \$14 million in Spartanburg County alone. The peach and fruit growers are in dire need and the area so disastrously affected should be designated by the Federal Government as a disaster area.

"This body therefore respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide the peach and other fruit growers of Spartanburg County and of other counties in this State with substantial aid so as to enable them to bear without complete ruin the unprecedented loss which they have sustained, and also to increase the cotton acreage of the farmers of this State so that they will have some means of offsetting the tremendous losses that they have sustained from the recent freeze: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Clerk of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to take action relative to the increased rents in the housing projects in the city of Boston

"Whereas the Old Colony housing project in the south Boston district of the city of Boston was established by Federal funds for the assistance to veterans and other needy persons; and

"Whereas the purpose of such a project was to keep low rental units; and

"Whereas notices have now been issued effective May 1, 1955, increasing the rents in 873 units from \$3.50 to \$16.50 per month; and

"Whereas such action at this time is unfair, unjust, and inequitable; and

"Whereas the housing authorities are contemplating raising the rents in other projects in the Boston area which will affect 13,000 other families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to cause an investigation to be made of the action taken by the housing authorities in the Boston district and to enact appropriate legislation to prevent such increases of rents: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Federal Housing Authority in the District of Columbia and the city of Boston."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing,

which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill for a public law, H. R. 1, which, if enacted, would give the executive branch of the Federal Government extended and broad new authority to reduce United States import duties and regulations without further congressional action and possibly contrary to express findings and recommendations of the expert United States Tariff Commission; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is sympathetic to the declared purposes of the present Federal trade agreements legislation and the continuance of such legislation as will further the interests of the domestic economy of the United States through expansion of reciprocal world trade, with fair and adequate means of protecting domestic workers, producers, and industries against excessive tariff reductions, but this legislative assembly opposes so changing the existing legislation as to make the tariff policy and rates of the United States primarily instruments of international politics; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is gravely concerned by the adverse effects which substantial tariff reductions already made are having upon important industries of this State, such as the cranberry, cherry, crab, dairy, flibert, fish, grass seeds, hops, lumber, mint, mushroom, walnut, and wool industries, and by the failure of the trade-agreements program to obtain effective reciprocal concessions for United States products, such as Oregon apples and pears which continue to be virtually barred from their former normal world markets by various arbitrary foreign import restrictions; and

"Whereas provisions of H. R. 1 go far beyond the present trade agreements legislation, and offer less, rather than more, promise of recovery and expansion of export markets for domestic products, and if enacted would threaten the possible destruction or substantial curtailment of agricultural and other industries which are vital to the economy of the State of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in regular session assembled, hereby does memorialize the Congress of the United States not to pass H. R. 1, or any legislation which would similarly add to and change the existing trade agreements legislation; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to United States Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Representatives WALTER NOBLEAD, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, SAM COON, and EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate February 18, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house March 11, 1955.

"E. R. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the United States, by and through its Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, has constructed more than 40 dams in the Columbia River watershed since 1902; and

"Whereas the fishery resource of the Columbia River has already received severe damage as a result of such dams; and

"Whereas it is evident that the river development projects referred to herein are prime factors in the depletion of the said fishery resource and that the river development projects should pay from their earnings the continuing operation and maintenance costs of the fishery rehabilitation program presently in progress for the Columbia River watershed; and

"Whereas the United States, acting by and through the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in June 1948 entered into a signed agreement with the fish and game departments of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho for a program of conservation and rehabilitation of the salmon fishery of the Columbia River by authority of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345), as amended August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932); and

"Whereas the agreement of June 1948 provided for construction of fishways, salmon hatcheries, and other improvements by the signatory States with Federal funds released through the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas many of these structures and improvements have now been completed; and

"Whereas the agreement providing for the creation of these structures and facilities does not provide for their permanent operation and maintenance with Federal funds; and

"Whereas it is evident that the depletion of the fishery resource of the Columbia River watershed caused by Federal irrigation, power, and navigation projects in the said watershed will be to some degree a continuous depletion which will necessitate a permanent operation and maintenance of these facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That your memorialists earnestly petition that the President and the Congress of the United States do recognize that the permanent maintenance and operation of these facilities are a Federal responsibility and that moneys for their operation and maintenance should become a continuing part of Federal appropriations, to be allocated to the State agencies responsible for such operation and maintenance through the Fish and Wildlife Service; be it further

"Resolved, That your memorialists earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to establish a permanent means of financing the maintenance and operation of these facilities by appropriate legislation, making the costs of such operation and maintenance a charge against funds received by the United States and its agencies in payment for electrical energy generated at Federal hydroelectric powerplants in the Columbia River Basin; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Oregon, to the

Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of the Army, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

"Adopted by senate March 3, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
"Chief Clerk of Senate.
"ELMO C. SMITH,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by house March 10, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
"Speaker of House."

"House Joint Memorial 11

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Federal funds are appropriated annually to the United States Geological Survey for a program of cooperative investigation of water resources, wherein the Federal allotment matches the State allotment in amount; and

"Whereas cooperative agreements for water resource studies are in effect between the United States Geological Survey and the Oregon State engineer, the Oregon State Highway Commission, and the water departments of Coos Bay-North Bend, Eugene, McMinnville and Portland, and negotiations are proceeding to effectuate a similar agreement with the county court of Douglas County; and

"Whereas in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Federal appropriation was not adequate to match all cooperative offerings with the result that each agreement was in the ratio of \$97.50 Federal to \$100 State; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the agreements must be further reduced to the ratio of \$95 Federal to \$100 State; and

"Whereas still further reductions are in prospect, with a probable ratio of \$85 Federal to \$100 State for fiscal year 1955-56 unless the Congress appropriates an adequate amount, and these deficiencies will result in discontinuance of some stream-flow measuring stations and inadequate rehabilitation and maintenance of existing stations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States hereby is requested to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to carry out the traditional practice of 100 percent matching of all State offerings for the purpose of continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resources; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house March 9, 1955.

"EDITH EYNON LAW,
"Chief Clerk.

"ED GEARY,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate March 14, 1955.

"ELMO C. SMITH,
"President of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 12

"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Senators and Representatives from Oregon in Congress of the United States of America; and to the Board on Geographic Names:

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in

legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas in 1954 the President of the United States of America threw the governing switch which sent thousands of kilowatts of electrical energy from a mighty dam that had just been constructed spanning the Columbia River, an historical day for the Nation marking another milestone in the progress of the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas it was proper and fitting that the dam should be named McNary in order to perpetuate the name of this illustrious pioneer statesman, Charles Linza McNary, who, cooperating with his friends and neighbors, had within the span of one lifetime built from an unexplored wilderness and sagebrush country a progressive and stable part of our United States, homes and industries of the Northwest consuming hundreds of thousands of kilowatts provided by McNary Dam and other dams promoted by Senator McNary and his neighbors; and

"Whereas Oregon and Washington owe so much to pioneer citizens whose hard work and fortitude made the Northwest great; and

"Whereas the dam being named McNary after a pioneer statesman, it would be proper and fitting that the waters creating a lake back of McNary Dam be named Aldrich Lake as a memento to that tireless newspaper editor, Edwin Burton Aldrich, who spent his entire life using his pen to achieve greater things for the Pacific Northwest through the development of its water resources; and

"Whereas E. B. Aldrich, editor of the East Oregonian in Pendleton, Ore., was the leader at the first meeting ever called for the development of the resources of the Columbia River; and

"Whereas E. B. Aldrich was one of the Northwest's representatives sent to alert the Congress of our Nation and Corps of Engineers of the power potentialities of the Columbia River; and

"Whereas it was E. B. Aldrich and his associates who secured the first money ever appropriated for the study of the Columbia River; and from that meager appropriation of \$50,000 from the Congress of the United States and \$10,000 from the State of Oregon an embryo was created from which has emerged multipurpose dams on the Columbia River; and

"Whereas although E. B. Aldrich's pen was forever stilled by his death in 1950, a record of his achievements should be marked for all time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to name this lake Aldrich Lake; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Wayne Morse, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Richard Neuberger, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Walter Norblad, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Sam Coon, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Edith Green, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable Harris Ellsworth, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Board on Geographic Names.

Adopted by house March 23, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,

"Speaker of the House.

"EDITH BYRON LAW,

"Chief Clerk.

Adopted by senate March 30, 1955.

"ELMO C. SMITH,

"President of Senate."

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk two joint resolutions enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing to the Congress to take action in two important fields.

The first relates to restoration of package freight shipping on the Great Lakes, an issue which I personally have recommended for many years and toward which I have in the past introduced legislation.

The second relates to the appropriate issue of a commemorative memorial stamp in honor of the first kindergarten in the United States, established in Watertown, Wis., by Mrs. Carl Schurz in 1856.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 38, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes

"Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Wisconsin industry, and provide a market for the agricultural and manufactured products of the State; and

"Whereas lack of package freight shipping has adversely affected Wisconsin agriculture and industry, and has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries of the Great Lakes area; and

"Whereas package freight shipping will contribute to the reduction of such unemployment; and

"Whereas package freight service will provide a steppingstone to the maximum use of the facilities of the Great Lakes ports of Wisconsin for international trade when the St. Lawrence Seaway has been completed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to restore package freight shipping on the Great Lakes at the earliest practicable date; and, be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the United States Maritime Commission, to each House of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"MARK CATLIN, JR.,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"ARTHUR L. MAY,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"W. P. KNOWLES,

"President of the Senate.

"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,

"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Joint Resolution 20, A

"Joint resolution memorializing the Post Office Department to issue a postage stamp commemorating the establishment of the first kindergarten in the United States in Watertown in 1856

"Whereas the concept of the kindergarten was developed in Germany during the 2d

and 3d decades of the 19th century by Frederick Froebel; and

"Whereas in 1856 the first kindergarten in the United States was established in Watertown, Wis., by Mrs. Carl Schurz, a student of Froebel; and

"Whereas it was not until 1873 that a public-school kindergarten was established anywhere in the United States; and

"Whereas the establishment of the Watertown kindergarten represents a milestone in the development of education in this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General, be requested to give consideration to the issuance, during 1956, of a postage stamp commemorating the centennial celebration of the founding of the first kindergarten in the United States in Watertown, Wis.; and, be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield and to each Member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

"MARK CATLIN, JR.,

"Speaker of the Assembly.

"ARTHUR L. MAY,

"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"W. P. KNOWLES,

"President of the Senate.

"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,

"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

CONTINUANCE OF AMERICAN MARINE HOSPITAL SYSTEM FOR SEAMEN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I did not wish to interrupt the eulogies in honor of the great Franklin D. Roosevelt. My heart is as tender in respect and high regard for the memory of that great man as are any of those who have made their expressions on the other side of the aisle. But there is an Appropriations Committee session beginning at 2:30 o'clock today, and for that reason I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the legislative body of the State of Minnesota. I think it is a very timely resolution, since it memorializes Congress to continue the operation of the great merchant marine hospital.

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

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, the United States Maritime Commission, and the Congress of the United States to support measures to insure the continued operation of the American Marine Hospital system for seamen

Whereas, the nature and type of work performed by the seamen on the American merchant marine operating on the high seas as well as on the Great Lakes is such that it is imperative that adequate hospital facilities be provided for them;

Whereas large numbers of residents of the State of Minnesota are beneficially employed as seamen on the Great Lakes and on the high seas;

Whereas steps have been taken which if carried out would lead to the destruction of the hospital system built up over many years for seamen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to insure the continued operation of the hospital system for the American seamen; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

ALFRED F. JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

KARL T. ROLVAAG,

President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives, the 10th day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1955.

G. H. LEAHY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate, the 30th day of March, in the year of Our Lord 1955.

H. G. SORREY,

Secretary of the Senate.

Approved April 5, 1955.

ORVILLE J. FURMAN,

Governor of the State of Minnesota.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY FOR FARM COMMODITIES — RESOLUTION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Isanti County Cooperative Association, at Zimmerman, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide 90 percent of parity on all farm commodities.

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

Since net farm income has fallen off about 30 percent since 1948, while nonfarm income has increased about 43 percent since 1948, no amount of scrambling of figures can convince us we are better off now under flexible-price supports than we were before. In view of these facts, we submit the following resolution:

Calling upon the President and the Congress to work out a long-range permanent farm program on all commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity—produced by the family-sized farm—(a family farm can be described as one of which the family lives on the land, makes all the major decisions, and supplies the major part of the labor).

We further resolve that the Government stop giving aid to the rich hobby farmers and the large cooperation farms—who really produce the surpluses if there are any—and that the Government provide enough money through low-interest credit for the farm program, CCC, crop insurance, REA, SCS, etc.

ISANTI COUNTY COOPERATIVE

ASSOCIATION,

RAYMOND STOECKEL, Secretary.

ZIMMERMAN, MINN.

INCREASED SUGAR QUOTA—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Blue Earth, the Commercial Club of Frost,

and the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, all of the State of Minnesota, relating to increased sugar quotas.

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

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of Minnesota; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of Minnesota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic sugar industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this organization is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Minnesota, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by Chamber of Commerce, Blue Earth, Minn., March 28, 1955.

A. KOLKJEN,

President.

M. A. GATZKE,

Secretary.

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital and necessary part of the agricultural and industrial life of this community; and

Whereas quota provisions incorporated in the Sugar Act of 1948 as temporarily expedient still are in force, denying the historic right of this industry to grow with our Nation; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry has, through important technological progress, increased its own productivity per acre by some 20 percent since establishment of fixed marketing quotas in the Sugar Act of 1948; and

Whereas the combination of rigid marketing restrictions and increased productivity per acre is forcing injurious acreage reductions and other sharp constrictions of the domestic sugar industry; and

Whereas these pressures not only are acting to the severe and unwarranted detriment of the domestic sugar industry, but also are having a depressing effect upon the economic life of this community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is petitioned to provide for immediate quota increases for the domestic industry and restoration to the domestic industry of its historic right to share in all future increases in United States sugar requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of Commercial Club is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives elected to the Congress by the people of Montana, and to the Secre-

tary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Interior.

Passed by Commercial Club, Frost, Minn., March 28, 1955.

SELMAR MATHESON, President.

LESTER SCOTT, Secretary.

The Director of the Moorhead Chamber of Commerce meeting in a special session on March 28, 1955, at Moorhead, Minn., approved the following resolution:

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended in 1951 expires December 31, 1956; and

"Whereas the sugar industry of the United States is today operating at a minimum of capacity; and

"Whereas the annual consumption increase since 1947 has been 1 million tons; and

"Whereas the sugar industry is a vital portion of the economy of the Red River Valley of the North; and

"Whereas we do have at the present time capacities to produce and process more than double the amount of beet sugar being produced and marketed from this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of Moorhead, Minn., go on record requesting that any increase in the consumption of sugar within the United States be given to the beet and cane producers within the territorial boundaries of this country commensurate with their ability to produce and market this additional consumption economically and in the best interests of the sugar industry of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to all other interested parties."

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE SENATE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Legislature, which has just concluded its biennial session, adopted a resolution petitioning the Congress to take appropriate action which would insure the continuance of programs for the impounding and control of water runoff in the State of Kansas.

This resolution calls attention to the severe hardships and the great financial loss from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

This action on the part of the Kansas Legislature is one of the most progressive and forward-looking steps taken in many years regarding future development of our State.

I believe that everyone must agree that our State's growth, economically, agriculturally, and industrially, will be determined by the amount of water that we can conserve and use.

Kansas is a State that has suffered seriously from intermittent floods and droughts. In 1951 we suffered one of the most disastrous floods in our State's history, causing hundreds of millions of dollars of damage. During the last 3 years, we have suffered a serious drought.

It is, of course, impossible to estimate the terrific loss suffered by our citizens from the lack of water. Our State, through the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, has completed a number of projects in our State that are proving to be of great value.

The programs under the direction and sponsorship of these agencies must not only be continued, but must be expanded.

Every Member of Congress will receive a copy of this resolution, and I sincerely hope they will keep in mind the problems that have been mentioned in the resolution approved by the legislature.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and the cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the United States Department of Agriculture

Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Kansas, and

Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Kansas have always been subject to flood and drought but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods and droughts during the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954; and

Whereas many cities, industries, and farms are suffering from a critical shortage of water, and, at the same time, are exposed to the further hazards of floods and droughts; and

Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply; and

Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, the principal responsibilities for the conservation of water and soil, and, more specifically, such matters as flood control, water supply, irrigation pollution control, and soil conservation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take what actions are necessary to assure continuance of surveys and planning and assure cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Kansas that are vital and necessary to the conservation of soil and water, by the three agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MERCHANT MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Pacific Coast Zone Marine Conference of the International Association of Ma-

chinists, at Portland, Oreg., favoring the establishment of a merchant marine and shipbuilding program.

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

Whereas the experience of two world wars has amply demonstrated the need for the shipbuilding industry standing on a firm base; and

Whereas in the event of a future conflict the added tempo of atomic and guided missile warfare will not allow leeway to build our deteriorated shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities and more particularly will not allow the time necessary to train personnel in skills required to man these yards, said skills including designers, engineers, supervision, and craftsmen of all trades; and

Whereas we are rapidly losing the trained personnel to carry on this industry due to the lack of a stabilized shipbuilding program and the present policy of offshore procurement in the building and repair of American vessels in foreign ports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the Pacific Coast Zone Marine Conference of the International Association of Machinists, assembled in Portland, Oreg., this 5th day of April 1955, strongly urges the shipbuilding industry of the United States and our Congress now in session to put forth every effort to establish a merchant marine and shipbuilding program in order to stabilize our present shipyard facilities;

2. That the Pacific coast zone should receive an equitable share of all construction and repair of vessels in order that employment in the shipyards on the west coast be increased and maintained at a level necessary to assist in the protection of the United States in case of emergency;

3. Our membership in the United States and Canada engaged in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry must continue to use every effort to impress upon their representatives in Government and industry the urgent necessity for immediate action in the building and maintenance of an adequate merchant marine fleet for the defense and protection of the North American Continent and the free world.

NINETY PERCENT OF PARITY ON BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—LETTER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have received from the Morrow County Farm Bureau, of Ione, Oreg., signed by Mrs. Markham Baker, secretary, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide 90-percent parity for basic agricultural commodities.

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

IONE, OREG., April 6, 1955.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: At the regular meeting of the Morrow County Farm Bureau held on March 22, a resolution was passed unanimously, advocating Government support of at least 90-percent parity on basic commodities used at home. One of the reasons for this action is the fact that industries and other groups are so supported thus keeping the prices of machinery and other things that the farmer has to buy at such a level that if the farmer is forced to take lower

prices it may prove disastrous as well as being unfair.

Sincerely yours,
MORROW COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Mrs. MARKHAM BAKER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF A HIGH HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Oregon Grangers, electric cooperative associations, labor unions, the State Farmers Union, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and other groups, in support of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

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

OREGON STATE GRANGERS RESOLUTION

Grangers, representing 34 of the State's 36 counties, meeting at State grange headquarters in Portland, Oreg., on January 17, 1955, to discuss the hydroelectric power situation in the Northwest hereby go on record urging immediate action by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to authorize the construction of the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

We feel that such action must be taken at once in order to assure that this great resource will be fully integrated into the Pacific Northwest grid system before an actual power shortage develops that will be a detriment to all the people of the United States.

We feel that to permit the Idaho Power Co. to despoil Hells Canyon with its partial and piecemeal scheme would be a dangerous and needless loss to this Nation and to this region. We therefore urge all granges and other organizations to join together in a united effort to attain authorization of the high Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

Signed by:

RAY W. GILL,
ALBERT ULLMAN,
EARL A. MOORE.

Resolved, That we reaffirm our former resolution that we favor the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government in accord with the survey and recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in Congress.

Adopted at annual State convention of the Oregon State Farmers Union in Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1955.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE OREGON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 14, 1954

Be it resolved, That the legislative program of the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association be supplemented by the following policy statement:

Resolution No. 4: That we urge early enactment of legislation to authorize construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

Resolution adopted.

B. R. LITTLE,
Secretary-Treasurer, Oregon Rural
Electric Cooperative Association.

CENTRAL LINCOLN
PEOPLES' UTILITY DISTRICT,
Newport, Oreg., February 10, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the interest of securing a continued supply of low-cost power necessary for the further development

and progress of the Pacific Northwest, the members of the board of directors of the Central Lincoln Peoples' Utility District solicit your support of the Hells Canyon Dam bill as recently approved by the board of directors of the National Hells Canyon Association.

It is our belief that only through Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project can the full maximum development and utilization of the hydroelectric potential be realized. Benefits of low-cost power for the Pacific Northwest would be realized through the proposed interconnection with the Federal Columbia River Power System and marketing of electric energy under provisions of the 1937 Bonneville Project Act.

Very truly yours,

MILLARD MARTIN,
President.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress, and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill, for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest Power Pool to insure needed power for this area, and for national defense, and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means, and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people, these added industries, this added payroll, added homes and all other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments, and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it, and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation, and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America, had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials, all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low cost power in the Northwest, and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure, and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure, so; therefore be it

Resolved, that Sixes Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon bill, and that we forward copies of this resolution to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, requesting their undivided support of this bill.

ALBERT BRITTON,
Master Sixes Grange.

DENMARK, OREG.

FRANK MORRIS, Jr.,
Secretary Sixes Grange.

SIXES, OREG.

BAKER DISTRICT POMONA GRANGE, No. 24,
March 5, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Baker District Pomona Grange assembled in regular session at Missouri Flat Grange, No. 612, on March 5, 1955.

Go on record as favoring adoption of the Hells Canyon bill as presented to the present

Congress and Senate of the United States.

We further resolve that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, Representative SAM COON, and the Oregon State Legislative Committee.

EDGAR STORIE,
Master.

EDITH MORIN,
Secretary.

CLACKAMAS COUNTY
CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL,
Oregon City, Oreg., March 18, 1955.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This council is appreciative of your efforts in behalf of congressional approval of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. PERRIN,
Secretary.

PUYALLUP, WASH., March 19, 1955.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our regular session, Fruitland Grange, No. 999, instructed me to inform you that we favor the early passage of S. 1333, authorizing the construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon.

We are familiar with your position but are simply offering written evidence which may be used by you in proving what the public sentiment is in regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

NEVA MILNE,
Secretary,
Fruitland Grange, No. 999.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, and many other Senators from many different States of the Union for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas to get the fullest benefits of the water resources of the Northwest for power, irrigation, navigation for all of the people for more industries and a fuller opportunity for work for an ever increasing army of working people. It is absolutely necessary to build the Hells Canyon Dam as soon as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226 of Portland, Oreg., do earnestly and sincerely endorse Senate bill 1333 as now introduced in the United States Senate and pledge its full support of said bill; be it further

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226 of Portland, Oreg., do hereby sincerely commend and appreciate all those Senators.

A. E. Larson, C. J. La Salle, James W. Johnson, C. B. Fairley, H. W. Goodding, T. E. Johnson, A. T. Williams, Sr., Geo. Hany, Andrew F. Sears, Carpenters, No. 226.

RESOLUTION FROM KITTITAS COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, No. 58, HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas we the Grangers of Kittitas County Pomona Grange No. 58 feel that the Hells Canyon Dam should be built to assure our downstream dams an ample supply of water when the river and its tributaries are low; and

Whereas engineers have assured that the dam will produce a capacity of 686,000 kilowatts, as well as serving as flood control, and other benefits: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kittitas County Pomona Grange go on record favoring the construction of Hells Canyon Dam and that Senate bill No. 1333; providing for the construction of the high dam by the Bureau of Reclamation, be passed and that construction be started as soon as practical; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution go to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator WAYNE MORSE, who introduced the bill, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Senator HENRY JACKSON, Representative HAL HOLMES, and Representative DON MAGNUSON. Copies should be sent to our Washington State Grange Master Lars A. Nelson, and to the Hells Canyon Dam Association.

The above resolution was adopted by the Kittitas County Pomona No. 58 meeting at Ellensburg on March 26.

ORVILLE E. BURGETT,
Master.

ELNA EMERSON,
Secretary.

OSWEGO GRANGE, No. 175,
Lake Grove, Oreg., March 24, 1955.
Re Hells Canyon bill No. 1333.

It is hereby resolved that the Oswego Grange No. 175 wishes to go on record in support of the Hells Canyon Dam, bill No. 1333.

DURWARD E. FRY,
Master.

SABRA F. OLDEHAM,
Secretary.

STANLEY OLDEHAM,
J. F. HALLMEYER,
JOE DECORT,
Executive Committee.

PENDELTON, OREG.
Cold Spring Grange, No. 801, urges the Federal Power Commission and the Congress of the United States to support the proposed multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam project and to oppose the alternate proposal for smaller dams.

Authorize the construction in the near future.

MERVIN R. MEINERS,
Master.

Mrs. BERT BLOOM,
Secretary.

JUNCTION CITY.
RESOLUTION

Whereas economic future of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest depends on an adequate supply of hydroelectric power,

Whereas Army engineers' reports show that the construction of a high multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River Basin: Therefore be it

Resolved by South Benton Grange, No. 756 (in session assembled March 25), to go on record as urging the adoption of Senate bill 1333, which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River; be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to State Grange, National Hells Canyon Dam Association, and Senators and Representatives of Oregon congressional delegation.

MILES PETERS,
Master.

EVA PETERS,
Secretary.

ROSEBURG, OREG., March 31, 1955.

Whereas Lookingglass Grange No. 927, of Lookingglass, Oreg., went on record January 12, 1954, in favor of and supporting the Hells Canyon donation fund: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of Lookingglass Grange No. 927 at a recent meeting went on record favoring S. 1333, the Federal high Hells Canyon measure.

CHARLES E. SCHULZE, Master.
SUSIE OAR, Secretary.

KEATING GRANGE,
Keating, Oreg.

Whereas this grange is, and always has been, in favor of a Federal Hells Canyon Dam: Therefore be it

Resolved by Keating Grange No. 823 (met in regular session this 25th day of March), Go on record as favoring Senate bill 1333; also be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen and to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to Representative GRACIE FROST, of Idaho.

Resolution examined and approved by Keating Grange No. 823, Keating, Ore.

BOB COWARD, *Master.*

ARLAINE CORNETT, *Secretary.*

BANDON, OREG., April 1, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We of Westmost Grange No. 884 would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in order to obtain construction of the vital Hells Canyon Dam.

This Grange has unanimously passed a resolution favoring Federal construction of the high dam in Hells Canyon. We want you to know that public support for this project is not lacking.

Sincerely,

WESTMOST GRANGE No. 894.

ED. B. GOULD,

J. J. MORRIS,

L. M. KRANICK, *Committee.*

RIVERSDALE GRANGE, No. 731

Roseburg, Ore.

Whereas Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been highly successful, contributing greatly to the winning of World War II, and have been the direct origin of the industrial expansion of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas additional facilities of this type are needed in order to continue this expansion, to provide for Oregon's rapidly increasing population, and further to minimize flood levels on the Columbia River and other streams; and

Whereas the Army engineers' 308 report has already shown that construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River System, providing the most practical upstream storage and maximum firm power at downstream dams; and

Whereas the State granges of Oregon, Washington, and California are in favor of the United States Government erecting a high dam in Hells Canyon: Therefore, be it

Resolved (1) That we again affirm our previous decisions regarding construction of Hells Canyon Dam. (2) That we strongly denounce the present administration for its failure to oppose the granting of a license by the Federal Power Commission to build three low dams and to promote the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government. (3) That a copy of this resolution be sent to: Kay Meriwether, executive secretary, National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 Southeast Salmon Street, Portland, Ore.; Senator Wayne L. Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Walter Norblad, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Sam Coon, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Edith Green, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Harris Ellsworth, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.; Gracie Frost, Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Submitted by Riversdale Grange, No. 731, Douglas County, Ore.

NELDA NORRIS, *Master.*

ANNA TROZELLE, *Secretary.*

POULSBOROUGH, WASH., March 29, 1955.

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,

Portland, Ore.

GENTLEMEN: We appreciate the fine work you are doing for the high dam on the Snake

River. We realize what this means to the economy of the Pacific Northwest. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

R. KVELATED,

Secretary, North Kitan Farmers Union, Local 488.

BEAVERTON, OREG., March 28, 1955.

Whereas in the electrical development of the Pacific Northwest, the Snake River will ultimately be harnessed; and

Whereas it is our considered belief that this will be accomplished most efficiently by the construction of a single high dam by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Beaverton Grange in regular session assembled this 28th day of March 1955 go on record favoring the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Adopted.

BERT WILSON,

Master.

E. G. PERKINS,

Secretary.

RESOLUTION

MCKINLEY GRANGE, No. 582,

Myrtle Point, Ore.

Whereas the need for electrical power is increasing rapidly in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas we do not believe in the administration's partnership-power program of the Government building dams and the private power interests collecting the lion's share of the revenue; and

Whereas we believe a high dam in Hells Canyon will utilize in the fullest the potential of this great site: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the McKinley Grange No. 582 in regular session on the 26th day of March 1955 unanimously went on record as favoring the enactment of S. 1333 at this session of Congress so that this great power site may begin contributing prime kilowatts to the Northwest power pool at the earliest possible moment.

ELMER STRODE,

Master.

PRISCILLA MAST,

Secretary.

FRIENDLY GRANGE No. 897,

Portland, Ore.

Whereas the supply of hydroelectric energy in the Pacific Northwest has presently forced the curtailment of production of aluminum and other goods essential to defense and national prosperity; and

Whereas reliable surveys indicate that by 1960, unless adequate steps are taken now, this region will face even more critical shortages; and

Whereas advance planning for the integrated development of the water resources of the region, as represented by the findings and recommendations of the Army's 308 report, calls for the construction by the Federal Government of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River; and

Whereas such a dam, operated as an integral part of the Bonneville system, will bring untold benefits to downstream areas in the form of increased power production and flood control: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Friendly Grange No. 897 go on record requesting immediate enactment of S. 1333, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon; Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, the chairman of the Senate Insular Affairs and Interior Committee; Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; the National Hells Canyon Association; and to the Oregon State Grange.

MILDRED NORMAN, *Master.*

CLAIRE ELLIOTT, *Secretary.*

Approved March 24, 1954.

UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE.

Whereas all the electricity that can be developed in the Northwest will soon be needed; and

Whereas aid to navigation and flood control that this dam will provide is a necessity for the full potential use of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and

Whereas the building of Hells Canyon Dam would result in an outstanding recreational lake amid a locality already famous for its scenery and place to spend vacations—such addition would become part of a growing asset as a tourist resort; and

Whereas the electricity generated at Hells Canyon and the buildup at the lower dams will be much more than any other proposed plan; and

Whereas cheap electricity is needed to develop the great phosphate deposits in Idaho for fertilizer that is used, more and more, in the growing of farm crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Union County Pomona Grange this 26th day of March 1955 in regular session, That we ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to support and pass S. 1333 as soon as possible and to appropriate funds to start the same.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON, *Master.*

LAURA E. BATES, *Secretary.*

NORTH RIVER GRANGE, No. 946,

Brooklyn, Wash., April 1, 1955.

Whereas we of the North River Grange No. 946 believe that a high, multipurpose dam should be built at Hells Canyon: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this Grange go on record as approving the construction of a high multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our representatives and to our Senators and to the National Hells Canyon Association.

Dated this 1st day of April 1955.

HAROLD E. WOOD,

Master.

JAMES M. CRICK,

Secretary.

ONTARIO HEIGHTS GRANGE, No. 917,

Ontario, Ore.

Ontario Heights Grange, No. 917, at a special meeting on March 25, 1955, held for consideration of the high Government dam as an integrated part of the Columbia and Snake Rivers resource development versus the low head dams as proposed by Idaho Power Co., voted unanimously to have the high dam built by the Government as an integrated unit in the Columbia Basin development.

It is emphasized that—

A. The high dam is a necessity for full development of this section of the basin to promote and insure continued expansion of our agricultural resources to provide power at rates that will attract industries with the resultant employment and taxable properties that the area does not now have in sufficient quantity, especially in the area adjacent to Hells Canyon.

B. The aid in equalization and firm-up of power at downstream powerhouses is imperative; without this storage for firm-up a loss of potential power and its benefits will occur at downstream points as long as they exist.

C. The development of the phosphate beds of southern Idaho are necessary if our farms of the area are to maintain their fertility and ability to produce the maximums. Existing transportation cost alone deny many of the farms of the great Northwest the benefits of phosphate application. The extension of the Bonneville grid system into this upstream area will insure phosphate development as well as attract payrolls and industrial development needed to stabilize many parts of our local economy.

D. Flood control, benefits of power revenues to help equalize high cost irrigation development, recreation with its vast potential for sportsmen, vacationists, etc., alone justify building of the high dam.

A God-given resource; a great river, its tremendous horsepower flowing incessantly, a canyon, one of the deepest in the world, a combination unequalled and unsurpassed; surely it is our duty and trust to preserve this for our sons and daughters and their future generations.

We urge immediate action favoring the Federal high Hells Canyon measure, S. 1333.

GEO. L. WHITE,
Master.
WYOMA ROGERS,
Secretary.

CENTRAL GRANGE, No. 360,
Veneta, Oreg.

Be it resolved by Central Grange, No. 360, Lane County, Oregon, That we go on record favoring the Hells Canyon High Dam on the Snake River as originally outlined in the 308 report of the Army engineers in the overall development of the Columbia River power system.

H. A. PETZOLD, Master.
FLORENCE INMAN,
Secretary.

FERNHILL GRANGE, No. 592,
Rainier, Oreg.

Whereas the Federal high Hells Canyon Dam will provide more power than the three low head dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co.; and

Whereas there is a vast need for more power in the Pacific Northwest to promote more industries which will help solve the unemployment situation in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas low cost power is needed to develop the phosphate beds of Idaho to furnish fertilizer which is badly needed by the farmers in this area; Therefore be it

Resolved, That Fernhill Grange, No. 592, Rainier, Oreg., go on record to petition the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to favor the Federal Hells Canyon Dam; be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the United States Senators and Representatives of Oregon and to the Oregon State Grange.

Resolution read and adopted by Fernhill Grange, No. 592, at a regular meeting, March 26, 1955.

W. W. KIMBLE, Master.
LUCILLE KIMBLE,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CONSTRUCTION OF
HELLS CANYON DAM

IRON WORKERS NORTHWEST
DISTRICT COUNCIL,
Spokane, Wash., April 4, 1955.

Whereas there is now before Congress of the United States, both in the Senate and House, a bill known as Senate bill 1333, introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and 29 other Senators representing 20 States; and

Whereas this bill provides for the construction of a multiple-purpose dam rather than the construction of the smaller dams as proposed by the Idaho Power Co.; and

Whereas the construction of Hells Canyon Dam will not only provide employment during its construction but will be an asset to the economic future of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, and essential to the defense strength and economic expansion and stability of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the second quarterly meeting of Iron Workers Northwest District Council go on record supporting construction of Hells Canyon Dam, and passage of Senate bill 1333.

Submitted by Iron Workers Local 29, John O'Neill, Carl Johnson, Henry Sinner, and lo-

cal unions affiliated with the district council: Local 505, Tom E. Day; Local 86, Claude Jackson; Local 506, Earl L. Lawrence; Local 14, Howard A. Turner; Local 511, Mickey H. Melaas; Local 114, Einar Nelson; Local 581, Arthur J. Ruehenson; Local 516, Homer I. Park; Local 598, Kenneth Frazier.

VALE GRANGE, No. 696,
Vale, Oreg., April 2, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the regular meeting of Vale Grange, No. 696, at Vale, Oreg., on April 1, 1955, a resolution was unanimously passed by the members to support the authorization of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Yours truly,
D. E. CARTER, Master.
CARRIE M. BERRY, Secretary.

OPHIR GRANGE, No. 767,
Ophir, Oreg., March 25, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Ophir Grange, No. 767, went on record endorsing Senate bill 1333 at their regular meeting on the above date.

Very truly yours,
RAYMOND H. STEVENS, Master.
RUTH M. MOORE, Secretary.

LINN COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
Albany, Oreg., March 17, 1955.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area and for national defense; and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people—these added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and all other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments; and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation; and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials—all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Linn County Pomona Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon bill, and that we forward copies of this resolution to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, requesting their undivided support of this bill; also, that a copy of this resolution be sent to every

Pomona Grange in the State of Oregon requesting their support.

G. R. TRUAX, Master.
WENONAH WILEY, Secretary.

In order to acquaint our Congressmen of the stand of our Grange regarding a high dam or three low head dams on the Snake River in the Hells Canyon area, we, the East Side Grange, No. 583, located at New Pine Creek, Oreg., propose the following resolution:

"HELLS CANYON DAM VERSUS THREE LOW-HEAD DAMS

"Whereas the three proposed low-head dams are to be located in the area which would be the reservoir site of the Hells Canyon Dam, as located by the Army engineers and the Federal irrigation group; and

"Whereas the sites for the three low-head dams are requested by private utility companies; and

"Whereas the granting of these sites to the private companies would shut off construction of Hells Canyon Dam without bargaining with the private companies for the return of the sites; and

"Whereas low-head dams make no provision for flood control, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide an exceptionally large reservoir in an ideal primitive area for water storage; and

"Whereas low-head dams require water rights to assure sufficient river flow for maximum development of power, while Hells Canyon dam would store great quantities of surplus water during the spring run-off, thus holding it from flooding the lower area and also providing power development even during the long dry periods, not only at the dam site, but to riverflow dams below, only becoming a low-head dam when the stored water is used down to the river flow; and

"Whereas low-head dams are of no value for wild life, scenic, or recreational uses, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide all these benefits: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this grange stands definitely for the construction of the Hell's Canyon dam and opposed to giving away the three sites in the Snake River which would obstruct the construction of the Hells Canyon dam; and be it further

Resolved, That we want the Hell's Canyon dam constructed and owned by the Federal Government, provided however, that in power development the Federal Government share with the States concerned such costs and benefits as may be for the best interests of the people of those States and of the Nation, and provided further that the Federal Government enter into such contracts with private companies, including cooperative companies, for the development, distribution, and sale of electric power as will be to the advantage and for the benefit of the whole population; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Congressmen and to our State secretary of the grange."

JOHN RICHARDSON,
Master.
MURIEL SMITH,
Secretary.

POWELL BUTTE GRANGE, No. 629,
Powell Butte, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Powell Butte Grange assembled in regular session April 1, 1955.

It was discussed and voted on in favor of S. 1333 and urge immediate action on this legislation.

Very truly yours,
NICK RACHOR,
Master.
HELEN SIMMONS,
Secretary.

MARYSVILLE, WASH.
Whereas after a careful study of both sides of the question of 1 high dam at Hells Canyon, or 3 low dams, on the Snake River, as

the arguments appeared in the daily press; and

Whereas we have in mind the most benefit to the most people, and after due consideration of both sides of the question we are convinced that it would not be to the best interest of the majority of the people living in the States of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington to build three low dams on the Snake River: Therefore be it

Resolved by Kellogg Marsh Grange, No. 136, in session the 19th day of March 1955, That we instruct and urge our Senators and Congressmen to work for a high dam on the Snake River at Hells Canyon.

GERTRUDE BRITTSCH,
Master.
A. G. ZIEBEL,
Secretary.
C. A. BRITTSCH,
R. C. FRANKIE,
Resolution Committee.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
MOUNT HOOD LODGE, No. 1005,
Portland, Oreg., April 8, 1955.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is the wish of the membership of Mount Hood Lodge, No. 1005, International Association of Machinists, to be placed on record as endorsing and supporting Senate bill 1333.

It is our belief, and history has proven, that Federal contract and operation of such projects in the Columbia River Basin are most desirable.

With sincere approval of your past efforts on behalf of this bill and best wishes for future success, I remain,

Very truly yours,

RALPH F. KAUFMAN,
Financial Secretary.

HOQUIAM, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We members of Humptulips Valley National Farmers Union, Local 441, wish to offer you our thanks for leading out in the fight supporting a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon. We are in hearty accord with any effort to prevent this "giveaway" of public resources.

Yours for more job opportunities and a better America through Federal power.

Sincerely yours,

HUMPTULIPS VALLEY NATIONAL FARMERS
UNION, LOCAL 441,
ELSIE TUFFREE.

COQUILLE, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Bandon Grange, No. 702, Bandon, Oreg., voted 100 percent in favor of Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

LEANDER PANTER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION AT 13TH ANNUAL
MEETING, FEBRUARY 17, 1955

Whereas long-established Federal power policy, embraced in the basic resource laws of the land for over 50 years calls for the full development of the peoples resources; and

Whereas the full development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin requires the construction of a high dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the rural electric systems strongly endorse the Morse-Neuberger-Pfost bill authorizing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the authorization of Hells Canyon Dam at this session of the

Congress and the appropriation of adequate funds to get construction underway immediately; and be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the campaign of the Idaho Power Co. to seize control of the middle Snake River in order that it may construct 3 small dams which would result in the waste of approximately half the power potential of that area.

FORT THOMAS VETERANS HOSPITAL, KENTUCKY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, resolutions adopted by the Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion Department of Kentucky, Covington; the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion Department of Kentucky, Newport; the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, Newport, Ky.; and the South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, Newport, Ky.; relative to the status of Fort Thomas Veterans' Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky.

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

Whereas our membership is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veteran Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the organization; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by the South Newport Boosters and Civic Association, Newport, Ky.

CHARLES J. GOETZ,
President.

Attest:

WILBUR SCHOO,
Secretary.

Whereas the American Legion is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veteran Administration Hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the American Legion; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the central office of the Veterans' Administration be requested to concur with the recommendations as made by Mr. W. G. Stephens, manager of the Veterans Hospital at Fort Thomas, Ky., as stated in his letter of March 7, 1955, file 5178-M, which is made part of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by Norman Barnes Post, No. 70, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, March 22, 1955, Covington, Ky.

STANLEY KANIENBERG,
Commander.

Attest:

FOSTER RAUCH,
Adjutant.

Whereas Jas. Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the Jas. Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans' Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Le-

glon, do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas "giveaway" program.

Passed unanimously by the James Wallace Costigan Post, No. 11, American Legion, in regular session assembled on Thursday, March 31, 1955, at Newport, Ky.

Geo. A. Mason,

Commander.

Attest:

LOUIS L. HOLLOWELL,
Adjutant.

Whereas our membership is strongly in accord with the principle of elimination of unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; and

Whereas it has been recommended by the Hoover Commission that the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Thomas, in Campbell County, Ky., to be closed; and

Whereas this recommendation seems to have been made after an extremely cursory and inadequate study of the facilities at this hospital; and

Whereas waiting lists of veteran, chronic, bedridden patients is known to exist at practically all Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the problem of caring for the veteran is of paramount importance to the organization; and

Whereas Fort Thomas Veterans Hospital problem is actually one of inadequate hospital staffs to care for veteran needs rather than surplus facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Clifton Third Alarm Associates do hereby unanimously recommend to our duly elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States that the following action be taken:

1. A new and complete investigation be instituted since there is grave question as to the merit of the findings and the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in regard to this hospital.

2. That no action should be taken which would impair the hospitalization or medical care needed by veterans.

3. If it be found on subsequent investigation that there is a situation of concurrent understaffing and an excess of veteran-patient on waiting lists, then steps be taken to correct existing deficiencies; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, believes that it is the duty and responsibility of our Government to honor its commitments to the Kentucky veterans of its several wars before it commits itself to a single overseas giveaway program.

Passed unanimously by the Clifton Third Alarm Associates, 203 Main Avenue, Newport, Ky.

EARL ANDERSON,
Commander.

Attest:

EUGENE GIANCOLA,
Adjutant.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE FROM 21 TO 18 YEARS—RESOLUTION OF MARINETTE COUNTY (WIS.) YOUTH COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear from the Marinette County Youth Council in my State on the issue of granting the vote for 18-year-olds.

I personally have long felt that these young men and women should be given the opportunity to cast their ballot; obviously, maturity is not simply a matter of chronological age. And certainly, since young people are considered old enough to fight, they should be regarded as old enough to vote.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, and thereafter be appropriately referred.

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

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE

MARINETTE COUNTY YOUTH COUNCIL,
Marinette, Wis.

(NOTE.—This is a copy of a resolution passed by the delegates to the Marinette-Oconto County Youth Conference, Saturday, March 12, 1955.)

Whereas as a result of a poll taken throughout the State, by the Wisconsin Youth Organization, it has been shown that the youth of Wisconsin are overwhelmingly in favor of legislation designed to lower the legal age required to vote from 21 to 18; and

Whereas it has been noted that President Eisenhower is in favor of legislation which would allow 18-year-olds to vote; and

Whereas it has been pointed out that there are about 5 million citizens, between the ages of 18 and 21, paying either direct or indirect taxes; and

Whereas we feel that this is an example of taxation without representation, an issue which the American Revolution was fought over; and

Whereas there are about 1,500,000 people between the ages of 18 and 21 that are married and have set up housekeeping; and

Whereas most of the young men between the ages of 18 and 21 are expected to enter military service to fight for their country, but still can't help in electing its leaders; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States clearly states that no person who is a citizen shall be denied the right to vote because of race, color, creed, sex, or previous condition of servitude; and

Whereas we feel that, since the majority of those between the ages of 18 and 21 must bear the responsibilities of a citizen, that they should not be kept from the rights of a citizen, as defined in the Constitution; and

Whereas bills, designed to lower the voting age, have been introduced in both the State legislature and the Congress;

Resolved, That the Conference of Marinette and Oconto County Youth urges the leaders of State and National Government to get behind the legislation which would lower the voting age from 21 to 18.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 33. A resolution for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission; with amendments (Rept. No. 137).

NELLE FUHR BECKLEY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Nelle Fuhr Beckley. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 88) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nelle Fuhr Beckley, widow of Harold R. Beckley, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF 57TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution to print the 57th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1954, as a Senate document. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 89) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the 57th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1954, be printed as a Senate document.

NELLE C. KOEN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution to pay a gratuity to Nelle C. Koen. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 90) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nelle C. Koen, widow of Frank L. Koen, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 9 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 13, 84TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress, entitled "Our

Capitol." I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), submitted by Mr. CLEMENTS on April 1, 1955, was considered and agreed to, 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.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by communistic-controlled authorities; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1654. A bill for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa;

S. 1655. A bill for the relief of Nicola Shawk Salameh; and

S. 1656. A bill for the relief of Ana DeMoura Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1657. A bill to authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities; to provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to certain other Federal property; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1658. A bill to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory bird hunting stamps; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1659. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael Barton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1660. A bill for the relief of Fidel A. Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1661. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure payment of the full face value of national service life insurance policies on which payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 1662. A bill for the relief of Herminio DePalma Inacio;

S. 1663. A bill for the relief of Antonio dos Santos Casqueira; and

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of Balbina Borenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1665. A bill for the relief of Ronny Tochinsky Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1666. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1667. A bill to incorporate the 29th Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MALONE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SCHOEPFEL, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 1668. A bill providing for the designation of a highway across the Continental Divide as a part of the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Dr. Milan Gavrilovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1670. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tanash H. Atoynatan and his wife, Eleni Atoynatan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Father Evencio Moreno Villiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Bruno Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (by request):

S. 1673. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Akers; and

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of Lawrence A. Woolhether; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of Dwight S. Sharer; and

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Antonio Domenico Narciso Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WITH RESPECT TO PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, to be printed and lie on the table, a bill to which I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader. In my opinion, the bill requires very prompt action by the Senate. At the present time a number of Americans are held as prisoners of war by the Chinese Communists. For the first time they will be required to pay income taxes if this measure is not enacted. I shall not ask for its immediate consideration, because this matter was called to my attention only yesterday afternoon, by the wife of one of the prisoners of war. I have had this measure prepared, and I should like very much to discuss it with the majority leader and with the chairman of the Finance Committee, as I have already done with representatives of the executive departments, including the Treasury Department and the Defense Department. The bill is very short, and I wish it have it read, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the bill read; and I shall be delighted to discuss it or any other bill the Senator from California may care to discuss with me at any time at his convenience.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and will lie on the table.

The bill (S. 1653) for the relief of members of the Armed Forces in respect to the payment of income taxes while held as prisoners by communistic controlled authorities, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 1653 which I have introduced may be read for the information of the Senate. It is my hope that the House, where a companion measure is being introduced by Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, will be in a position promptly to act on the matter, because of the time element involved. I wish to have the proposed legislation printed and to lie upon the table. It is my intention, at the earliest opportunity, if there is some other revenue bill which the Senate Finance Committee should report to the Senate, to add my measure as an amendment, in the event that there is no legislation dealing with the subject at an earlier date, because I feel that it is extremely important.

Mr. President, may the bill be read for the information of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand that the Senate has given its consent to having the bill lie on the table?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to the bill being read at this time and to having it lie on the table. I think the statement the Senator has made will permit early action in the event the House acts. I wish to assure the Senator that I shall cooperate in seeing that the matter is brought to the attention of the appropriate committee and of the Senate.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's understanding of our situation today. There is certainly no desire to prevent the bill from being read to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that. The Senator has always extended every courtesy. I have many times had an opportunity to remark to Members on this side of the aisle and to persons outside the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Texas has always been most courteous regarding any of the requests we have made, and we have tried not to make unreasonable requests.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding after subsections (a) and (b) a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) Gross income does not include compensation for active service received by any member of the Armed Forces of the United States for any period during which he was held against his will in an area controlled by a Communist government authority even though such area does not constitute a combat zone within the meaning of this section."

Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is further amended by renumbering subsection (c) to read subsection (d).

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that there might be a brief explanation of the situation, section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 reads, in part, as follows:

(a) Enlisted personnel: Gross income does not include compensation received for active service as a member below the grade of commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such member—

(1) served in a combat zone during an induction period.

Subsection (b) reads, in part, as follows:

(b) Commissioned officers: Gross income does not include so much of the compensation as does not exceed \$200 received for active service as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces of the United States for any month during any part of which such officer—

(1) served in a combat zone during an induction period.

Subsection (c) reads, in part, as follows:

(c) Definitions: For purposes of this section—

(2) the term "combat zone" means any area which the President of the United States by Executive order designates, for purposes of this section or corresponding provisions of prior income-tax laws, as an area in which Armed Forces of the United States are or have (after June 24, 1950) engaged in combat.

(3) service is performed in a combat zone only if performed on or after the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the commencing of combatant activities in such zone, and on or before the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of the combatant activities in such zone; except that June 25, 1950, shall be considered the date of the commencing of combatant activities in the combat zone designated in Executive Order 10195.

Under the Executive order of January 1, 1955, the combat operations in Korea were terminated as of January 31, 1955; and there is no desire to recreate the previous situation through the proposed legislation. But had the prisoners of war been released under the terms of the armistice agreement, this situation would not have arisen. Nevertheless, the fact is that I received word yesterday from the wife of one of the prisoners who are being held by the Chinese Communists that because of the provision in the statute, the prisoners of war are being compelled, for the first time, to pay an income tax. Of course, they are being held against their will.

It appears to me that there is no way in which the executive branch of the Government can, by Executive order, modify the law. In other words, it would be necessary for the executive branch to recreate a combat zone to enable everyone concerned, including those serving in Korea today, to receive an exemption, or a change will have to be made in the law.

I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is chairman of the Committee on Finance; with the ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; and also with some of the Members of

the House; and I am very hopeful that, because of the imminence of the income-tax deadline of April 15, some way may be found in the House to expedite consideration of the proposed legislation. Then, when it comes to the Senate, we might promptly take up the matter. I intend to be in touch with the distinguished majority leader, to expedite action on the bill, as I have indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it appears that the bill is meritorious. However, the Senate has no authority to originate tax legislation, even with a deadline confronting us. I think the proper course is being followed, namely, to have the bill introduced in the House. While it is somewhat unusual to give consent to have a bill lie on the table, perhaps, with the agreement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and also the ranking minority member, the bill might be considered by the Senate without following the usual formalities, in view of the merits of the measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

PROPOSED FEDERAL PROPERTY TAX AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to strengthen the independence and integrity of local governments by restoring to them a part of the revenues they have lost because of Federal acquisition of real estate and other property. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared describing the bill be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks, together with the text of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1657) to authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities; to provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to certain other Federal property; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Property Tax Authorization Act of 1955."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States hereafter to make such tax payments and contributions in lieu of taxes on account of such property as may be fair and equitable to compensate the States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities for tax revenue of which they are deprived by reason of the ownership or control by the Federal Government of such property within the States.

(b) In enacting this act it is the purpose of the Congress to remove, so far as practica-

ble, inequities existing between taxpayers of State and local governments, on the one hand, and taxpayers of the Federal Government, on the other hand, in the distribution of governmental costs incident to property owned or used by the Federal Government.

(c) In consideration for the payments authorized by this act, the Congress expects that the several State governments, and all political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, when so requested, will make all public services normally provided by them available to and with respect to the Federal Government, its property, and its officers and employees, upon the same terms and conditions as such services are made available to or with respect to other property and individuals.

(d) The Congress reserves the right to amend, modify, or repeal the provisions of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, office, or independent establishment in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and any corporation now or hereafter subject to the provisions of title I of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 846);

(b) The term "Federal property" means any property the legal title to which is held by the United States or any Federal agency;

(c) The term "controlling agency," when used in relation to any Federal property, means the Federal agency which is charged with the duty of administering such property;

(d) The term "Board" means the Federal Tax Payments Board established by this act;

(e) The term "State" means any State of the United States;

(f) The term "State tax authority" means any State, and any county, city, municipality, tax district, or other political subdivision or public entity thereof having authority under the law of such State to levy and collect within its territorial jurisdiction any tax or special assessment;

(g) The term "person" means any individual, partnership, association composed of individuals, or private corporation;

(h) The term "tax" means any tax of general application levied according to value by any State tax authority upon property situated within its territorial jurisdiction, but does not include (1) any tax levied upon the manufacture, purchase, sale, transfer, or use of any property, or (2) any tax levied or fee imposed for the procurement of any license, permit, or other authorization to engage in any form of activity;

(i) The term "tax year," when used in relation to any tax, means a period of 1 year, beginning with (1) the first date on which liability for the payment thereof is established under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax, or (2) if no such date is ascertainable under such law, the first day of the assessment period prescribed under such law for such tax;

(j) The term "taxable person," when used in relation to the payment of any tax, means any person who is the owner of any property and who is not, by reason of his status or the use made of such property, exempt from obligation to pay such tax;

(k) The term "special assessment" means any levy, other than a tax, imposed by any State tax authority directly upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction to defray the cost of any public improvement, and equitably apportioned according to the benefit conferred by such improvement upon such property;

(l) The term "property" means any real property or tangible personal property;

(m) The term "real property," when used in relation to any tax or special assessment,

means any interest in land, and any improvement thereon if such improvement constitutes real property under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax or special assessment;

(n) The term "tangible personal property," when used in relation to any tax, means any physical object, other than real property, defined as tangible personal property by law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such tax, but does not include any coin, bullion, currency, credit, security, or chose in action;

(o) The term "industrial or commercial use," when used in relation to any Federal property, includes any use made of such property for (1) the mining, manufacturing, fabrication, or repair of any article or commodity, (2) the generation of electrical energy, (3) the transportation of individuals or property, (4) the storage of property, and (5) the sale or leasing of commodities or services;

(p) The term "governmental use," when used in relation to any Federal property, means any use made of such property other than (1) an industrial or commercial use, or (2) use for the housing of individuals for which rent is received; and

(q) The term "local governmental use," when used in relation to any Federal property, means any governmental use made of such property for the purpose of rendering public service to or for persons residing within the vicinity of such property.

CONSENT TO TAXATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this act, all Federal property of the following classes situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority shall be subject to the assessment and collection of any tax imposed by such authority to the same extent and under the same conditions as other property of like class situated within such jurisdiction—

(1) any property legal title to which is held by a Federal agency to secure any Federal agency against loss in connection with any loan, contract of insurance, or guaranty; and

(2) any property legal title to which is held by any Federal agency but which has been leased, or sold under a conditional sale contract, to any taxable person.

(b) Tax payments authorized by subsection (a) with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the beginning of the tax year for which such tax is imposed. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made to each State tax authority for each fiscal year with respect to all Federal property (other than property subject to tax under sec. 2) of the following classes situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority:

(1) Any property devoted to commercial or industrial use by any Federal agency or by any other person acting, directly or indirectly, for or on behalf of any Federal agency;

(2) Any property devoted to the housing of individuals for which rent is received; and

(3) Any property devoted primarily to any other use except a local governmental use.

(b) Subject to limitations contained in this act, the aggregate amount of the payments authorized by subsection (a) to be

made to each State tax authority for each fiscal year shall be a sum equal to—

(1) the nominal Federal tax liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the taxes which would be payable to such authority during such year with respect to all property of the classes specified in subsection (a) if legal title to such property were held by a taxable person for that portion of the applicable tax year during which such title was held by one or more Federal agencies; reduced by

(2) the Federal credit against tax liability, which shall be the aggregate value of governmental services of kinds normally furnished by State tax authorities which, during such fiscal year, were furnished within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority by Federal agencies, computed upon the basis of the unit cost incurred by such authority in providing like services, or (in the absence of such data) the unit cost therefor incurred by comparable State tax authorities in the same vicinity; and increased by

(3) the Federal specific liability, which shall be the aggregate amount of the expenditures incurred by such authority during such fiscal year in furnishing to or on behalf of all such Federal property services of kinds not customarily furnished by such authority to or on behalf of other properties of like class.

(c) No payment shall be made under this section to any State tax authority for any fiscal year with respect to any Federal property unless such authority—

(1) files with the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property a claim, in such form and containing such information as the Board shall prescribe, for payment under this section with respect to all Federal property subject to such payment which is controlled by such agency within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority;

(2) files with such claim an itemized statement of (A) the property with respect to which such claim is made; (B) the assessed valuation placed by such authority upon such property; (C) the nominal Federal tax liability claimed with respect to such property; (D) the tax rate or rates applied in computing the amount of the nominal Federal tax liability of such agency; (E) the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability accorded to such agency in computing the amount claimed from such agency under this section; and (F) the amount of any Federal specific liability included in such claim for payment;

(3) files with such claim a detailed statement of the procedural action which may be taken by such agency to obtain administrative review, or judicial review, or both, with respect to the nominal Federal tax liability of such agency with respect to any such property;

(4) for the purpose of determining the amount of the nominal Federal tax liability of such Federal agency under subsection (b), makes available to such agency all substantive and procedural rights, administrative and judicial, which would be available under law in effect within such authority in determining the valuation of such property, the rate of tax applicable thereto, and the amount of the tax which would be payable with respect thereto if such property were owned by a taxable person; and

(5) for such purpose treats such property in all respects in a manner at least as favorable as the treatment accorded to property of like owned by taxable persons.

(d) Each payment authorized by this section with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the beginning of the fiscal year for which such payment is due. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment

shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(e) Whenever any Federal agency and any State tax authority fail to agree with respect to any question concerning the identity of Federal property claimed to be subject to payments under this section, the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability or the amount of the Federal specific tax liability to be included in computing the amount of any payment to be made by such agency under this section to such authority with respect to any Federal property, application may be made by such agency or by such authority to the Board for the determination of such question.

(f) Whenever properties subject to payments under this section which are situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority are controlled by more than one Federal agency, and determination of the amount so payable by any such agency involves any question concerning the allocation among two or more such agencies of the amount of the Federal credit against tax liability or the amount of the Federal specific tax liability which shall be included in computing the aggregate amount of the payments to be made to such authority with respect to all such properties, such authority shall apply to the Board for the determination of such question.

EXCLUDED PROPERTIES

SEC. 6. (a) No payment shall be made under section 4 or section 5 to any State tax authority with respect to any Federal property—

(1) acquired by any Federal agency before September 8, 1939; or

(2) subject to taxation by such authority, or with respect to which any payment in lieu of taxes is authorized to be made to such authority, under any other provision of law.

(b) No such payment shall be made with respect to any Federal property which—

(1) if privately owned or controlled, would be exempt from tax because of the use to which it is devoted;

(2) is the subject of any revenue sharing arrangement, entered into under authority of Federal law, under which any portion of the revenue derived from its use or sale, or from any product of such property, is paid to such authority; or

(3) is devoted primarily to any local governmental use, including (without limitation) any courthouse; post office; property used for any purpose incidental to local postal operations; weather station or observation post; assay office; local irrigation or sanitation project; airport maintained and operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; or any plant, farm, station, laboratory, or other property devoted to any experimental, testing or research purpose rendered primarily to the local public.

(c) No such payment shall be made with respect to any—

(1) office building which is not devoted to any industrial or commercial use and is not included within any class of properties listed in section 4 (a);

(2) customs house;

(3) facility for coining money or printing currency;

(4) bullion depository;

(5) river or harbor improvement;

(6) prison, reformatory, detention farm, or disciplinary barracks;

(7) hospital, dispensary, clinic, or other medical facility;

(8) sanatorium, home for the aged, or facility providing domiciliary care;

(9) cemetery;

(10) aid to navigation administered by the United States Coast Guard;

(11) beacon or other aid to air navigation administered by the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(12) facility used in the performance by any Federal agency of any police, investigative, or regulatory function, except any such function performed incidental to the administration of property of any class listed in section 4 (a) or section 5 (a); or

(13) post, camp, station, fort, armory, airfield, proving ground, or other installation administered by any of the Armed Forces of the United States, except to the extent that any such installation may be devoted to any industrial or commercial use.

(d) No such payment shall be made with respect to any—

(1) stock of strategic or critical material or any agricultural commodity in the custody of any Federal agency; or

(2) other personal property unless such property is devoted to an industrial or commercial use.

LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the aggregate amount of the payments authorized by section 5 to be made for any fiscal year to any State tax authority by one or more Federal agencies with respect to all property of the classes described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 5 (a) exceeds the aggregate amount of the taxes levied by such authority upon all taxable property situated within its territorial jurisdiction which is not Federal property, any such Federal agency may apply to the Board for an order requiring a reduction in the amount so payable by such Federal agency. Upon the filing of such application, the Board shall give notice thereof to such authority and to each Federal agency subject to any such payment, and after hearing shall determine whether the payment of the aggregate amount payable by such agencies under section 5 would confer upon such authority unwarranted benefit contrary to the interest of taxpayers of the United States. If the Board determines that the payment of such aggregate amount would confer such unwarranted benefit, it shall prescribe (1) such lower aggregate amount as it shall determine to be fair and equitable, and (2) the portion thereof to be paid by each such Federal agency. The aggregate amount so prescribed shall be a sum not less than the aggregate amount of the taxes levied by such authority for the applicable tax year upon all taxable property situated within its territorial jurisdiction which is not Federal property. The portion thereof to be paid by each such Federal agency shall be a sum which has the same relationship to such aggregate amount as the assessed valuation of all property administered by such agency with respect to which such payment is made has to the total assessed valuation of all property administered by all Federal agencies with respect to which all such payments are made.

(b) Whenever any State tax authority fails to furnish to property administered by any Federal agency, or to any officer or employee thereof, or to the family of any such officer or employee, any service furnished by such authority to any other property or resident upon the same terms upon which such service is furnished to such other property or resident, and such agency has not expressly waived the furnishing of such service as unnecessary or undesirable, no payment shall be made under section 5 to such authority by any Federal agency for any tax year during which such failure occurs.

TRANSITIONAL PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 8. (a) In addition to the payments authorized by section 5, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made to each State tax authority, for each of the first 10 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this act, with respect to all Federal property

situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such authority which—

(1) is of any class listed in section 6 (c), but is not included within any class described in section 6 (b);

(2) was acquired by the United States or any Federal agency on or after the date which is 10 years before the date of enactment of this act; and

(3) is not subject to tax under section 2.

(b) The aggregate amount of the payments authorized by subsection (a) to be made with respect to such property to each State tax authority for each such fiscal year shall be a sum equal to the difference between the following two sums:

(1) The aggregate amount which would be payable with respect to such property for such year if such property were subject to payments in lieu of taxes under section 5; and

(2) A sum equal to the percentage of such aggregate amount which is specified for such fiscal year in the following tabulation:

1-----	0
2-----	10
3-----	20
4-----	30
5-----	40
6-----	50
7-----	60
8-----	70
9-----	80
10-----	90

(c) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 5 shall apply to payments made under this section to the same extent and with the same effect as if such payments were authorized to be made under section 5. The prohibition contained in section 7 (b) shall apply to payments made under this section.

CONSENT TO LEVY OF SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this act, all Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority shall be subject to the levy and collection of any special assessment upon real property to the same extent and under the same conditions as other property of like class situated within such jurisdiction whenever such assessment is levied upon non-Federal as well as Federal property. No payment shall be made under this subsection unless such authority treats all Federal property subject to such payment in all respects in a manner at least as favorable as the treatment accorded to property of like kind owned by taxable persons.

(b) Payment of any portion of any special assessment authorized by subsection (a) with respect to any property shall be made by the Federal agency which is the controlling agency for such property at the time such portion becomes due and payable under law in effect within the State tax authority imposing such special assessment. If such agency ceases to exist before such payment is made, payment shall be made by the Federal agency which is the successor of such controlling agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

FEDERAL TAX PAYMENTS BOARD

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Tax Payments Board, which shall be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Of the original members, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, 1 for a term of 2 years, and 1 for a term of 3 years. Succeeding members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. The President shall designate one member to

serve as chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, after notice and hearing, for malfeasance in office, neglect of duty, or incompetence, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members shall at all times constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of \$14,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(d) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a chief clerk and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(e) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 11. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board—

(1) to prescribe such uniform rules, regulations, and forms as may be required for the submission by State tax authorities of claims for payments authorized by this act;

(2) to promulgate such uniform rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the making by Federal agencies of the payments authorized by this act and for the determination of the amounts thereof;

(3) to consult, at least once in each calendar year, with the advisory committee established under section 12 of this act with respect to problems arising in the administration of this act;

(4) upon application by any State tax authority or any Federal agency, to hear and determine any question of fact or law concerning (A) the liability of any Federal agency to make payment under this act, (B) the identity of Federal property subject to any payment under this act, or (C) the amount of any such liability, except that no such question shall be heard or determined by the Board until the parties to such controversy have exhausted administrative and judicial remedies available to them under law in effect within the jurisdiction of the State tax authority concerned for the determination of any question concerning the nominal Federal tax liability with respect to any property as to which such application is made; and

(5) to transmit to the President and to the Congress, as soon as may be practicable after the end of each calendar year, a written report containing a full and complete statement of its activities during such year including—

(A) the names, salaries, and duties of employees of the Board;

(B) an account of the moneys disbursed by the Board;

(C) a description of each proceeding heard or determined by, or pending before, the Board; and

(D) such recommendations for legislation as the Board may consider advisable with respect to the administration of this act.

(b) Upon the filing of any application for any determination under this act, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may summon and join as a party to such proceeding any Federal agency or State tax authority found to be a necessary party to the determination sought; hold hearings; administer oaths and affirmations; examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States; and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of

documentary evidence deemed to be relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of any Federal agency or State tax authority which is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpoena, the Board may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process issued to any individual or person may be served in any judicial district in which such individual or person is an inhabitant or is found.

(c) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel; to offer oral or documentary evidence; to submit rebuttal evidence; and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

(d) Each determination made by the Board under this section shall be final and conclusive upon all State tax authorities and Federal agencies who were parties to the proceeding in which such determination is made, and shall not be questioned by any court or by any accounting officer of the Government.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 12. (a) The President shall establish an advisory committee on Federal tax payments composed of 12 members appointed by the President, of whom six shall be officers or employees of Federal agencies, three shall be officers or employees of State governments, and three shall be officers or employees of other State tax authorities. One member shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman of the committee.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to—

(1) study the administration of this act and problems arising in connection therewith;

(2) consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems; and

(3) transmit to the President from time to time a report containing a summary of the results of its studies, together with its recommendations for administrative or legislative changes which it may consider necessary or desirable for the efficient, economical, and equitable administration of this act.

(c) Members of the committee who are officers or employees of any Federal agency shall receive no additional compensation for service rendered under this act. Other members may receive such compensation, not in excess of \$50 for each day of service, as the President shall prescribe. All members shall be reimbursed for travel and other expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties under this section. All funds disbursed under this section

shall be disbursed by the chief clerk of the Board from funds appropriated to the Board.

MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) Each Federal agency which is the controlling agency for any Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of any State tax authority which is claimed by such authority to be subject to any payment under this act shall furnish to such authority, upon request made in writing by the appropriate officer thereof, such information concerning such property as may be lawfully required with regard to property of like kind owned by taxable persons within such jurisdiction.

(b) The failure of any Federal agency to make, or to make timely payment of, any payment authorized by this act shall not subject—

(1) any Federal agency, or any person who is a purchaser of any property from any Federal agency, to the payment of any penalty or penalty interest, or to any payment in lieu of any penalty or penalty interest; or

(2) any Federal property to any lien, attachment, foreclosure, or other legal proceeding not specifically authorized by this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to each Federal agency such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under this Act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any Federal agency or any State tax authority, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this act, and the application of such provision to other Federal agencies and State tax authorities, shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. Sections 4, 5, 8, and 9 of this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1955. All other provisions of this act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am introducing in the Senate today a bill intended to strengthen the independence and integrity of local governments by restoring to them a part of the revenues they have lost because of Federal acquisition of real estate and other property. The bill would authorize the taxation of certain Federal property by State and local tax authorities and provide for the payment by Federal agencies of sums in lieu of taxes with respect to other Federal property.

In recent years, the States and local communities have become increasingly concerned because their revenues are being undermined by the Federal Government. The increasing acquisition of various types of property by Federal agencies has removed billions of dollars of property from the tax rolls of the States and towns and cities throughout the country. This trend has threatened the integrity and independence of local governments, and should be halted at once.

Many communities throughout the Nation, a number of them in my own State, have been adversely affected. But perhaps the most glaring example of the impact upon a community when the Federal Government acquires an industrial plant and removes it from the tax rolls is in Stratford, Conn. In Stratford is located Air Force Plant No. 43, operated for the Government by the Avco Manufacturing Co. The current value of the installation, as estimated by town officials,

is more than half the amount of the entire grand list of taxable property now totaling \$126 million. Until a recent revaluation, the appraised value of the plant exceeded that of all other properties in the town combined, \$83 million as against \$67 million. The influx of workmen needed to man the machines, and their families, resulted in a sharp increase in population. Stratford was forced to build more schools, and provide more police and fire protection and other services. Local taxpayers had to dig into their pockets to pay the bills while Uncle Sam took what amounts substantially to a "free ride."

Federal ownership of land and buildings is by no means the only problem involved. Many procurement contracts negotiated by the various armed services with private contractors contain provisions under which the Government, upon making any partial payment, takes title to parts, materials, inventories, work in progress and tools, acquired or produced by the contractor for the performance of the contract. Both the Government and the contractors claim that this legal technicality makes such property tax free.

Connecticut industrial centers, together with others throughout the Nation which are contributing to the defense effort, have lost tax revenues as a result of this bit of legal legerdemain. Congress should authorize payments in lieu of taxes on such property, and the bill would so provide.

The plight of Stratford and the hardship suffered by other Connecticut communities to a lesser degree as a result of the tax-exempt status of federally owned defense production plants and other facilities was called to my attention during the 83d Congress. Because I felt strongly that an injustice was being done to the municipalities in my State and throughout the Nation, I became deeply interested in legislative attempts for remedial action. Upon consulting the late Senator Robert A. Taft, I found that he was greatly concerned with this problem. As a result of his initiative and the interest of a number of other Senators, legislation was drafted which was intended to provide substantial relief to communities which had lost tax revenues as the result of the Federal acquisition of defense-production facilities following the outbreak of the war in Korea. S. 2473, based on the draft prepared for Senator Taft, was introduced in the 83d Congress by the then majority leader, Senator Knowland, with Senators Taft, Ferguson, Potter, and myself as cosponsors. An identical bill, now numbered S. 826, has been introduced in the present session by Senator BENDER.

Although hearings were held in both sessions of the 83d Congress on S. 2473, no legislative action was taken because the creation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations brought under review the whole broad problem of reaching a fair distribution of tax revenues among all levels of Government. S. 2473, together with related bills, was referred to that Commission for consideration in its study. Mr. Arthur E. B. Tanner, former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Connecticut General Assembly, was a member of the Commission, and headed a task force assigned to consider the question of Federal consent to taxation or grants in lieu of taxes. It is my understanding that the full Commission is now reviewing the problem, and that its recommendations to the Congress are scheduled to be made by June 1.

Although the Commission's recommendations undoubtedly will be of great value to the Congress, I am strongly convinced that we should begin focusing our attention upon this problem at once, recognize its seriousness, and consider all possible solutions. For that reason, I am introducing this bill, which, while similar in some respects to S. 2473, recognizes that equitable treatment of the States and local governments re-

quires Federal payment of taxes or grants in lieu of taxes on other property in addition to that acquired as a result of the Korean war.

Many difficult problems are involved in drafting legislation which will result in fair treatment of the States and municipalities while safeguarding legitimate Federal interests and avoiding the imposition of too great a burden on the Federal Treasury. I do not offer this bill as the final answer, but believe it will provide a sound basis from which to start. It is my hope that the bill will be in harmony with the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. While the Commission's report is being awaited, a savings in time would be accomplished if this bill and related measures were given intensive study by the staffs of the Committee on Government Operations and the appropriate governmental agencies. I hope that such studies will be started at once.

DESIGNATION OF MAY 11, 1955, AS COLONEL - COMMANDANT MICHAEL KOVATS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating May 11, 1955, as Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day.

Colonel Kovats was a distinguished officer of Hungarian birth who served as Colonel-Commandant of the Pulaski Legion, the cavalry of George Washington's army in the War of the Revolution. He was mortally wounded on May 11, 1779, in a heroic charge against the British.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from Emil Lengyel's book, "Americans from Hungary," which describes Colonel Kovats' career and his services to America be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim May 11, 1955, Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Colonel-Commandant Michael Kovats, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The excerpt presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

George Washington did not sleep in every bed, but every nation likes to boast of a general attached to George Washington's staff. Few had the luck to produce a Marquis de Lafayette, or a Count Pulaski. But there was a Hungarian officer who played a distinguished part in Washington's army. His elusive fame had fascinated workers in the field of Hungarian Americana, and one of them, a judge in the Budapest Patent Office, Aladár Póka-Pivny, spent years in tracking down incidents in his hero's life.

The name of this officer was Michael Kovats, or de Kovats, or Kowatch, Kovach, Kowacz, Cowatch. He, himself, preferred to sign his name as "Kovats." The common spelling in today's Hungary is Kovács, meaning Smith.

Michael Kovats was born at Karczag-Ujszálás, now Karczag, on the Hungarian plains, of Calvinist stock. The year was 1724. Military tradition was strong in the region peopled largely by descendants of Cuman warriors who had terrorized eastern Europe centuries before. Young Kovats joined the huszárs, mounted troops, and had an adventurous life in Europe. One luckless day, however, he found himself in the Hapsburg capital, Vienna, an unemployed hero. A disloyal servant had stolen his mounts and Kovats set out to catch him. Hot on the servant's trail, he reached Bohemia's Prague, and thence proceeded northward.

Frederick the Great was then Prussia's ruler, warring against a large part of the world. In great need of soldiers, he was not very scrupulous as to how he got them. No sooner was Kovats inside Prussia than he was impressed into the Prussian Army by the King's men, in spite of the fact that he was a foreign subject. This type of service was, evidently, to the liking of our Hungarian, however; he fought for Frederick for 16 years, won his promotion as a captain, and had command of a body of men known as Kovats'sches Corps. He was wounded several times. One of Frederick's enemies was Queen Maria Theresa of Hungary, Kovats' own sovereign. During an engagement the Hungarian huszár was captured by the troops of the Queen. Fighting one's own country today would be high treason, but in those days the dividing lines were not so sharp, and Captain Kovats talked himself out of trouble. Again unemployed, and finding nothing better to do, he returned to his native Hungary. But word had reached him about the fight of the American colonists for independence and he decided to try his luck overseas. By way of Venice and Genoa, he reached Bordeaux and there he offered his services to America in a letter to Benjamin Franklin in Paris.

Franklin was one of the three commissioners the Continental Congress had dispatched to France to negotiate a treaty of alliance, amity and commerce with the French Government, and to obtain supplies, military and naval assistance. His fellow commissioner, Silas Deane, had concluded a contract with the far-famed champion of Polish liberty, Count Casimir Pulaski, to fight for the freedom of America. Kovats, therefore, approached the right people. However, we have no record of any answer from any of the commissioners.

If America did not want him, that did not mean that he did not want America. He set out for himself, arrived in America, sought and obtained an interview with Pulaski, who must have found him to his liking. The Count wrote to Washington on behalf of Kovats on January 9, 1778, that the new cavalry formations which it was contemplated to set up "must be exercised and taught the service from colonel to private. Colonel Kovats is a man of great merit and deserves the charge of master of exercises; he is an officer worthy of research and exclusive of a thorough knowledge of his abilities I request his being employed by your Excellency. I can recommend him and assure your Excellency will never have reason to repent your confidence in him, if this proposal should be agreeable to your Excellency. The sooner I am informed the better, as he will be of infinite service to the cavalry this winter in quarters."

No reply was forthcoming from Washington's headquarters. A few weeks later the Count wrote again, this time from Trenton, "about the commission for Colonel Kovats with authority to command a detachment as a colonel." Still no reply, and he dispatched another letter to George Washington in mid-March: "I would propose for my subaltern, an experienced officer, by name Kovats, formerly partisan in Prussian service."

A few days later the authorization did come for the formation of the Pulaski Legion, 68-horse and 200-foot, and in mid-April Colonel Kovats was appointed Colonel-Commandant of the Pulaski Legion. By that time word had got around about the Hungarian ex-huszár and we hear him described as "that famous Colonel Kovatz," and "the well-known Kovats, Prussian officer in the last war."

Pulaski's Legion was ordered to Sussex Court House, then to Cale's Fort, where it wintered, defending New Jersey against the Indians. In February 1779 it received orders to join Gen. Benjamin Lincoln in South Carolina, and reached Charlestown (now Charleston) in May. The town was defended by Gen. William Moultrie. His plight was so hopeless that civilian authorities urged him to surrender. At that strategic moment the Pulaski Legion arrived. While not a large force, the commander knew how to make it appear impressive. The British forces were commanded by Gen. Augustine Prevost.

On May 11, Pulaski and Kovats attacked General Prevost with 120 men, and met an overwhelming force. In the very first onslaught, Kovats was mortally wounded. "The British buried him where he fell," Dr. Joseph Johnson, Charleston physician, recorded in his Traditions and Reminiscences "on the west side of the road, in the land now owned and enclosed by John Margart, at the corner of Huger Street. He was an officer of great merit," the physician added, "a Hungarian by birth."

The Pulaski Legion was the "best cavalry the rebels ever had," wrote Maj. F. Skelly, brigade major of the English forces at Charleston.

The commander of the Legion, Count Pulaski, met his death at the siege of Savannah, on October 9 of the same year. These losses so weakened the Legion that it was disbanded. Its colors were preserved in the Maryland Historical Society at Baltimore.

"The news of Kovats' death seems to have reached Hungary very quickly, for a report dated September 28, 1779, from the Buda Fortress Command to the Hungarian General Headquarters speaks of his wife as a widow. She herself, unable to visit her gallant husband's grave, erected a small memorial chapel to his memory near the church of Szinne. There it stands to this day, surrounded by century-old lime trees, recalling the memory of the Hungarian officer of hussars who died in action for the liberty of the United States of America."

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY CERTAIN EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, in the summer of 1945—with the explosion of the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima, Japan—the world entered the atomic age.

Man's conquest of the atom was a momentous development, opening doors to long-dreamed-of opportunities in the industrial and medical fields.

But the development of the atom, like the lifting of the lid on Pandora's box, brought with it a number of terrible fears. Man was faced with the fact that he had developed the means to destroy in a day the civilization it had taken centuries of effort to build.

That fear was intensified by the development of atomic weapons by the Soviet Union. That development made it necessary for us to concentrate most of

our efforts on the building of bigger and better nuclear weapons of destruction.

Nearly 10 years have passed since the race for atomic superiority between the Western and Communist worlds began. Perhaps hundreds of thermonuclear devices have been exploded in that time by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. With each passing year the explosions become larger and the number of tests more frequent. Soon more nations will be joining in the race for atomic and hydrogen weapons.

It is not pleasant to think of the possible consequences which the development of nuclear weapons might have on our civilization. In the case of war, we know their use would be suicidal, both for us and for the Soviet Union.

But what about peacetime? What about the continued effects of testing, testing, and more testing all around the globe?

In recent weeks many reputable scientists have sounded a note of alarm, a warning that continued testing of nuclear weapons might have lasting genetic effects on all living things on this earth, including man. Scientific associations are taking a keen interest in this problem, fully aware of the dreadful possibilities in which further delay could result. Not long ago the highly respected National Academy of Sciences said it was undertaking a study of the question.

It is scientific fact that radioactive particles—some more dangerous than others—are released by thermonuclear explosions. Carried by the winds into the atmosphere, these particles could infect thousands of square miles of earth near the explosion. Others are carried off all around the globe in a matter of days. They could infect plants and animals—the things we eat—as well as man himself.

Radioactive particles have no respect for boundaries or national sovereignty. They could infect the American as well as the Russian, the Japanese, the South Sea Islander, and even the peoples living above the Arctic Circle.

It is not enough that a scientific association in this or some other country directs its attention to this problem. This is a matter of the greatest importance to peoples all over the world. It is a matter which the United Nations alone is capable of studying in such a way as to insure the greatest possible participation and interest. For any action which is taken to insure that injury is not done must be taken by all the nations of the world, particularly those with the capability of producing nuclear devices.

In raising this question today I do not mean to be an alarmist. There is still no known evidence that harm has been done by the nuclear explosions which have been set off to date. But the possibility that harm could be done is a very real one. We must not delay until it is too late. For once the damage has been done, it will be difficult indeed to correct it.

It is my hope that the United Nations may come up with some sound determinations on this problem. I hope that it will be possible for the Soviet Union to offer genuine cooperation in working toward an answer to this ques-

tion which is bigger by far than any issue presently before the world. Before we can do anything about controlling the atom, we must all be aware of the full consequences of not controlling it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which would put the Congress on record as favoring United States participation in a scientific commission to look into this grave problem under the auspices of the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may lie on the table until April 20 to afford other Senators, who may so desire, an opportunity to cosponsor it.

I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of my resolution and a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955, entitled "How Bad Is Radiation?" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Maine; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) submitted by Mr. PAYNE, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas various nations are setting off an increasing number of nuclear explosions; and

Whereas the number of such explosions is more likely to increase than decrease in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas it has been established that the radioactivity released as a result of such explosions can have serious deleterious effects, from an immediate and long-range standpoint, on human beings and other living organisms, and

Whereas existing knowledge of the effects of such explosions on living organisms is very incomplete: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress requests the President to instruct our chief delegate to the United Nations to take whatever steps may be necessary to propose and urge the formation of an international scientific commission within the United Nations to study and determine the effects on living organisms of radioactivity released by nuclear explosions.

The editorial presented by Mr. PAYNE is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

HOW BAD IS RADIATION?

The National Academy of Sciences has undertaken a highly important task in studying the effects of atomic radiation on living organisms. If the mounting concern about radioactivity is justified, the public ought to know it; and if the apprehensions are unwarranted, the best way to dispel them is with facts. The field for exploration is a vast one and the extent of present-day knowledge about the effects of radioactivity is appallingly small. No other group, unless possibly an international scientific commission, assembled by the United Nations, could speak with the standing and authority of the National Academy of Sciences.

Perhaps there can be no clearcut conclusions. The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, generally has been inclined to pooh-pooh fears about present radioactivity from nuclear weapons tests on the basis of its own extensive studies. But the Com-

mission's pronouncements have been carefully qualified, and they serve to emphasize that there is much that is not known about the byproducts of nuclear explosions—whether in tests or in actual warfare. A number of reputable scientists here and abroad are seriously disturbed about the possible long-range genetic effects even of further tests. Few adjustments are so delicate, of course, as those that determine human inheritance. Whether or not the study can answer all questions, it should throw new light on the areas of danger.

Another benefit from the study may be the evolution of new criteria for civil defense planning. The known facts about the radioactive fallout from new-type hydrogen-uranium weapons are alarming enough, but the Atomic Energy Commission has seemed to indicate that persons in bombed areas can minimize the effects by taking proper shelter and decontamination precautions. Is there a possibility, however, that some of the fine radioactive particles would remain in the air so that they would be inhaled in breathing? If so, then perhaps the plans for shelters that protect against blast and direct radioactivity will need revising.

There is no area of public policy in which so little firm information is available. Recent Gallup polls have shown a surprisingly uncritical public resignation to the use of hydrogen bombs—an example of the danger in making policy decisions on the basis of expressions of opinion about questions upon which the public has little information. The crying need is for facts, and since so few seem to be emanating from the Government it is the more important to have an authoritative study.

INVENTORY REPORT ON FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 32)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations on Tuesday, April 12, it was recommended that a committee print of a newly compiled inventory of Federal Real Property, prepared by the General Services Administration at the request of the committee, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations. I present the committee print for that purpose.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I also ask that the correspondence relating to the report, together with a press release and fact sheet on the inventory, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence, press release, and fact sheet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: We are pleased to submit the attached report covering the inventory of Federal real property in the continental United States as of December 31, 1953.

This report has been prepared pursuant to the committee's request in report No. 237, dated May 12, 1953 covering the first independent offices appropriations bill, 1954.

This has been no small task. The report consolidates 11,493 reports on individual Federal installations with a total cost of \$30.2 billion, with no value on land in the public domain.

We believe the effort well worthwhile. It gives the Government an inventory which

can be maintained on a current basis. It will be useful in many ways, and, will help the Government attain the objectives set forth on page 2 of the report—not the least of which is to facilitate disposal of surplus property and thereby increase revenues and decrease expenditures.

Every effort has been made to achieve maximum accuracy. However, it would be improper to assume that a report of this magnitude—particularly the first one—contains no discrepancies. Additional work is needed to refine the data and the records of the holding agencies from which the data is obtained.

Pursuant to the committee's request, GSA, in cooperation with the General Accounting Office, is working on the development of a reporting system which will maintain the inventory on a current basis.

The report could not have been prepared without the splendid cooperation of all participating agencies. Submission of the report at this time would not have been possible without the helpful cooperation of the Bureau of the Census.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Earl Cooper, of the committee's staff, whose counsel and assistance has been invaluable.

Cordially yours,

E. F. MANSURE,
Administrator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 25, 1955.

HON. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator of General Services,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: The committee is in receipt of the Report on Federal Real Property in the United States as of December 31, 1953, prepared by your Administration pursuant to the committee's request.

Examination of the report reveals much information of value in all phases of the operation of this huge business we call the Federal Government. The extent of the usefulness of the inventory is indicated in the major objectives listed to—

(a) Facilitate disposal of surplus property and thereby increasing revenue to the Government, as well as decreasing maintenance and realty costs;

(b) Restore property to private ownership and thus increase the opportunity for its productive use, especially as a source of employment;

(c) Return such properties to the tax rolls of State and local governments;

(d) Effect economies in acquisitions by purchase or lease and in construction and operation;

(e) Facilitate the preparation of budgets by individual agencies;

(f) Assist in the intelligent evaluation and appraisal of budgetary requests, and

(g) Achieve maximum control over and utilization of real property.

Now that the inventory has been compiled to this point, the committee requests that a second report be compiled as of June 30, 1955, to be issued as a Senate document in January 1956, and that the reporting procedures and compilations be continued as of the end of each fiscal year thereafter.

The summary report, with supporting charts and tables, is being issued as a Senate document and made available to all Federal agencies as well as to the public generally. We recommend that a set of the electric accounting machine detail data sheets be furnished to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees and to the reporting agency, and that file and working copies of these sheets will be available also in your Administration for reference.

The committee also strongly urges that you, as Administrator of General Services, in conjunction with the Director of the Bureau

of the Budget, see to it that the inventory information is made available to each agency, as well as each part of an agency that may be concerned, with specific instructions as to the method of obtaining and the use to be made of the inventory information.

The committee believes that each agency of the Government should make good use of this inventory, in order to consider well if suitable space or facilities may be already available to the Government, before requesting to spend money in making further acquisitions. It would seem that resulting economies must certainly reward such vigilance.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN,
STYLES BRIDGES.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, announced today that General Services Administration has compiled an inventory of federally owned real property in the continental United States.

The inventory, prepared at the request of the committee, lists in detail all land, buildings, and other structures and facilities owned by the United States or Government-owned corporations on December 31, 1953.

The announcement was accompanied by publication of an inventory report on "Federal Real Property in the United States," summarizing inventory findings submitted to the committee by Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of General Services.

In announcing completion of the inventory, Senator HAYDEN commented in behalf of the committee:

"This inventory report is a fine tribute to the memory of Senator Maybank, as well as a mark of achievement for Senator SALTONSTALL. These capable leaders of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations recognized the need for the inventory, when it was brought out during hearings on the 1954 appropriation bill, that no attempt had been made since 1937 to compile one. They caused a request for this compilation to be placed in the Senate committee report on the independent offices bill, and there now is established what the Government owns in real estate in the United States.

"We now have thousands of facts reported and compiled in orderly form. The report reveals what the Government owns, what it cost, what it is used for, and what agency uses it. This array of information replaces previous inadequate, piecemeal glimpses of the huge Federal holdings.

"The inventory will prove invaluable. Both the executive and legislative branches will find the information indispensable in managing Federal property in the best interest of the Nation.

"With the inventory in hand, we are in position to achieve greater economy in the Government and make greater savings for taxpayers. These inventory facts and figures will help assure maximum control and utilization of property now in Federal ownership and avoid unnecessary new acquisitions and new construction. Specific property information will encourage economical budgets by helping executive agencies prepare requests to fit their needs and by assisting Congress in evaluating those requests.

"In addition to these benefits, the inventory provides a tool which will be useful in locating Federal holdings no longer needed to serve the public interest. As an aid in identifying additional surplus, the inventory will help eliminate unnecessary maintenance costs, bring additional revenue to the Treasury from sales, and restore property to real estate tax rolls to the benefit of State and local governments. Returning property to private ownership, moreover, will enhance the opportunity for its productive use as a source of employment.

"This body of information, uniformly brought together in one place, is a genuine contribution to knowing and understanding the Government of the United States. It supplies a heretofore unavailable source of facts necessary in considering many issues of modern-day government. The benefits of this work will be valuable to Federal, State, and local governments, taxpayers of all kinds, industry and labor, and, lastly, research. The inventory represents a major achievement in the operation of the Federal Government.

"The committee acknowledges with appreciation the service performed by General Services Administration in compiling the inventory in cooperation with the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Census, and the Federal agencies which supplied the basic facts.

"The committee has requested that continuing reports be issued for each fiscal year hereafter."

FACT SHEET ON INVENTORY AND REPORT

NOTE.—The information below highlights the chief findings in the GSA summary of the Federal real property inventory and sets forth rules used in collecting the data. The inventory covers all holdings of the Federal Government and its wholly owned corporations in continental United States, including the District of Columbia, but does not embrace real property owned by the District government.

Federal real property in the United States represents a total acquisition cost of \$30.2 billion. This is the sum total of the cost of all property acquired since 1789 and still in Federal ownership on the inventory day, December 31, 1953, with one major exclusion from the cost total.

The principal excluded items consist of the land in the public domain, lands withdrawn for national parks, national forests, and other conservation uses, and historical sites acquired other than by purchase. Properties held in trust by the United States, mainly Indian tribal lands, are likewise excluded.

Acquisition cost represents the actual cost, plus later improvements at their cost, or the estimated cost at the time of acquisition.

The holdings are presented and summarized under three major types of realty:

Land: The United States owns 405.1 million acres, about 21 percent of the Nation's continental land area. Public domain, including national forests and parks, represents the bulk of the holdings—346.6 million acres in all. The balance, 58.5 million acres with an acquisition cost of \$2.2 billion, consists of lands acquired by purchase or other methods. Trust properties amounting to 56 million acres are excluded from the acreage as well as the cost total.

Buildings: The United States owns 428,786 buildings with a total floor area of 2.2 billion square feet and an acquisition cost of \$14.4 billion. The buildings include those for industrial, housing, storage, service, office, and institutional uses. The total acquisition cost for each of those uses ranges downward in the same order from \$3.6 billion for industrial property.

Structures and facilities: These properties represent an acquisition cost of \$13.6 billion. These installations include property used for power development, utility systems (heating, sewage, water, and communication), roads and bridges, flood control and navigation, reclamation and irrigation, electrical distribution systems, harbor installations, and railroads.

The acquisition costs for each type ranges downward from \$2.7 billion for power development facilities. These include hydroelectric projects consisting mainly of dams, powerhouses, and integrated transmission lines. Electrical distribution systems, as facilities of a separate type, distribute energy from sources in non-Federal ownership or operation, usually to Federal installations.

Inventory data has been analyzed by use, by agency, and by State, and the summary facts are to be presented in a Senate document. The 3-way breakdown, moreover, has been applied to the inventory totals for each of the 3 major types of realty.

Detailed reports for 11,493 Federal installations in the United States were compiled to complete the inventory. An installation is defined as a reporting unit and may represent a military reservation, industrial plant, office building, or the like. For units with area in more than one State, such as national forests, a separate report was prepared for the section in each State.

Projects under construction on inventory data are reported only if they were available for use at that time.

The inventory is the first to be completed since 1937 and is more comprehensive in coverage and treatment than the earlier listing of Federal buildings and real estate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

Excerpts from an address by Vice President Nixon before American Association of School Administrators at Cleveland, Ohio, on April 3, 1955.

Report by Senator SMITH of Maine on trip to the Far East.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him over station WGN, Chicago, entitled "Easter, the Atom, and Automation."

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement relating to plans of the Bald Knob Christian Foundation, Inc., for the erection in Union County, Ill., of a 500-foot cross dedicated to greater unity of religious thought and effort.

Statement prepared by himself, and letter from Miss Josephine Taylor, director of social service at Cook County Hospital, Illinois, dated March 4, 1955, regarding the training of hospital and clinic personnel, etc.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Article from the Oregonian of April 8, 1955, regarding Representative EDITH S. GREEN, of Oregon.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

Tabulation of votes received from the State of Iowa in response to annual questionnaire.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senate received today from the White House, the following nominations: C. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the State of Vietnam; Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

For the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

QUEMOY AND THE MATSUS— EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of editorials dealing with American policy in Asia. Many of the editorials have special reference to Quemoy and the Matsus, and other of the editorials point out the growing perplexity among the American people concerning the question of what our foreign policy in Asia is. The editorials show an interesting shift in editorial opinion in the United States.

There is much talk about keeping the Asians in doubt. I happen to be one who believes there is no justification for keeping the American people in doubt as to what our Asian policy is. But at the present time the administration has not made clear to the American people what our policy is in regard to Quemoy and the Matsus. It is about time for the President of the United States to tell the people of the Nation what our policy there is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

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

[From the Chicago Daily News of March 6, 1955]

ONE BRITON APPROVES OUR FORMOSA POSITION (By John S. Knight)

With the British public opinion openly hostile to United State Asiatic policy, the observations of Arthur Bryant, writing in the Illustrated London News, are worth noting.

Bryant calls President Eisenhower's Formosa stand "brave and sensible"; deplores British criticism, and adds:

"If the Americans, who won the island back from Japan, regard Formosa as essential to the preservation of themselves and others from the fanatical and murderous tyranny of those who invaded South Korea and who, like the Japanese, slew and tortured helpless American and British prisoners, we should allow them the right to be judges of what is their own affair."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer reports that a number of boomlets are under way in behalf of Ohio's Governor, Frank J. Lausche, as the Democratic candidate for President. * * * As usual, Lausche is keeping his own counsel, but plans to run for the Senate against Senator GEORGE BENDER, Republican, in 1956.

The Defense Department is concerned over local and political resistance to location of guided missile (Nike) defense sites. * * * Many of our cities yowl about the lack of "adequate" defense but want no inconvenience in getting it.

In diplomatic circles, the biggest guessing game is what the United States intends to do if the Chinese Reds attack the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. * * * We are pledged to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. * * * Secretary Dulles says "the United States will not abandon Quemoy and the Matsus—unless that abandonment would bring a guaranteed peace to Asia, and unless Nationalist China agrees."

Dulles has warned the Communists they risk United States attack if they invade the small coastal islands.

The Dulles doctrine has the unrealistic ring of his proclamations last summer concerning the defense of Indochina. * * * Even if Nationalist China should agree, a "guaranteed peace" understanding with the Communists would be utterly worthless.

The people will back Eisenhower in defending Formosa but they want no part of a shooting war over Chiang's Nationalist-held islands a few miles off the China coast.

[From the Des Moines Register of March 5, 1955]

RUSSIANS TRYING TO SPLIT ALLIES ON FORMOSA ISSUE, BINDER WARNS (By Allan Hoschar)

Loss of Formosa to the Chinese Communists would be far less of a setback than a split among Western allies over United States action there, Carroll Binder, editorial page editor of the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, said here Friday.

"Russian leadership would like nothing better than to see us involved in the Formosa Straits, tying up our Navy and Strategic Air Force," he told the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce luncheon meeting at Hotel Savery.

"That would give a freer hand for Russia in Europe," he continued.

REDS HOPE TO SPLIT ALLIES

"Russian policy is to split the Western allies from the United States," Binder continued, as he told of the rift and suspicion in the minds of our allies on United States policy in Formosa.

"As long as we have alliances (in the free world) we can withstand communism," said Binder.

Binder said the United States is committed to the defense of Formosa but most of our allies believe it suicidal for the United States to make an attempt to hold (the offshore islands of) Quemoy and Matsu.

The Labor Party in England has made an issue of the United States policy in Formosa, Binder said, adding that there is a division in Conservative ranks in England. Canada, he said, opposes involvement in the islands.

DISTURBING TENDENCIES

Binder, for many years a foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, cited what he called a disturbing tendency in the United States to underestimate the hold the Communists have in China and that country's tie to Russia and to entertain a theory that "if we drop a few bombs, the people would panic."

Instead, said Binder, the Communists have succeeded in imposing their will "to an extent that no central government has done for centuries in China."

The Chinese Communists have developed a great hatred for the United States and regard Chiang Kai-shek as a traitor, he said.

The trouble is that both the United States and the Chinese Communists have a "serious underestimation of what the other is out to get," said Binder.

REPORT FROM INDIA

Binder indicated belief that the Chinese Communist leadership will "not really commit the tremendous folly to take Formosa" but said he had been perturbed by recent news reports from New Delhi, India, and Burma, by different writers, "that the Reds mean to have Formosa this year."

He said he had contacted a friend in India and that a reply received Thursday said "Nehru has no knowledge (of such a plan). * * * Nehru believes that if the Chinese Communists keep up pressure, then Formosa will just fall in their lap."

"I don't think anyone knows if there will be shooting, but I think we should be careful of our relations with the Nationalists and our allies that can create a situation * * * which would involve the United States in a total war," said Binder.

President Eisenhower has stated that "our policy is not to participate in any aggression," Binder recalled, and termed it a "wise decision" for the President to reserve the power himself to decide what to do should the Communists take the first step."

TENSION FOR DECADES

Binder, who recently visited Tokyo, Hong Kong, and other Asiatic cities, looked for the present tensions to continue for decades. He said the United States must maintain alliances with the free world.

"We never understood the nature of the struggle between Nationalists and Communists in China," said Binder.

He pointed out that it became fashionable in some circles to say "the United States lost China," an expression he flatly declared not true. Because China was lost, "we thought we should regain China," said Binder.

"In retrospect it would have been better in 1949 to recognize the regime (Communists) that had established de facto control of China, such as did Great Britain and some other of our allies," he said.

AID TO CHIANG

Binder said the United States has spent \$1½ billion to aid Chiang on Formosa since 1949 on the promise this group will be established on the mainland, which he saw as fine, if realized, but extremely unlikely.

There is a tendency in the United States, he said, to overestimate the strength of Chiang's troops.

He said they were elite troops when taken to Formosa, but time has crept up on them. He said there were only about 100,000 Formosans in the army.

HOPES REDS VISIT IOWA

Binder commented briefly in his talk on the recent editorial in the Register inviting Russians to come to Iowa to study corn production, an idea that has found favor in the Russian-controlled press.

"Russians have made an incredible mess of their agriculture," said Binder. "I hope they come (to Iowa), and I hope they learn."

Binder recalled that he was in Russia 26 years ago as a foreign correspondent, when the Soviets started farm collectivism, the breaking up of small farms.

"Three to five million persons perished that winter in the liquidation," said Binder.

"Their agriculture has never recovered from that, because the peasant owners killed their animals and chopped down their fruit trees, knowing they were probably going to lose their own life, anyway."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 14, 1955]

STILL NO. 1 ENEMY

We hope you have read William Philip Simms' thought-provoking memo published on page 3 today.

Because Phil Simms has been an avid student of United States foreign policy for 40 years, and a penetrating writer-analyst for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Because there is acknowledged grave risk in our China policy. There is no intention of going all-out in a war against Red China, yet we have drawn a line around Formosa and will fight if we have to, with air and sea forces. But can we hold it to that?

Four years ago Mr. Simms wrote that in no circumstances should we be suckered into an all-out war with Red China.

He said then that Russia instigated the Korean war, which brought massive intervention by the Red Chinese, with the idea of wearing us down while Russia sat on the sidelines awaiting the hour for striking at us with increased assurance of success.

That is his warning today. The scene has shifted, but his reasoning, in our opinion, is just as valid today.

Let's stop pretending we don't know what Russia is up to in the current crisis. Her unchanging policy is to find and utilize every means to bleed the United States white.

Red China may or may not be Moscow's instrument. But by drawing us into an all-out war, certainly she will be subscribing to Russia's pattern. And it would be "a very

nasty, costly war," as Phil says, with no assurance we would win.

For one thing, we would be going against a nation of 600 million, an enemy notoriously callous about human life, and an ideology that millions of their own people would be expendable if it led to world communism and, of course, a more powerful Red China in the end.

That is not to say we must let the Chinese Communists have Formosa. But neither should we fall into the Moscow-Peiping trap and shove ourselves into a war on the Asian mainland.

That, we think, is the larger picture in true outline, as framed by Phil Simms with his usual perspicacity. We agree with him that we should be wary of any talk of a "quick and easy" victory in case of war. Especially that we should "not let China tie our hands, at Moscow's behest and with Moscow's aid, bleed us white," while Russia waits to move in for the kill.

The answer is not here. Except, "to keep ourselves as strong as we can, militarily and economically, ready and willing to go along with any allies who are ready and willing to go along with us—but never forgetting that Soviet Russia is the main foe—not Red China."

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 29, 1955]

A CLEAR LINE IN THE FAR EAST

The military estimate of a Red Chinese attack on the offshore islands by mid-April may or may not be accepted as final; but there is no doubt that the situation is critical. It could deteriorate rapidly, at any time, from the uneasy stalemate of today to limited or even total war.

The citizens of the United States will want to face up candidly to this danger and to discuss it openly. Partisanship can have no place in such discussion. The country's long-range interests, and the interests of a world that recognizes increasingly the fatal nature of modern war, must be controlling.

The fact is that a large degree of imprecision has grown up around our intentions in regard to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. The essence of American policy had been to avoid imprecision and ambiguity—to make plain, as was not made plain before the outset of hostilities in Korea—the nature and extent of the American commitment. Unfortunately, this kind of explicitness is the very thing that is lacking where the offshore islands are concerned. Vagueness in matters of such importance increases the danger.

The basic policy is entirely clear. It is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores. This newspaper believes the country must reassert this policy, must rest on it, must make it strictly determine every other action in the area.

Mr. Dulles has stated that this country will not defend the offshore islands "as such." That is, it seems to us, the right position. It means that we would defend them only if in the President's judgment an attack upon them were a direct part of an attack on Formosa; only if, again in the President's judgment, the threat to them were of such a nature as to make the holding of Formosa militarily impossible.

In a word, the possible defense of Matsu and Quemoy is related specifically to the problem of maintaining the territorial integrity of the islands where we have a clear moral and juridical responsibility. To make Quemoy's defense a matter of the free world's prestige, or a matter of upholding the morale of Chiang Kai-shek, would be an extension of the original policy which thus far has received no formal expression of support from the American people.

As things stand at present there rests upon President Eisenhower the whole weight of deciding whether Chinese action against the

offshore islands is or is not part of a movement against Formosa, so direct and menacing as to call for immediate resistance by our forces. It is a fearful choice, in effect, determining the issue of peace or war.

To decide to withhold support after the attack has begun, moreover, would inevitably be exploited by the enemy as a defeat. For that reason, it might be impossible to effect such a move even if there were no overriding military necessities for taking up the battle.

Suppose, on the other hand, the President should decide to announce now a decision not to intervene in support of the offshore islands? This would not alter in any way the commitment to defend Formosa. No one contends that Formosa and the Pescadores are incapable of being defended without Matsu and Quemoy. The 7th Fleet operating in the Formosa Strait, plus air support from Formosa and the Pacific bases, would be a strong guard, behind which the Nationalist forces would be deployed. There is every reason to believe that this country would have the support of powerful allies—a support which will almost certainly be lacking in an undertaking to hold the offshore islands.

To decide against intervening is admittedly not easy. There are many areas in Asia where such a move would be construed adversely. The impact on the Nationalist Chinese could, in particular, be very great. But the gains should not be underestimated. This country would once more be in a situation where its military line and its juridical responsibilities coincide; it could be confident that it could do the job and secure in the knowledge that it was a job which enlisted the assent and support of allies across the world.

In making such a decision, the President would be following the policy of disengagement which he has pursued consistently. Truce in Korea, partition of Indochina, an enforceable cease-fire in the Formosa Straits—these would all be part of the same picture. It is not an ideal picture by any means, but one which conforms to the realities of a harsh and bitter situation. Given the resolve to stand fast and the statesmanship which looks toward some ultimate settlement, it may yet be converted into the foundations of a true peace.

The country is united on the fundamentals of foreign policy in the Far East. What is important now is that the fundamentals not be obscured by secondary considerations. Clear lines, definite commitments, unwavering determination—these can be reaffirmed now—and their reaffirmation can be the means to keep the peace.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of March 10, 1955]

DULLES LAID IT ON THE LINE, BUT WHAT LINE?

The reaction of Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, to Secretary of State Dulles' latest report on the Formosa crisis was probably fairly representative. The Senator thought that Secretary Dulles has laid it on the line. For our part, however, we still wish he had found it possible to take this firm stand on a line that more nearly coincides with the military and political realities in the Formosa Strait.

The judgment that the Dulles speech represented some hardening of American policy on Formosa derives from its tone rather than from its content. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State revealed no real change at all in the United States position: We remain as firmly committed as ever to defense of Formosa and the Pescadores; we still will not say whether or not we intend to fight if necessary to hold the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu; the requirements of flexible defense make it necessary that this question be left up to the President to decide in light of his judgment as to the overall value of certain coastal positions

to the defense of Formosa, and the cost of holding these positions.

The impression Mr. Dulles conveyed of expecting a showdown came from his frank estimate that "the Chinese Communists seem to be determined * * * to challenge" United States power in Asia, and his assurance that "we are prepared to * * * meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess." The necessity for such firmness he attributed bluntly to "Chinese Communist propaganda (that) portrays the United States as being merely a paper tiger. It suggests to the small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force. * * * We must always remember that the free nations of the western Pacific and southeast Asia will quickly lose their freedom if they think that our love of peace means peace at any price."

After such a statement, it is difficult to see how we can again "fall back," perhaps even from Quemoy and Matsu, if the Chinese Communist challenge materializes there. It is Mr. Dulles' open anticipation of such a challenge, and of disastrous political consequences if we fail to meet it, that seems to make the United States attitude in the Formosa crisis more uncompromising than ever, even though our policy itself remains unchanged.

To whatever extent the possibility of our fighting for Quemoy and Matsu may have been thus increased, to that extent the administration's position seems to us to be growing more risky and more questionable. The necessity of our going to war if necessary to defend Formosa and the Pescadores is now almost beyond dispute by responsible Americans. But it does seem that such a war could be fought to much better advantage, militarily and politically, on and over the 100 miles of open water separating Formosa from Communist China than in the scant 7 miles between Quemoy and the mainland.

Moreover, as Foreign Secretary Eden, of Britain, suggested almost simultaneously with the Dulles speech, if the United States could get Chiang Kai-shek to yield the remaining coastal islands, there seems an outside chance that they might yet be used in diplomatic negotiations to avoid altogether an immediate war over Formosa. If Quemoy and Matsu could be exchanged for a cease-fire, enforced by those 100 miles of open water between the Communist and Nationalist forces, Eden said "consideration could then be given internationally at an appropriate stage to the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations and to the future status of Formosa."

This sounds to us like the best hope for peace. If peace should prove impossible, withdrawal from Quemoy and Matsu would still leave us in a position to fight for Formosa and the Pescadores on the best available terms. The worst possible position we could occupy—the most politically isolated, the most militarily dubious—would be to let ourselves be boxed into going to war to keep Chiang Kai-shek on a few tiny islands that are geographically a part of mainland China.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 10, 1955]

WAR DECISION LEFT IN HANDS OF REEDS

Secretary of State Dulles reported to the American people Tuesday night on his trip to the Far East. He outlined an Asiatic policy based on realities of the situation—much of it a long-range program dependent for its success upon the military power and economic resources of the United States.

While not specific about our military commitments, the Secretary made statements from which it will be difficult to retreat. In fact, as he pointed out, further retreats will result in complete loss of confidence in this country and the threatened neighbors of

Communist China would fall like ripe apples into the Red basket.

He reiterated that the United States will defend Formosa. But once again he was not specific about the time or place. His remarks did, however, contain a warning to the people of this country that the Communists seem determined to attack Formosa. If this be true and if he has made our intentions clear, war is perilously close.

Mr. Dulles made one statement that is a departure from all past concepts of the use of atomic weapons. Our sea and air forces, he pointed out, are equipped with new and powerful precision weapons "which can utterly destroy military targets without endangering unrelated civilian centers."

As the speech clearly shows, the United States is on the defensive in Asia. In fact, our entire foreign policy is and has been negative and defensive. It has been conducted in an atmosphere of crisis.

There have been some successes with these defensive tactics, but we definitely have not seized the initiative about which Mr. Dulles so bravely talked when he took over the job. We have met a ruthless, aggressive, and completely understandable Communist foreign policy with retreats and apologies.

Mr. Dulles detailed some of the positive steps now being taken in Asia. They sound constructive. Backed by United States power, these countries may indeed want to preserve their freedom and be willing to exert the effort necessary. If Communist China is bent on aggression—and it is perfectly obvious that the vast resources of Southeast Asia are the objective—there is great danger.

Meanwhile, reports from the Far East to Washington are not in the least encouraging. While we can be hopeful that Dulles' speech will ease the situation, a move by the Reds on Formosa will mean a general war with Communist China.

[From the Boston Post of March 10, 1955]

DULLES AND HIS PAPER TIGER

Apart from the announcement that we now have a new precision bombing weapon, presumably atomic, there was nothing significant in the speech of John Foster Dulles except the admission that his soft Asian policy is not only a failure but has become a deadly boomerang. Plenty of people have been trying to warn Mr. Dulles of this fact for some time, but until now he hasn't heard—or hasn't listened.

By his own admission the Red Chinese have long since decided that our failure to act swiftly and with strength in the various crises in Asia proves that we haven't the courage or the will to fight anywhere.

More important, they have sold many of the millions of Asiatics on this idea. To them United States power is—in Mr. Dulles' own words—a "paper tiger," without teeth or claws; an international joke, or laughing stock.

Listen to Mr. Dulles' own words about the Red Chinese claims: "They boast that in 1950, in Korea, they drove United States forces back from beyond the Yalu and gained a great victory. They boast of their victory over the French Union forces in Indochina. * * * When we recently helped the Chinese Nationalists to evacuate the Tachens * * * the Chinese Communists claimed that this represented great victories for them. * * *

"In such ways Chinese Communist propaganda * * * suggests to the small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force and that Communist China is sure to win."

The paper tiger has claws now, the Secretary warned the world in his speech. There is available, he said, a new secret weapon which can destroy Red forces without damaging civilian populations.

This is, of course, heartening news. We don't know what the secret weapon may be, but as a matter of speculation it may well be a guided missile. It is a matter of public record that the Navy is using such weapons on some of our ships and, by the same token, it is the Navy which will share the burden of defending Formosa with the Air Force.

We heartily hope that whatever the weapon is it is available to our forces in large quantities, ready for instant use. We also hope Mr. Dulles doesn't believe that the Reds are likely to be unable to strike with similar force.

The Russians have guided missiles, too, and may be ahead of us in their development because they have working for them the German experts they captured after the last war. According to James A. Michener's dispatch from the Matsu Islands, the Communists are at work on the Chinese mainland right now digging what look to be big gun emplacements. It could be that these are actually launching platforms for guided missiles with atomic warheads.

The Chinese can't produce such weapons. But the Russians can and have, and what would give the Russians more pleasure than to try them out under the Chinese flag with the American Seventh Fleet as a prime target?

[From the New York Times of March 27, 1955]

"BURNING DAYLIGHT" IN ASIA

Readers of this newspaper may well have been startled by a Washington dispatch from Anthony Leviero, published yesterday. Their minds will not be relieved by James Reston's article on the Far Eastern situation, on this page today. Mr. Reston quotes Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. GEORGE was facing the problem of what to do if the Chinese Communists invaded the Quemoy and Matsu islands lying off their coast. He knew, as the Pentagon knows, and as the White House knows, that there is grave danger that the islands will be invaded some time during the months of April and May. Senator GEORGE said: "We are burning daylight. The darkness is coming on in the Far East."

Senator GEORGE at 77, in the twilight of his own career and in his 33d year in the Senate, has the courage and is in a position to speak out. Mr. Reston gives this interpretation of the opinions of some other Senators who have not spoken out: "We are drifting into a war over Matsu and Quemoy. The administration is reconciling itself to the idea that this issue now rests not with Washington but with Peiping." So we have, as today's news describes it, a situation in which a certain kind of logic—the logic, perhaps, of death and widespread destruction—goes from the defense of Quemoy and Matsu to an all-out atomic attack on the industrial potential of Communist China. What this logic means in cost of human life and perhaps in a vast destruction of cities far outside China, the citizen may ponder.

It is clear that the resolution authorizing the President to take whatever steps are necessary to defend Formosa gave a choice only between rejecting the administration's foreign policy in the Far East, or accepting with it an ambiguous phrase that might justify an all-out defense of the Quemoy and Matsu islands. Everyone in this country, certainly including the President, would be happier if the Quemoy and Matsu islands did not exist or if our national prestige and honor had not somehow seemed to be involved in their defense. If we had been able to persuade our Nationalist Chinese friends to pull out of them when they abandoned the Tachen islands, we would all be easier in our minds.

There is the further argument, which we find reiterated in today's dispatches from Taipei on Formosa, that the morale of Chiang Kai-shek's troops and people would collapse if the islands were abandoned or lost. There is a curious paradox in the fact that while Senator GEORGE and many others in this country fear involvement over the islands, some persons on Formosa suspect that we are making a quiet deal with the mainland Chinese to abandon them.

Here is a dilemma that can easily be understood. Whether a greater wisdom on the part of the State Department and the administration would have avoided it we do not know. The fact is we face it.

There may, however, be one way out that has not been fully explored and exploited. From Japan to Canada and all around the circle of our allies and potential allies there is strong opposition to joining us in any hostilities brought on by attempts to hold the Quemoy and Matsu Islands. There is not the same opposition toward the defense of Formosa, which is a keystone in guarding the frontiers of all the free nations of southeast Asia, including the Philippines.

This newspaper believes that the time is ripe for a new Formosa Strait declaration. We believe that that declaration should make it plain that we will put all we have into a defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, which are essential to such a defense. The Seventh Fleet is already a formidable obstacle to an attack on Formosa. It might be possible to throw at least a token force of American ground troops into the island to assist in repelling attack.

What this situation calls out for above everything else is precision. The enemy ought to know just what he can do and just what he cannot do without meeting resistance from us. If he learns that he can take the Quemoy and Matsu Islands without provoking a major war, that fact may be tragic. Nevertheless there are small tragedies and vast tragedies. A vast tragedy would be stumbling into war against the intention and the wishes of the majority of our people and our allies. A still vaster tragedy would be a loss of freedom through repeated retreats.

It is time that the fire eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon or elsewhere, went into silence. We need calmness and wisdom. This newspaper hopes and believes that President Eisenhower, hating war as we know he does, and realizing, as he said he did, that one cannot see where a war will take us, will exercise his leadership during this coming critical week to save this country and the world from irretrievable disaster.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of March 1, 1955]

THE MOVING FINGER WRITES

(By Ralph McGill)

Two United States Senators made speeches Sunday night.

In Cleveland, Ohio, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S, Democrat, text before a Democratic Party dinner was that the United States should quit talking about defending the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. We also, he said, should cease pretending that Chiang Kai-shek is the key to blocking the spread of communism in Asia; the future and strength of India and Japan hold the key to the future of southeast Asia.

In Baltimore, Senator BUTLER, Republican, spoke to the Knights of Columbus. His text was that British leaders should quit "demanding that we turn Formosa, Quemoy, and Matsu over to the Reds." "Instead," he said, "we should stand up and be counted in opposition to further Communist aggression in Asia."

Most of Senator BUTLER'S talk was criticism of British policy, especially the left-wing labor leaders who "found it pleasant to break

bread with Red leaders and, in effect, give away part of the British Empire."

TOO LATE?

KEFAUVER, the tall Tennessean, shelled down the corn. He was positive, direct.

"A Far Eastern policy tied to Chiang is almost certainly doomed to fail, and by the time the failure is recognized it may be too late to disengage ourselves without grave loss of prestige," he declared.

"While this country is under obligation to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, we should not," he said, "kid the world or ourselves by keeping up the fiction that Chiang is a great, dynamic force in Asia."

He urged a policy which recognizes that the future and strength of Japan and India hold the key to the future of Asia.

"If they remain free, there is every reason to believe that the bulk of Asia will remain free," he said. "If they go under, the Communists are likely to take over from Tokyo to Cairo."

The Senator put a pragmatic finger on a sensitive point without mentioning the Manila Pact.

"We must continue to defend and support the smaller nations now friendly to us, but we should not assume that they constitute a decisive, effective anti-Communist force," he said.

KEFAUVER denied that Quemoy and the Matsu Islands are necessary to Formosa's defense, saying this "is about like saying that the defense of Staten Island, in front of the harbor of New York, is necessary to the defense of Bermuda."

"They may be important to the morale of Chiang Kai-shek but one cannot really expect the Chinese Communists to lie down and play dead with his forces that close to their harbors."

TRUTH

What KEFAUVER said may not be contradicted.

There is tragedy in it.

Chiang's supporters charge we failed him in his hour of need. He controlled about three-fourths of China. Yet, the steady deterioration of his own armies, which never had the heart to fight, quickly became a disaster. It was like dykes breaking.

If we accept all his most extreme admirers charge, the sad facts of today are not thereby changed. Senator KEFAUVER is not in error. The islands in question are not essential to the defense of Formosa. It is only domestic politics which attempts to make them so.

The moving finger writes and what it has written may not be erased with blood or tears. Whatever the past, whatever our failures, the facts of today are that Chiang is no longer an asset. Formosa, if there is a battle for it, will be held by American troops, aircraft and Navy, not by Chiang.

And, as for the Matsu and Quemoy, the American people do not want to fight for them. The moving finger may write this was our moment of failure, a prelude to disaster. But the fact remains. It is not only Britain. The people of this country do not want a war over Matsu and Quemoy.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 15, 1955]

STATE OF THE NATIONS: PAPER TIGER?

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

WASHINGTON.—It becomes desirable, it seems to me, to examine most carefully why Secretary of State John Foster Dulles feels that it may become necessary to prove to Communist China that the United States is "prepared to stand firm and, if necessary, meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess."

According to Mr. Dulles, the Chinese "are persistently trying to belittle our power and to throw doubt on our resolution." He says that Chinese Communist propaganda "por-

trays the United States as being merely a 'paper tiger.'" This, he says, "suggests to small peoples whom they threaten that the United States will always find reasons to fall back."

Mr. Dulles cites three events in recent history as being used by the Chinese propaganda to support their claims that the United States is a "paper tiger"—the retreat from the Yalu in 1950, nonparticipation in Indochina in 1954, and the evacuation of the Tachens in 1955.

The real question at issue is whether these three events actually make a reason why Communist China, or anyone else, could believe that the United States will always find a reason to "fall back"; whether they do add up to evidence of irresolution in Washington.

The answer is unavoidable, no matter how painful, that in each of these episodes in history there was evidence of irresolution, and even of vacillation, in Washington. In each case there was a moment when Washington talked as though it would do more than it actually was prepared to do when the test came.

In 1950 Washington changed the definition of its purposes in midstream. The original statement of purpose at the time of the intervention in Korea was "to repel the aggression and punish the aggressor." When a chance seemed to present itself to "drive to the Yalu," the purpose was enlarged to encompass the reunification of Korea. This larger purpose was not achieved.

In 1954 the act of nonintervention in Indochina was preceded by an assertion that Vietnam was of "paramount importance" to the security of southeast Asia. And Vietnam was likened to the cork in the neck of the bottle of the Malayan Peninsula. Those characterizations of the importance of Vietnam indicated an intention to intervene to save it from a Communist victory. The purpose implied in the characterizations was not achieved.

In 1955 the withdrawal from the Tachens was accompanied and surrounded by words and interpretations which appeared to imply a forward movement, when actually they covered a regressive movement.

If we consider these three cases carefully we can, I submit, see why actions which need not have implied irresolution did come to seem irresolute. There would have been no irresolution in Korea had Washington and its allies adhered rigidly to their first definition of purpose in the Korean intervention. When the 38th parallel was crossed the aggression had been repelled, and in the process the aggressor had been severely punished. It was when the original purpose was expanded that an unachieved goal was created.

There would have been no evidence of irresolution in Indochina had words been avoided which implied an intention to do something which subsequently was not done.

There would have been no evidence of irresolution in the Tachens withdrawal had it been labeled publicly precisely what it was, a military withdrawal.

In each case there was no need of causing an impression of irresolution. Had Washington estimated accurately what it would do and limited its declared or implied purposes to its actual intentions, there would have been no basis for a belief anywhere in the world that Washington was irresolute. The damage arose out of appearing to be ready to do more than was actually done.

In the same speech in which Mr. Dulles faces up to the dangers which arise out of the appearance of irresolution in Washington, he presents a theory that if the Chinese Communists aggress on any one of their fronts they would be confronted "with tasks at the south, center, and north." This is his theory of the three-front war. It implies that a Chinese advance on any one front would automatically release war on all three

fronts. He doesn't forecast it or say that it will necessarily happen. He does imply that it would happen.

But if the treaty commitments which cover these three fronts are examined, grave doubt emerges that they would or could be joined. To reopen the Korean front would require an act of the United Nations. To reopen the Formosa front would require, according to Mr. Dulles' own previous assertions, the constitutional process in Washington. American intervention on the southern front, in the event of aggression, would also require the constitutional process. As Mr. Dulles has pointed out himself, none of the United States commitments in Asia involves the automatic feature of the NATO alliance.

It would seem to me that Washington once more has laid itself open unnecessarily to an appearance of irresolution by using words which sound stronger than they really are. The man who understates his intentions is never open to the charge of irresolution, is never mistaken for a paper tiger.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 29, 1955]

ATOMIC WAR OVER MATSU?

This capital is in the midst of a war of nerves about the Matsu and Quemoy islands. The deadline for a Chinese Communist attack on the Matsus may be approaching, some sources believe, and the assault may come by April 15 unless the Chinese are deterred by the certainty of American retaliation. If an attack should come, the same argument runs, the question would be whether the counterattack should consist of an effort to blot out Communist airfields with tactical atomic weapons or whether it should also aim at China's industrial potential. Thus is the deadly prospect of nuclear war raised over a couple of tiny and in themselves insignificant island groups on the doorstep of Communist China.

This possibility of involvement over the Quemoy and Matsus has caused increasing concern among our allies. The British have made known their intention not to join in a war over the coastal islands; and last week the Canadian Foreign Minister said much the same thing. These protests evidently are aimed at dissuading the administration from what other governments consider a rash course; our allies know that if a major war should develop from a clash over the Matsus the question of cause would become academic and they would inevitably be drawn in. The fact remains that despite a large measure of support for the American pledge to defend Formosa and the Pescadores, most of the free world simply does not believe that the Matsus and Quemoy are worth a war.

How, then, did we get into this paradoxical situation in which the administration is being urged to fight for some remote islands which under peaceful circumstances it probably would relinquish? It is instructive to recall that the Matsus and Quemoy were very lightly held by the Chinese Nationalists until 1953. Then, as part of the policy of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, we abetted him in garrisoning the coastal islands until he now reportedly has between a fifth and a fourth of his entire army on them.

An opportunity to get off this hook existed last fall when the administration began its praiseworthy effort to revise its China policy in a more realistic direction. A withdrawal from the Quemoy and Matsus would have been a logical corollary of the evacuation of the Tachens and the releasing of Chiang in an attempt to bring about a cease-fire. But the coastal islands were left in an anomalous status, apparently in part for bargaining reasons, in part as a concession to Chiang and his spokesmen in Congress. It may be suspected that there now is an element of

blackmail in Chiang's refusal to give them up, for a war over the coastal islands represents his one remaining hope of restoration on the mainland.

If it is easy to see how the predicament might have been avoided, it is not so easy to see a way out at this stage. Against the argument that we should abandon the Quemoy and Matsus and force Chiang to withdraw, there is the countervailing argument that this might undermine the defense of southeast Asia and paralyze the will to resist Communist subversion. Furthermore, the argument goes, it would be extremely difficult to sustain the morale of Chiang's army if another withdrawal were to follow the evacuation of the Tachens. Such action might leave Chiang's ranks wide open to subversion.

Also, it is said, the amazing new developments in tactical atomic weapons make it possible to regard them virtually as weapons of precision. That is, small atomic weapons could be used against military targets without necessarily endangering unrelated centers. If an American counterattack were confined to the use of such weapons against military targets, Russia might not feel bound to enter the conflict.

While there undeniably is some truth to these contentions, there also are powerful arguments on the other side. Military men have acknowledged the usefulness of the Matsus and Quemoy in a defense of Formosa, but no responsible military leader has said that they are essential. That is the point that stands out: a war over the Quemoy and Matsus would be a war over islands that are not militarily essential. Moreover, no one can be sure that a war over these islands would not lead to general war. In such a situation Senator BRIDGES' crass comment that no "American white soldier" would be forced to fight in Asia would become even more ridiculous. There is no safe warrant for the easy assurance that air and naval action would suffice or for the blithe assumption that, as Elmer Davis puts it, only ground troops have mothers.

Finally, we must consider the responsibility for initiating atomic war. From a strictly military viewpoint it would be logical to use atomic weapons wherever they could be employed profitably—especially if reliance on them has narrowed our capabilities in conventional weapons. In a large war, even a war concerned directly with the defense of Formosa, their use would be inevitable. But in a war over the Matsus and Quemoy—in which a large part of the world would be critical of the American position—to initiate the use of atomic weapons would be to cross a vast psychological bridge. Even if such weapons could be restricted to purely military targets, Asians have not forgotten that the only atomic bombs ever used in war were employed against an Asian nation; and Chinese propaganda would be sure to stress the point.

This newspaper is not so presumptuous as to think that there is an infallible prescription for protecting the American interest in this dilemma. President Eisenhower has exhibited great statesmanship on the avoidance of nuclear war; and there is every reason to think that he will not be stamped by zealots who would welcome a holy crusade against communism. Conscientious men in Government are aware of the risks. There is something to the point that at this stage the prestige of the free world might suffer a serious blow in an abandonment of the Quemoy and Matsus, and that the most disastrous course of all would be for this country to undertake to defend them and then back down.

But Congress and the public ought to understand just how close war may be, and to have no illusions about its nature or about the solitary situation of this country once it started. The hope lies in the sagacity of President Eisenhower in a decision that Con-

gress has left in his hands, and in the earnest efforts of free world diplomacy to enlist the help of Moscow in averting a Chinese attack. Meanwhile, the administration would do well to put a muzzle on the tough talk that, far from dispelling any idea that we are a "paper tiger," may contribute to the notion that we are one.

[From the Hartford Courant of March 4, 1955]

CONFUSION CONTINUES OVER QUEMOY AND MATSU

So experienced a Secretary of State as Mr. Dulles must feel sure he is doing the right thing. But some aspects of our policy over Formosa have left, and continue to leave, much of the public vaguely uneasy. Yesterday again, after having visited Chiang Kai-shek, Mr. Dulles made some statements that confirmed the original doubt as to whether we would, or would not, make war over those close-to-shore islands, Quemoy and the Matsus. Mr. Dulles obviously wanted, once more, to keep the Red Chinese guessing. But he kept the American people, and their worried allies, guessing too.

Even that would be entirely satisfactory, obviously, if it achieved the national objective: To avoid a retreat from Formosa without ourselves starting a war. The whole purpose of President Eisenhower's approach to Congress, for confirmation of his authority to fight in Formosa if need be, was precisely to warn the Red Chinese in advance. The idea was to keep them from repeating the tragedies of 1914 and 1939, when the aggressors started two world wars by miscalculation. In 1914 it was the inability of Sir Edward Grey to say in advance that Britain would fight, if Germany invaded Belgium, that tempted the Kaiser to invade and so let loose the war. And again in 1939 it was the neutrality of America, and what Hitler took to be our decadence, that fooled him into thinking he could fight a war without our getting into it. The whole purpose of such an advance warning, if it is to do any good at all, must be to make what we will fight for clear and precise beyond all question.

In Formosa yesterday, however, Mr. Dulles warned the Chinese Communists once more that they risk possible United States attack if they invade the Matsus and Quemoy. He also echoed his all-but-forgotten threat of massive retaliation. For he said that the Chinese Reds must not assume that defense would be static and confined to Formosa itself, or that the aggressor would enjoy immunity with respect to the areas from which he stages his offensive.

All this, instead of removing doubt, adds to it. This at a time when Sir Winston Churchill, and our own authorities from the President down, assure us in all but so many words that the possibility of mutual annihilation in H-bomb warfare has made war obsolete. Mr. Dulles himself, behind closed doors in Manila only the day before yesterday, told our Far Eastern Ambassadors that war has become so abominable, and dangerous to civilization, that we must deter aggression by unswerving firmness. One could wish that he would be not only firm but utterly clear.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of March 4, 1955]

NOW CHIANG IS TELLING US

The United States now appears to have been maneuvered into a position where its defense of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands is a matter for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to decide, instead of the designated authority in Washington.

This is the surprising purport of the statement by Secretary of State Dulles as he took off from Taipei on his flight to the homeland.

Whereas it was once believed that the United States would be willing to trade the offshore islands for a ceasefire agreement in the Formosan area, it is now reported from Taipei that the kind of truce entertained would allow the Nationalists to hold the islands in present circumstances but does not insist on their permanent retention as an irrevocable American policy.

The most important concession obtained by the unyielding Chiang is revealed by Mr. Dulles with these words:

"I have * * * made it clear the United States will not enter into any negotiations dealing with territories and rights of the Republic of China except in cooperation with the Republic of China."

And when he further says that there will be no trade of the islands, which certainly are not the republic's territories, "behind the Nationalists' back," there is the strongest kind of intimation that Chiang at last has won the right to call the shots.

The Secretary gave no indication of Chiang's attitude on the American position, according to news reports. But at the same time it was revealed that sources close to the generalissimo told their distinguished visitor that Nationalist China has staged its last retreat and cannot possibly accept any plan which would mean evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsus.

Faced by such a dilemma, Mr. Dulles can only express the "ardent hope * * * that the Chinese Communists will not insist on war as an instrument of policy." That hope should also be extended to the Nationalists.

Although at no time in the past have we made definite commitments to go along with Chiang's plan of dealing with the offshore islands—at least not publicly—the very vagueness of our keep-'em-guessing program has created an impression that we would do so. We can understand how another evacuation would mean unbearable loss of "face" for Chiang, but it is strange to find the United States being influenced by the same consideration.

Regardless of what we at home might think, it has come to pass that American refusal to defend the disputed islands in company with their Nationalist allies, would be hailed as another great Communist victory. American prestige would be immediately hurt, and the effect on the scheduled April meeting of Asiatics in Indonesia could be damaging indeed.

One significant fact about Mr. Dulles' farewell airport statement was his reminder that President Eisenhower holds the power to decide how and when to use American forces in the defense of the islands while he did not mention the "if." If this omission was an oversight, it was an unfortunate one. If it was premeditated, it has somber implications.

On the face of things, Senator KNOWLAND and the China lobby have reason to rejoice that the American policy has veered so closely to that of Chiang, whose only hope of survival as a world figure is to involve the United States in war with the Communists.

And by the same token, those who have warned against involving ourselves too closely with the man whose rule over China was destroyed by his own inefficiency and the corruption of his government and armies, will be sorely disappointed.

Whenever the United States cannot make decisions regarding war or peace without Chiang's consent; whenever the veto power in a danger spot of the Far East is placed in the hands of one not worthy to wield it, it is an ominous development."

In the extension of Mr. Dulles' remarks, which is sure to come when he reaches Washington, an effort to clarify our current relationship with the Nationalist leader of the Chinese Republic may be expected. On this occasion, it is to be hoped, he will attain his long-sought objective of clarity and transparency on a question of high impor-

tance to the waiting people. The guessing game has lasted overlong.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 13, 1955]

PEOPLE UNIMPRESSED BY DULLES' WARNING (By Russell Reeves)

Considering that the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, virtually told the Nation that it is on the brink of war, the people remained amazingly calm.

Perhaps "calm" is not the word. "Smug and imperturbable" might be a better description. Aside from the remarks of a few editorial writers and commentators, there was no reaction.

It is no exaggeration to report that there was more expressed concern in these parts over the problem of using the Cleveland Indians' pitching strength than there was over the danger of war with Communist China.

NO SIGN OF WAR JITTERS APPARENT

Yet Secretary Dulles was not delivering a silent soliloquy in a soundproof room when he spoke last Tuesday after returning from a 2-week trip to the Orient. His words were caught up by microphones and catapulted electronically through a vast network of radio and television stations. Thousands of newspapers reported the address at length and in prominent positions.

And there was scarcely any mistaking of what he was saying. He asserted that the Chinese Communists "seem to be determined to try to conquer Formosa." He repeated the fact that we are committed by treaty and authorized by law to defend Formosa and the Pescadores with the Armed Forces of the United States.

So if the Secretary is right in believing the Chinese Reds are determined to try to conquer Formosa, then we are in for war. Why he believes such war would be wider than the Formosa area he explained in these words:

"For military purposes, the Chinese Communist front should be regarded as an entirety because if the Chinese Communists engage in open armed aggression this would probably mean that they have decided on general war in Asia. They would then have to take into account the mutual defense treaties of the United States with the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China, and the forces maintained under them. Thus, general war would confront the Chinese Communists with tasks at the south, center and north, tasks which would strain their inadequate means of transportation."

Secretary Dulles also gave the impression that we would use atomic and other new weapons if we got into such a war.

All in all, it was a dismal picture he painted. But there was a minimum of public response to it. How can that be explained?

Do people believe Secretary Dulles has exaggerated the situation? Are they confident that Red China will be restrained by our threats? Are they incapable of visualizing what a war in the Orient would mean in terms of human grief, alienation of other nations, material cost, and inconclusiveness? Or are they completely fatalistic about whatever happens?

Anyone may have a theory, but no one just now has an authoritative answer.

The known facts suggest that the war which Secretary Dulles foresaw is not likely to break out in the months immediately ahead. There are no indications of a military buildup on the Chinese coast large enough to support an assault on Formosa.

Furthermore, it would be impolitic for Red China to take any aggressive action before or during the Afro-Asiatic Conference scheduled for next month.

AGREEMENT WITH CHINA WILL COME

Whether the unsettled condition of the Moscow Government would be a deterrent

is debatable. The Kremlin might be happy to have the upstart Chinese Reds get involved in a war which inevitably would weaken us and would take the spotlight away from their troubles.

Secretary Dulles said nothing to clarify our position regarding the Chinese coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu, now in the hands of Chiang's Nationalists.

Many Americans consider it was a serious mistake to intimate that we might try to repulse an attack on them if it were considered a prelude to an attack on Formosa. It would be impossible to defend such action before the bar of world justice and it would alienate nations which might otherwise be friendly.

Nevertheless, President Eisenhower is under pressure to include those islands along with Formosa and the Pescadores in our guaranty.

It is unlikely that he will yield to that pressure, for he must recognize the danger in so doing. It is of vital importance that when and if we have to act in Asia, or in any other trouble spot, we act in concert with the other non-Communist powers, and not play a singlehanded game.

Likewise, it is important that we keep all possible doors open for reaching an agreement with the Chinese Reds. As difficult and disagreeable as they seem to us at the moment, the fact remains that someday, with or without a war, we will reach an agreement with them.

History is full of irony. It just could happen that someday the Chinese Reds might be our ally in a future war with the Kremlin.

PROPOSED RELEASE OF GERMAN ASSETS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have in my possession a copy of a statement made by Dr. Herman Abs requesting our Government to release German assets seized during the last war. Dr. Abs was Chancellor Adenauer's special representative sent here to negotiate this question with this Government.

I ask permission to have Dr. Abs' statement printed in the RECORD. I understand this statement was made by Dr. Abs at the beginning of the negotiations with the executive branch of the Government. It is an able argument of the German case for the return of the property seized from German nationals during the last war.

A press release dated March 3 this year indicates that the State Department favors only a partial return of such assets, a return limited to \$10,000 for each natural person. This would exclude corporate claimants, and thus all individuals who hold shares in such corporations. The proposed solution offered to Chancellor Adenauer is offensive for many reasons and has the effect of recommitting our Government to a policy of confiscation of private property—something we talk about as happening only in Russia.

The New York Times in one of its leading editorials of March 9, 1955, rejects the proposed partial solution by our State Department. The editorial concludes:

The sooner that problem is finally solved with full vindication for the principles for which we stand, the better we will be able to meet the Communist challenge to the free world.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have the full text of this New York Times editorial printed in the RECORD.

According to a news release published in the New York Times, Dr. Abs is quoted with respect to General Aniline and Film Corp., one of the companies seized as German property. Dr. Abs stated that the Germans have no interest whatever in that company. He said it was Swiss property.

Mr. President, in view of Chancellor Adenauer's strong plea for the return of German property, coupled with Dr. Abs' statement that the Germans have no interest in General Aniline and Film Corp., I think it is time that the appropriate committee handling this problem should look into this matter very closely. If the statement by Dr. Abs is correct, then this Government had no right to seize the Swiss property at all. The Swiss claimants already have testified to this effect before the Judiciary Committee. I think the appropriate committee chairman should have this question looked into on the spot in Germany and Switzerland.

If these suggestions are followed, I believe we can dispose of this entire matter on the basis of principle and in accordance with our traditional respect for the sanctity of private property.

There being no objection, the statement by Dr. Abs and the editorial from the New York Times of March 9, 1955, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. HERMANN J. ABS
ON FEBRUARY 10, 1955

It is indeed a privilege for me to be meeting with representatives of the Government of the United States for discussions on a subject which our people and my country have very much at heart, namely, the release of the property of German citizens. The Chancellor of the Federal Republic has entrusted me, as his special plenipotentiary, with the task of conducting here in Washington the discussions which were agreed upon between President Eisenhower and the Chancellor on the occasion of the Chancellor's recent visit to this country. In connection with this question, as you know, the Chancellor addressed a letter to the President on July 17, 1954, which in fact forms the starting point for the subsequent development that was to lead up to the present discussions. In that letter, the Chancellor drew attention to two principal categories of claimants whose property was taken in pursuance of wartime measures, and who are anxious to see their property released or adequate compensation granted in cases where assets have been liquidated; one category comprises a large number of Germans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in a very distressed economic position, and the other, those German individuals and corporations who by investing their capital in the United States have in the past contributed toward friendly relations between our two countries and their peoples.

We all know, of course, how difficult it is under the present circumstances for a country to change its policy—economic or political—once it has been adopted, all the more so if that policy has been embodied in international agreements or domestic legislation. It would be even more difficult for a country to shift its adopted policy over to an entirely new basis if that policy is the consequence of a belligerent dispute with another country. The Federal Government is, therefore, all the more grateful—and I am

pleased to be privileged to convey its gratitude to you—for the willingness of the Government of the United States, as indicated in the President's declaration, to discuss the question of German property with German representatives. I would like to add to this my own personal expression of gratitude.

We think that this willingness to discuss with German representatives a question of this nature, which, after all, is not altogether free from emotional and political factors and business interests, offers striking evidence not only of the particular openmindedness with which the United States faces all problems as they arise, however difficult of solution they may be, as is the case with the set of questions to which we are now about to address ourselves; in our view, this attitude also shows that the awareness of the individual's private sphere which harbors his person and his rights is today as alive in this freedom-loving country as it has always been.

In Europe, the rights of the individual have during the past 50 years in many cases undergone a greater measure of restriction than, for instance, in this country. This was due to a number of factors inherent in our general development, such as extremely rapid industrialization which caused large masses of people to be crowded into small and even very small areas, and—most important of all—the disintegration and depreciation of property and the sundering of economically coherent reasons after each of the two world wars. It was not until they were threatened with imminent danger from the East, aggravated by the advance of the Communist ideology on the West European continent and elsewhere, that the peoples of Europe, their political parties and governments really became definitely alive to the fatal and inevitable consequences of a policy which carries with it an evergrowing measure of disregard for individual freedom and private rights. The nations of Europe, and especially those living closest to the Iron Curtain, have now fully grasped the magnitude of the fate which threatens the Western World, and they not only have become much more determined in resisting Communist methods and ideas but have also grown more conscious of the importance of personal freedom and private property rights. Their position has been substantially strengthened by the generous economic and moral aid which the United States accorded Western Europe during the postwar period.

This development is certainly encouraging but there are strong opposing forces at work, and they are constantly drawing support from behind the Iron Curtain. They are still too strong to be checked by Europe, or by individual European nations, without assistance from outside. Problems of international policy and the necessity of joint military defense make it imperative to us, and to the Western World as a whole, to stand together as free nations, firm and unequivocal, in words and deeds, on those questions which primarily affect the individual, namely, personal freedom and the inviolability of lawfully acquired rights. Only if the individual sees that in this sphere he enjoys the full protection of his own government and of those connected with it, will he consciously identify himself with Western policy. This, in the last analysis, is the crucial test; for unless the individual believes in the rightness of the policy to which he is asked to subscribe, the weapons he may one day have to wield in defending his country, however ingeniously devised, will remain ineffective.

That openmindedness, that liberal concept and the aliveness to the rights of the individual with which your country has grown and become great, and which are among the foundations of democracy and the Christian way of life, encouraged me

to address myself to, and discuss with you, the problem of private property, despite all the existing legal and political obstacles. At the same time, this attitude inspires me with confidence in the successful outcome of my mission.

I would like to invite you to forget for a moment that I am addressing you as a German citizen. I would like to remove the property problem, for the time being, from its particular context of German-American relations and to consider it within the general framework of the political and ethical fundamentals of the free Christian world, my motive being, that, as an individual person, I, like your great Nation and like each of you here, am deeply concerned regarding the fate of the Western World in its conflict with Eastern ideology, and feel that I have my share in the responsibility for our future destiny. We are each of us aware that this period marks a decisive phase in Western history, and a crucial point in the controversy with the Eastern block.

We have come to a crossroad, and there are but two courses open: Either the free individual will disappear and with him the things he stands for—progress, security, trust, and humanity among nations; or the inner values upon which we have built up our life through the centuries, will be restored in all their strength and fullness.

In the history of the United States, from the Declaration of Independence to this very day, two things have played a paramount part: The pioneer spirit of its citizens and respect for the human person and the private sphere surrounding it. With all its immense wealth in soil and mineral and other resources, this country could never have accomplished its astounding evolution from an undeveloped land dependent on capital to its present position of primary power and principal creditor of the globe, but for the scrupulous difference which its foremost representatives have at all times shown to this fundamental principle. I trust you will not take it amiss if I quote some of these men in this context, my sole motive being one of responsibility for our common destiny.

In 1794, Alexander Hamilton, defending article X of the Jay Treaty, solemnly declared:

"No power of language at my command can express the abhorrence I feel at the idea of violating the property of individuals, which in an authorized intercourse in time of peace has been confided to the faith of our Government and laws, on account of controversy between nation and nation. In my view, every moral and every political sense unite to consign it to execration."

After World War I, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, said in an address, in Philadelphia, on November 23, 1923:

"Confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interests of particular individuals, but at the foundation of international intercourse * * * rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state. It is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles."

In 1938, Mr. Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State, said:

"It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory, whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or those of friendly powers. The departure from that policy and the taking over of such property except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results."

Again, after World War II, many distinguished persons, among them the elder statesman Mr. Bernard Baruch, faithfully upheld American tradition and pronounced

themselves against the seizure of private property belonging to former enemies. Mr. Baruch did so in these words:

"Back in the days of the Versailles Treaty, when Britain and France urged that the private property sequestered of aliens should be seized, I took a definite decision and said: 'No.' I took the stand in Paris that under all law, all morality, and all tradition, all private property of former enemies—and that included ships seized at sea—was inviolate. I would not permit it."

And also Mr. John Foster Dulles, the present Secretary of State, who had opposed the seizure of private property owned by nationals of former enemies under the Treaty of Versailles, recently reaffirmed this position during the hearings on the Dirksen bill. In his words,

"The policy adopted after World War II of completely eliminating ownership of enemy private property was a departure from historic American policy after other wars. I myself have had some experience in this field, I worked at this very problem at Paris in connection with the Treaty of Versailles at the end of the First World War.

"I can say frankly, that I would like to see a return to our historic position, the position of the sanctity of private property in time of war, to return to that historic position to the extent that may be practical, although I recognize that there are considerable difficulties in dealing with the matter on that basis after so long a period of time."

The sanctity of private property which these eminent statesmen strove to uphold is of paramount significance in this present time and will be even more so for the future, because with the ever growing number and density of populations everywhere, the increase in functions taken over by governments and the development in all fields of technology and communications, the burden resting on the individual will increase while his rights and freedoms will of necessity become more and more restricted. As this process goes on, there will gradually melt away that sphere in which free enterprise—be it that of corporation owners or managers, or that of the man in the street—can be freely deployed. And it is the first and foremost task of the policy conducted by the countries of the Western World to arrest that process and to reverse it, wherever possible, lest we drift slowly, but with inexorable steadiness toward the state of affairs in which the countries of the Eastern bloc, through revolution or outside force, now find themselves. How many people are there in the Western World even now, who have succumbed to resignation or are prepared to submit to communism, because, as they see it, there is in practice but little to choose between the two ideologies. Many are those who think that free Western thought is not worth fighting for if it should remain dead and sterile as a mere embellishment of the phraseology of treaties and propaganda, while it has no resonance in their own everyday life.

I would like to take only one example out of many which demonstrates with particular clarity the fatal consequences of departing from the path of law and morality: as everybody with some knowledge of economics knows, our economic and political future stands or falls with the development of world production and world trade. This great task can only be mastered if we can find new markets with such purchasing power as will ensure work for our industries and a better standard of living for all our peoples. Countries with surplus capital, such as the United States and Great Britain, have therefore at an early date established plans for financing new investment projects in underdeveloped areas and have already achieved remarkable results. Financing these projects will require an ever increasing participation of private capital now that the first phase of govern-

ment financing, necessitated by post-war conditions, is coming to an end. Drawing on private capital sources is necessary both in order to reduce step by step the excessive taxes and duties and to revive private initiative which was largely lost during the period of dirigism which, as we all hope, will forever remain a thing of the past. But we can expect private investors to be able or willing to assume the risk involved in investments abroad only if they are assured that their investments will be secure from confiscation or expropriation. But this security cannot be said to exist now, no matter how many clauses in private contracts and international agreements purport to give it; for if it did exist, there would be no need to have recourse to the rather doubtful device of offering prospective investors guaranties on the part of their own governments against risks of this nature.

There is, I think, no need for me to dwell on the many instances of confiscation of alien capital and property during the recent past. They are all well known to you. I would submit that the majority of these cases would not have occurred at all, or would not have assumed the same dimensions, had it not been for the far-reaching extent to which the concept of private property had suffered from confusion and been watered down even in our Western World, for reasons not always directly resulting from the war.

An illustration of this is offered by the well-known case in which a confiscating government tried to justify its action on the ground that the investor's country had nationalized some of its own industries. Other instances of this nature result from a tendency to couple private property rights with claims which are in no way connected with them.

We—and I am not exempting my own country—have for some time now been dangerously close to getting entangled into an inextricable maze of legal confusion and moral disintegration in which all those principles will be fatally destroyed on which are founded our human and international relations and our mutual confidence and loyalty. This will be the inevitable outcome if we fail in the timely restoration of the principle of the sanctity of private rights such as has been so vigorously defended by distinguished statesmen such as Alexander Hamilton, Mr. Cordell Hull, or Mr. John Foster Dulles, and by many others both in the United States and in Europe.

The United States, a country which has devoted itself with particular energy to the welfare of all nations, today has financial interests throughout the world, running to many billions of dollars. It is the policy of the United States further to increase its investments abroad for the benefit both of its own economy and of the standard of living especially in less developed countries. Taxation benefits and other measures have been or are being introduced in order to induce private capital to take a greater interest in financing such investments. Europe, too, has been invited to take a greater part in these projects than she has done until now. Our continent has by now sufficiently recovered for us to be able to undertake such a task; but the risks to be run, especially on the political and moral side, are so great that neither private individuals, nor business enterprises, nor even the European governments feel encouraged to invest any further substantial financial interests abroad. Can we, for example, expect those countries which are using capital invested by our citizens and our national economy to develop their own economies, to respect and protect without restraint our interests if we ourselves by our own deeds defy the established principle of the sanctity of another person's property? I do not think we can, and there are many who share my opinion. Not the

least among them is Mr. Dulles himself, who last year, during the hearings of the Dirksen bill, said:

"I recognize that there is force in what you say, to the effect that our own position to protect American interests abroad is strengthened, if we protect foreign interests that are here.

"I would think that in an era when we expect the American interests abroad, American capital investments abroad, it is wise for us to adhere ourselves strenuously to the highest standards of conduct in relation to those matters. That puts us in a better position to call upon others to apply the same standards."

As a banker whose profession calls for the assessment of credit and goodwill, I certainly would strongly advise my clients against investing their money in countries where, over and above the natural economic risk connected with any investment, there would be the added hazard of losing one's investments through expropriation or seizure. Only recently I witnessed a particularly striking example of the utter hesitation prevailing in German business circles as regards new foreign commitments, which is motivated by that very political hazard.

On the other hand, if we indulge in an ambiguous attitude regarding private property rights, we shall discourage and alienate people and groups of people of good will who, throughout the world, still have faith in the ethical and legal tenets of the Western way of life.

We heed them; only with their help can America and Europe hope to safeguard their own rights and those of their citizens so that they will put their hearts into stemming back nationalism and communism. As a citizen of the Western World whose views are guided above all by the supremacy of confidence among nations, I believe that we can ensure this inner preparedness of our citizens if your great country, acting in a given concrete case, demonstrates to the world at large that she is resolved to stand firmly by her consistent tradition of maintaining inviolate the private property rights even of nationals and companies of one of her former enemies.

In the long run, our struggle to check the powers of the Eastern bloc and to stem the infiltration of socialist ideologies will be doomed to failure if we rely on financial and physical means alone. Our physical strength must be backed by the conviction among our peoples that the Western World unflinchingly stands for the ethical values of the Occident, and that we are all devoting our efforts to living by them. The highest rank among those spiritual values belongs to personal freedom and the sanctity of private rights.

I could well imagine that if your great country were to give this practical demonstration with regard to former enemy private property, this would leave a deep impression both on our friends and our opponents, and would stand out in this period of ethical confusion and political instability in which the nations of the world are anxiously awaiting a visible sign of the rebirth of Christian ethics. For is it not true that the principle of the sanctity of private property, like that of personal freedom, has its ultimate roots in the philosophy of protecting one's weaker neighbor as it was first conceived in Christian teaching—the philosophy of protecting individuals against injury by their own state and protecting citizens of little states against measures threatening their person and property on the part of bigger ones.

If a mighty country such as the United States took the lead in the field of private interests, as she has so admirably done in international politics since the end of the Second World War against so many difficulties and setbacks, I believe that she would thereby also conquer the hearts of those

multitudes of people on whom we must rely to attain our common goal.

This, however, would only be a first, although decisive step, toward our common task of protecting individual rights and legitimate interests against restrictions or against encumbrances which belong exclusively to the field of relations between states and have no possible connection with the sphere of private rights. If this first step were accompanied by an appeal launched by the United States for the conclusion of an international convention, a Magna Carta to be drawn up for the protection of lawfully acquired property and providing for joint sanctions to be taken especially in the economic field against any future cases of deprivation of rights and infringements upon the inviolability of personal freedoms of foreign citizens and corporations, she would thereby make an essential contribution toward the final aspiration of all freedom-loving men and women, that respect for the individual and unconditional protection of his interests may once more become the unwritten law of nations. At the same time, this would insure the implementation of the vast development programs which have been established by the United States and other major powers to advance world economy and to improve the living conditions of all peoples.

The efforts made by distinguished Members of Congress on both sides of the House until this very day, and the statements regarding the property question which have been made by representative Americans—and this brings me back to the specific question of German-American relations—have convinced me that the principle of the sanctity of private property and its application with regard to former enemies is regaining increased acceptance in American public opinion. This being so, there would have been no need for a German initiative in raising the problem of German private property with the Government of the United States, had it not been for the necessity before which the federal republic finds herself of solving an impending problem of extremely great difficulty, both internal and external, namely, the final step of integrating the Federal Republic of Germany into the Western defense system and her accession as an equal partner to the concert of Western nations. The Federal Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, ardently wishes—and of this I may give you full assurance—to see the Federal Republic of Germany fully integrated with the Western community, and to make such sacrifices as are necessary to attain this end, to the fullest possible extent. This policy, however, cannot lead to complete and lasting success unless it is supported by a decisive majority among the German people. And this is where an early release of private German property confiscated in the United States, with adequate compensation for such assets as have been disposed of, would constitute a substantial contribution toward convincing those in Western Germany who are still in hesitation or opposition, that the Chancellor is right in his policy. It is a policy geared to the defense by all of those values which determine the strength and growth of free nations and their countries and which, in the last analysis, are the foundation of their very existence.

While it is true that only a relatively small section of the German public have assets and interests to defend in the United States, we should not underrate the strains and stresses which the confiscation and liquidation of German private assets have caused in the relations between our peoples. Nor should it be overlooked that these measures affect not only the actual owners but also, in an indirect way, the large number of small stockholders and workers who depend on them. They all feel—and I think rightly—that the seizure and disposal of

their property would be something they have not deserved. Moreover, they feel that there is a marked contrast between the general policy to which they as citizens of the Western nations are asked to subscribe—a policy which is, after all, directed against Communist methods—and the practical measures which the same Western nations are maintaining despite the changes which the political configuration of this world has undergone in the meantime.

It is clear from this, I think, that this is not a question which involves the interests of only some few owners or managers of large enterprises, but a profound question of principle, which has deeply stirred public opinion in Western Germany. If that question has only recently found its way into public opinion, it was because the German public as well as the Federal Government and Parliament had felt that Germany should settle her most urgent external obligations first.

I do not think that I am saying too much when I state that the Federal Republic of Germany has given proof of her willingness to make every sacrifice that it is within her power to make for our common cause, and I would not be here today if I were not convinced that my country, divided and crowded with millions of refugees as she is, has done everything possible to atone for the wrongs perpetrated by the rulers of the Third Reich against the nationals of former enemy countries. I may mention, with all modesty, first the settlement of German external debts under the London Agreement of 1953, and the measures of restitution to victims of persecution by the Third Reich. The Federal Republic of Germany will make every effort in continuing this policy.

This fact is to me an added encouragement in hoping that the step taken by the Federal Republic of Germany and Chancellor Adenauer in raising the question of German property and seeking discussions with your Government will not give cause for resentment or surprise in the United States.

In taking this step, the Chancellor is well aware of the political, legal and also technical problems which render a solution of this question difficult. However, once the principle of the sanctity of private rights has been recognized as henceforth extending also to Western Germany, and its full application effected, as I have not the slightest doubt it will, I am sure that these difficulties will yield to our concerted endeavor.

In conclusion, I may be permitted to say a few words on the friendly relations existing between the German and American peoples, which it is the particular concern of the federal government and the Chancellor to strengthen even further. In the last analysis, these relations between peoples themselves are the basis of any joint policy—for what would be the good of treaties of friendship and alliances if they were not carried by mutual trust among peoples?

I am most gratified to be able to state that this mutual trust in our relations exists not only between our statesmen, Government representatives, and businessmen. We also agree that the same trust has gained strength from year to year between simple German and American citizens, despite the element of tension which any occupation is bound to introduce in international relations. In former eras of diplomatic practice, ambassadors and ministers of one country, when speaking of friendly relations with the host country, could refer only to a select circle of private persons and official governmental representatives of the countries in question who were in contact with each other through professional intercourse. Today, however, one can truly say that between Western Germany and the United States the peoples themselves are in close day-to-day contact with each other. Many thousands of American tourists, soldiers, officials, and businessmen are com-

ing to Germany for extended visits where they live together practically as members of our community. And conversely, the United States has offered an immense number of Germans an opportunity to become acquainted with your country, its people, and its institutions. The result of this process is as positive as it could possibly be in international relations, and I am very happy to confirm this fact. The German people have discovered that they have many features in common with the American people, which makes it much easier to maintain friendly relations. In addition, they admire the outstanding achievements of the American people in practically every field of human activity, their openmindedness and love for freedom, qualities which are today more than ever apt to make a particularly favorable impression on the German people. It is the particular wish of the Federal Chancellor and the Federal Government to see a situation in which a troubled chapter of the past has been closed and the road made free toward genuine and sincere friendship and cooperation.

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1955]

GERMAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States and Germany have reached a preliminary understanding on an American plan calling for a partial return of German property in this country seized during the war. According to this plan, which must still be approved by Congress, the United States proposes to return such property to individual owners in West Germany up to a maximum of \$10,000 per person, and to restore all German copyrights, trade-marks and cultural property. The same formula will be applied to residents of East Germany when Germany is reunited.

Germany welcomes this plan as a constructive step, but it is not a final solution in either principle or substance. The property is to be returned "as a matter of grace," not as a matter of respect for private property—a principle to which the United States has frequently pledged itself and which it observed in large measure after the First World War. Furthermore, the plan does not cover corporate property, which constitutes the bulk of the \$450 million worth of German assets seized. This is left to future settlement.

The problem has been complicated, first, by the ruthless Nazi treatment of private property, which prompted European nations to look askance at any return of German property, and second, by counterclaims of American nationals against Germany for war damages. The latter claims are now to be settled up to a maximum of \$10,000 in each case, from a fund of \$100 million to be set aside out of payments made by Germany for American economic aid after the war. But taking into consideration the scandals attending the Allen Property Administration after the first World War, the use of such property for political rewards after the last war and the long delays in and exorbitant cost of any settlement, it cannot be said that the treatment of private property constitutes the most glorious chapter in the history of Western democracy. The sooner that problem is finally solved with full vindication for the principles for which we stand the better will we be able to meet the Communist challenge to the free world.

NECESSITY FOR A STRONG AND VIRILE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there was a meeting held in Washington by the independent bankers of the country. At that time a resolu-

tion was adopted with reference to the Senate Small Business Committee, particularly with reference to Senate Resolution 16 which is pending before the Senate, and which has, I believe, the sponsorship of 70 Senators, or at least more than a majority. The resolution asks for a change in the rules relating to that committee. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Independent Bankers Association be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS RESOLUTION

Whereas there was created in the 82d Congress, February 20, 1950, a Senate small business continuing committee; and

Whereas because of the effective work carried on by that committee in behalf of small business these past 5 years; and

Whereas the committee members believing the time has arrived to give standing-committee status to the present Small Business Committee, a resolution was introduced in the 83d Congress providing standing-committee status, the resolution being sponsored by the full Committee on Small Business of the Senate, together with other Members of the Senate, totaling 50 in all; and

Whereas the Senate Rules Committee failed to act on the resolution in the 83d Congress; and

Whereas on January 6, 1955, a similar resolution was introduced in bipartisan action in the 84th Congress, Senate Resolution 16, cosponsored by 53 Members of the Senate; and

Whereas the number of Senators supporting the resolution has now reached a total of 70 Members of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, in convention assembled in Washington, D. C., this 26th day of March 1955, That the Independent Bankers Association endorse the resolution as now introduced in the 84th Congress to give the Committee on Small Business the status of a regular standing committee of the United States Senate; be it further

Resolved, That the Independent Bankers Association furnish a copy of this resolution to the present chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Honorable JOHN SPARKMAN, and the ranking minority member, the Honorable EDWARD THYE; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution be forwarded to each member of the Senate Rules Committee, with an accompanying letter urging the Rules Committee to take immediate action in reporting Senate Resolution 16 to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I share a common interest with other Senators in this august body who have devoted much time and considerable effort in promoting the welfare of small business. It has long been my feeling, and I have urged it on many occasions, that a strong and virile small business community is an essential element in the economic bloodstream of America.

Some of the requisites for nurturing small business include proper financing, and a fair share of both Government and military contract work. Obviously, this calls for a substantial measure of cooperation from the large firms. It is vital that the base of our economy be as broad as possible; and every step which results in the acquisition of new business by a small company is a step toward the enlargement of that foundation.

Those who saw the full-page advertisement by the Radio Corporation

of America in the newspapers of April 11, in which RCA recited its program for the development of small business, were—as I was—doubtless impressed by the facts stated therein. It is possible that no large company, including RCA, has yet gone far enough in the direction we advocate. It may well be that even this corporation, which has taken a long stride in the right direction, can increase the scope of its relationship with small business. However, I feel that the efforts made by General David Sarnoff, the chairman of the board, and Mr. Frank M. Folsom, the president of RCA, constitute notable progress in this sphere. It is to their credit that 80 percent of their 7,500 suppliers are small businesses from 43 States; that this 80 percent receives from 45 to 50 percent of the dollar volume expended by RCA with its suppliers; and that all this has been accomplished without the use of Government-owned or Government-leased plants, facilities, or equipment.

I am sure that many other companies are taking the same forward steps; but I was gratified to read of the implementation of the policies of General Sarnoff and Mr. Folsom in the full-page advertisement to which I adverted earlier.

This is indeed a heartening and encouraging sign of progress.

PREVAILING MINIMUM WAGE DETERMINATIONS UNDER THE WALSH-HEALEY PUBLIC CONTRACTS ACT OF 1936

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the statement I am about to make is made on behalf of both the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself. On April 4, Judge Alexander Holtzoff, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, handed down an opinion in the case of Covington Mills against Mitchell which, if it is allowed to stand, will destroy the effectiveness of prevailing minimum wage determinations under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act of 1936. The Secretary of Labor was given authority in the Walsh-Healey Act to ascertain already existing prevailing minimum wages and to require that employees of a manufacturer who enters into a contract with the Federal Government be paid such prevailing minimum wages. The purpose of this provision in the Walsh-Healey Act is to make sure that pressure to get Government contracts on a low-bid basis does not depress industrial wages and to insure that Government contracts do not go only to those areas of the country which pay the lowest wages.

Generally speaking, the Secretary of Labor has made most of his prevailing minimum-wage determinations on an industrywide or nationwide basis. In the Covington Mills case Judge Holtzoff ruled that industrywide determinations were "invalid as in contravention of the statute."

For some time it has been realized that the language of section 1 (b) of the Walsh-Healey Act is ambiguous. To correct this ambiguity I introduced S. 1703 in the 83d Congress on April 21, 1953. This bill was designed to clarify

the present language by authorizing the Secretary to make his Walsh-Healey minimum-wage determinations within such a geographic area as he found appropriate. On behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself I introduced an identical bill (S. 738) in the 84th Congress on January 26, 1955.

It is a function of the Congress and not of the courts to correct ambiguities in statutes. This was clearly pointed out in the Covington Mills case when Judge Holtzoff stated:

The court is impressed with arguments made by counsel as to the administrative difficulty that would be created if the Secretary of Labor were not to be permitted to make nationwide determinations under the Walsh-Healey Act. The court is further impressed with the argument that it is desirable from a social and economic standpoint in some instances to fix the rate of prevailing wages on a nationwide basis. The court expresses no opinion on these points because they are not for the judiciary to determine. These arguments should be addressed to the Congress, because they relate to policy and expediency and not to the interpretation and the meaning of what the Congress has already enacted.

It is hoped that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will schedule hearings on S. 738 and other bills to amend the Walsh-Healey Act at the earliest opportunity. This matter is of such importance in our basic national labor policies that it should be resolved without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the opinion in the Covington Mills case, a copy of S. 738, and three editorials on this matter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion, bill, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COVINGTON MILLS, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS, VERSUS JAMES P. MITCHELL, SECRETARY OF LABOR, DEFENDANT

Llewellyn Thomas, Esq., of Washington, D. C., and Whiteford Blakeney, Esq., of Charlotte, N. C., for the plaintiffs.

Edward H. Hickey, Esq., of the Department of Justice, and Stuart Rothman, Esq., Solicitor of the Department of Labor, both of Washington, D. C., for defendant Secretary of Labor.

David E. Feller, Esq., of Washington, D. C., for defendant Textile Workers of America.

Warren F. Farr, Esq., of Boston, Mass., for defendant National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.

This case comes before the court on cross motions for summary judgment. The action is brought for a declaratory judgment to adjudicate an order by the Secretary of Labor to be invalid as in contravention of the statute pursuant to which it was promulgated.

The order in question fixed a minimum wage for persons employed in certain branches of the textile industry in connection with Government contracts. This was done pursuant to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. The prevailing wage as determined by the order in question, promulgated on December 5, 1952, was to be the same throughout the United States.

The Walsh-Healey Act, pursuant to which this order was promulgated (41 U. S. Code, sec. 35), relates to Government contracts for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding \$10,000. One of the provisions of the act is that there shall be

included in each contract a representation and stipulation that all persons employed by the contractor in its performance will be paid not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work or in the particular or similar industries or groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract.

It is contended by the plaintiffs that under this provision the Secretary of Labor is without power to fix a single prevailing minimum wage for a particular industry on a nationwide basis. To determine whether this objection is sound it is necessary to analyze the pertinent phraseology of the act. The Secretary of Labor is directed to determine the prevailing minimum wages for persons employed on similar work, or persons employed in the particular or similar industries, or persons employed in groups of industries. In other words, he may act under any one of these three provisions. These provisions are followed by the clause, "currently operating in the locality in which the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment are to be manufactured or furnished under said contract."

It is contended by the defendants that the words "currently operating in the locality" are limited only to the last of the three alternatives, namely, persons employed in similar groups of industries. On the other hand, the plaintiffs claim, contrary to the contention of the Secretary, that those words relate back to all of the three clauses. There is some ambiguity in the statute. It is difficult to construe it according to strict grammatical requirements. The words "currently operating" seem inapplicable to the noun "work" or to the noun "industries." It is, perhaps, an unfortunate choice of words, but it seems to the court that the phrase "currently operating" may not be construed as being limited solely to the last of the alternatives but relates back to each of them, namely, persons employed on similar work currently operating in the locality, or persons employed in the particular or similar industries currently operating in the locality, or persons employed in similar groups of industries operating in the locality. This is the interpretation, in the opinion of this court, which should be accorded to those words.

In this connection, the court wishes to call attention to the fact that when the construction of this provision was first raised in litigation in *Lukens Steel Co. et al. v. Perkins, et al.* (107 F. (2d) 627), the point now made by counsel for the Secretary of Labor was not advanced, but it seemed to be assumed that the words "currently operating in the locality" were applicable to and limited each of the three alternatives. Apparently the present construction sought to be applied by counsel for the Secretary of Labor is more or less of an afterthought.

Since the phrase "currently operating in the locality" applies to each of the three alternatives, the next question to be determined is whether the entire United States of America can be considered as a single locality in the discretion of the Secretary. To be sure, the word "locality" is an indefinite term. It may mean a single community. It may mean a county. It may mean a region. A considerable degree of discretion is vested in the Secretary to determine what shall constitute a locality for any particular purpose. So long as the construction placed by the Secretary is reasonable, the court may not set it aside. May it be said, within reason, that the entire United States of America may be regarded as a single locality? It seems to the court that to attach this interpretation to this term would be to place a tortured interpretation and attach a distorted meaning to a simple English word.

Such a type of interpretation and construction of words was satirized by a great English satirist in the well-known book *Through the Looking Glass*. This book records a dialog between Alice and Humpty Dumpty, and says:

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."

The court is not going to place its seal of approval upon that type of construction of plain English words. The court is of the opinion that under no circumstances is it reasonable to construe the word "locality" as applicable to the entire United States of America and calling the entire country a single locality.

The court is especially impelled to this conclusion by the opinion of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Lukens Steel Co., et al. v. Perkins et al.* (107 F. (2d) 627). That case involved the validity of an order under this statute, which fixed wages in the steel industry at a single figure for an area of about 14 States and the District of Columbia and referred to them as a locality. In an opinion written by Mr. Justice Justin Miller, in which Mr. Justice Vinson, then a member of that court, concurred, it was very cogently and persuasively held that the word "locality" may not be used to describe a broad area consisting of 14 States and the District of Columbia. On this point the court made the following observations (pp. 630, 631):

"It is true that the word 'locality' is one of somewhat indefinite meaning. Still, its indefiniteness has certain well-recognized limits in common meaning and usage, which exclude and forbid the interpretation placed upon the word by the appellees in their determination."

And again the court stated:

"In ordinary and common usage locality is synonymous in meaning with such words as place, vicinity, neighborhood, and community. These words, also, are too indefinite to be used for purposes of exact measurement in terms of acres or square miles. But neither they nor locality itself, in any case, connote large geographical areas, with widely diverse interests, such as the 14 States and the District of Columbia, grouped in the protested determination."

A fortiori, if 14 States is too large an area to be deemed a single locality, it necessarily follows that the United States of America is much too large an area to be so considered.

In that case Mr. Justice Edgerton dissented. He did not disagree with the interpretation by the majority of the word "locality," but reached the conclusion that the plaintiffs had no standing to sue and for that reason and that reason alone felt that the bill of complaint should be dismissed. The Supreme Court reversed the determination of the court of appeals (310 U. S. 113). The Supreme Court, however, did not discuss the views of the majority of the court of appeals as to what is meant by "locality," but merely held that the complaint should be dismissed on the ground that the plaintiffs had no standing to sue. This procedural obstacle was later overcome by the so-called Fulbright amendment, which permits judicial review of the determinations of the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. (41 U. S. C. A. 43 (a), added June 30, 1952, 66 Stat. 308.)

The court is impressed with arguments made by counsel as to the administrative difficulty that would be created if the Secretary of Labor were not to be permitted to make nationwide determinations under the

Walsh-Healey Act. The court is further impressed with the argument that it is desirable from a social and economic standpoint in some instances to fix the rate of prevailing wages on a nationwide basis. The court expresses no opinion on these points because they are not for the judiciary to determine. These arguments should be addressed to the Congress, because they relate to policy and expediency and not to the interpretation and the meaning of what the Congress has already enacted.

Accordingly, the court will hold that for the reasons stated the order of the Secretary of Labor here involved is invalid as in contravention of the statute, and will deny defendants' motion for summary judgment and grant the plaintiffs' cross motion for the same relief.

ALEXANDER HOLTZOFF,
United States District Judge.

APRIL 4, 1955.

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1 of the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended (the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) That all persons employed by the contractor in the manufacture or furnishing of the materials, supplies, articles, or equipment used in the performance of the contract will be paid, without subsequent deduction or rebate on any account, not less than the minimum wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor to be the prevailing minimum wages (1) for persons employed on work similar to that to be performed under said contract; or (2) for persons employed in the particular industry in which work under said contract is to be performed or in industries similar thereto. In making determinations of prevailing minimum wages, the Secretary of Labor may determine such wages within such geographic area or areas as he finds to be appropriate, giving due consideration to locations of establishments, areas of marketing competition, or other competitive factors."

[From the Boston Herald of April 6, 1955]

WALSH-HEALEY SETBACK

The decision of United States District Judge Holtzoff, enjoining the Secretary of Labor from setting an industry-wide minimum wage for cotton textile workers employed on Government contracts, is a blow not only to New England, which has strongly supported such a minimum, but to the country as a whole.

Under the Walsh-Healey Act, which became law in 1936, Government contractors are required to pay the prevailing minimum wage as determined by the Secretary of Labor. The obvious intent of the legislation is to prevent marginal producers from undercutting their competitors by paying substandard wages.

The Government thinks this should apply to groups of producers as well as individuals, and to regions as well as groups. It has therefore determined prevailing minimums on a country-wide basis. But this hasn't set well with areas whose chief competitive advantage has been cheap labor. And when the minimum for cotton textiles went up to \$1 an hour recently, 140 southern mills went to the courts for relief.

What is the legal issue? The original act refers to prevailing wages "in the locality in which the materials are to be manufactured," and the southerners charge that the Government is interpreting locality to mean the whole United States. Judge Holtzoff agreed with them that this interpretation was tortured and he threw it out.

But the Government contends that the wages of the "locality" are only 1 of 3 standards which the law permits it to use. The others are wages "for persons employed

on similar work," and wages "for persons employed * * * in the particular or similar industries." It is all a question of how you read the law.

Surely it would have been better for the judge to resolve the doubt in favor of the Government. The Labor Secretary is presumably acting in good faith, and he has given the law the meaning which he thinks will be most beneficial to the country as a whole. Is Judge Holtzoff's guess any better than his?

New England has a special interest in retaining a strong Walsh-Healey Act. Because of the wage differential between northern and southern textile plants it has had to compete at a tremendous disadvantage and it naturally welcomes any move which will tend to narrow the wage gap.

But the Federal law can only narrow the gap. It cannot close it. An industrywide minimum wage would still be well below the New England average, and would leave the South with a considerable wage advantage. New England industry is prepared to fight its own battles. It asks only that the rules be kept reasonably fair.

The Government will, of course, ask a review of Judge Holtzoff's restrictive ruling. And we have no doubt that the higher courts will restore to the Labor Secretary the right to interpret the Walsh-Healey Act as it was intended. But it is frustrating, to say the least, to see the opposition's delaying tactics officially abetted.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun of April 6, 1955]

COTTON TEXTILE WAGE MINIMUMS

It may be some time before we have final judicial determination of the issue, but the northern textile mills, cotton as well as woolen, have lost an important round in the dispute over how to interpret the Walsh-Healey Act.

The Walsh-Healey law, passed back in the early days of the New Deal, was a device intended to boost wages and thereby incomes. It stipulated that the Federal Government could set wage minimums in industries making goods on Government contract, taking into account the wage-floor prevailing for "similar work" in "similar industries" and in "groups of industries currently operating in the locality in which the materials * * * are to be manufactured or furnished."

For many years "locality" was interpreted to mean the entire United States, and by throwing into the scales the wage rates prevailing in northern textile mills, the Government was able to set textile-pay floors well above those then prevailing in the South alone.

But when the late Labor Secretary Maurice Tobin boosted the cotton textile minimum from 87 cents an hour to \$1, just before the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, the South rebelled. Its cotton mills sued to prevent application of the Tobin order, on the premise that Congress never intended to have Walsh-Healey wage minimums fixed on a nationwide instead of a local basis.

Now a Federal judge has agreed with them, and we are inclined to feel that eventually the judge will be proven correct. If Congress had not meant to use the word "locality" in the sense of "regional," it would not have placed that language in the law.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Evening Journal of April 5, 1955]

SOUTHERN MILLS WIN

Cotton textile mills in Dixie won the first round in a legal battle over the minimum wage.

A Federal judge granted a motion by some 140 southern mills for a permanent injunc-

tion barring the Secretary of Labor from determining such wages on an industry-wide basis.

The decision was a setback for textile unions and for New England mills which have contended they were at a disadvantage, because of generally higher wages in New England, in competing with southern mills for Government contracts for textile goods.

Holtzoff's ruling was an interpretation of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Law. This law requires contractors for Government work to pay wages at least as high as the prevailing wage of the locality for that type of work.

The northern mills haven't given up the fight. They will take the decision to a higher court.

AMERICAN TRAVELERS ABROAD—AMBASSADORS OF GOOD WILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared relative to the increasing numbers of Americans who are traveling abroad.

I regard this great increase in international tourist travel as an extremely significant phenomenon. Tourist travel abroad widens the personal horizons both of Americans and of the various foreign peoples. It brings them into closer contact with one another so that they can see for themselves and truly get better acquainted.

International tourist travel also largely increases the availability of dollar exchange in foreign countries.

I am always pleased to note that many fine private American groups are encouraging this tourist travel. The National Association of Travel Organizations has been a leader in this field. In my statement, which follows, I also refer to the constructive activity of the Illinois Commercial Men's Association. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. I hope that worldwide tourist travel will increase. Contrary to many reports, the behavior of our private citizens and of our servicemen already has, on the whole, been splendid. We look forward to further increases in civilian travel this year.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Last year, a new high of 452,000 passports were issued to the American people. This is 34,000 more than in 1953, and almost 60,000 more than in 1952.

The principal means of overseas transportation was steamship—253,000—followed by aircraft: 194,000.

This tremendous upsurge in travel reflects the increased amount of leisure time available to the American people.

It reflects their increased curiosity to find out for themselves more about the world. It also reflects the activity of many fine American organizations which are encouraging travel for professional, business, fraternal, religious, civic, veterans, and other interests.

I cite one particular instance: That of the Illinois Commercial Men's Association. It sponsored a nation-wide membership contest resulting in 15 awards to members—awards wisely taking the form of travel and, in particular, travel to foreign lands.

These award winners, two of whom are from my own State, from Milwaukee and Ashland, respectively, will shortly set out for abroad. They will walk the streets and tour the rural areas of foreign lands—to wonder and compare, from their own American viewpoints. But they will also be, to those who meet with them, symbols of American friendliness and good will.

Carrying within themselves the basic American qualities of simple dignity, generosity and quiet humor, they will personify the best among us.

The Illinois Commercial Men's Association, formed for mutual aid by self-reliant men, is to be congratulated for this thoughtful private contribution to the nurturing of the best form of foreign relations our country can achieve. May I also at this point congratulate these 15 men who, with their wives, we are pleased to have as our unofficial ambassadors:

Michael E. Adameak, Milwaukee, Wis.; Scott A. McLean, Ashland, Wis.; Lee S. Vincent, Chicago, Ill.; Charles E. Cole, Portland, Oreg.; John E. Lunsford, Birmingham, Ala.; A. E. Sharpe, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Adelbert A. Young, Oakland, Calif.; George W. Harlan, Sacramento, Calif.; A. O. Wendelburg, Miles City, Mont.; W. S. Corneille, Ambler, Pa.; Kendall Daskey, Peoria, Ill.; Lloyd Dean Estes, Memphis, Tenn.; Theodore I. Glou, Syracuse, N. Y.; Bert B. Rosen, University City, Mo.; Raymond H. Young, Houston, Tex.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia will not make a point of order, but he would like to remind his colleagues that the Senate is prepared to take up an appropriation bill involving the appropriation of \$4 billion. Therefore he hopes that Senators who wish to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business will confine themselves to 2 minutes, under the rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say as a matter of courtesy to the distinguished majority leader that he permitted a departure from the rules of the Senate which not only took most of the time of the morning hour to which the Senator has referred—and I have no complaints about it—but a second rule was changed so that the majority leader was permitted to yield time during the entire period, and no one on this side of the aisle had an opportunity. There were several Senators who remained and who had an opportunity to transact some of their business, without any remarks which they normally would have an opportunity to make during a morning hour. I think that would be a more correct way of putting it. But I raise no complaint, and I hope the Senator will not call attention to the expiration of the 2-hour period and thus foreclose those Senators on this side who under a normal 2-minute provision would have an opportunity to make some remarks.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I said that I would not make that point, but I wished to remind my colleagues that the morning hour had expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that unanimous consent was granted, and the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

(At this point Mr. WILEY addressed the Senate in tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD.)

DISMISSAL OF EDWARD CORSI BY SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on April 9, on hearing of the dismissal of Edward Corsi by Secretary Dulles, I made the following statement:

The ouster of Mr. Edward Corsi from his position as special assistant to the Secretary of State on immigration problems represents another milestone on the path of administration retreat from principles it professes to hold.

It is a shameful surrender to the opponents of immigration and citizenship law reform, a capitulation to the apologists for the racial and national discrimination built into the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. Corsi was, for many years, a high-ranking member of the Republican administration of my State under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. But he has been considered by Republicans and Democrats alike as a reputable, loyal, and outstanding American citizen, who, in such questions as immigration policy, considered the reform of present law as the concern of all Americans, regardless of party. He was determined also to make the Refugee Relief Act work, despite its tragic shortcomings and built-in booby traps.

Now he has been mercilessly sacrificed because of his identification with immigration reform.

I do not have the benefit of knowing Mr. Corsi on a personal basis, but I do know of his works, and speaking even as a Democrat, I would say that most of them have been good.

His removal from his present position is an assault upon the cause of immigration reform, but it is also an insult to the people of New York State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks 3 editorials, 1 from the New York Times of April 12, 1955, entitled "The Corsi Affair"; 1 from the Washington Post-Times Herald of April 12, 1955, entitled "Knuckling Under"; and 1 from the New York Post of April 11, 1955, entitled "The Aftermath to a Clear Case of Political Murder."

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

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1955]

THE CORSI AFFAIR

If President Eisenhower has ever wondered why it is sometimes difficult to get first-class citizens to serve in important jobs in his administration let him look at the treatment meted out to Edward Corsi, former Industrial Commissioner of New York.

Mr. Corsi has been a distinguished public servant for more than two decades. His first public office of note was Federal Commissioner of Immigration here, a post to which he was appointed by Herbert Hoover in 1931. A liberal Republican, he has been his party's nominee for United States Senate and also for mayor of this city. Because of his expert knowledge of and sympathetic interest in immigration problems, Secretary Dulles named him last December as special assistant for refugee and migration problems, presumably on the theory that if anybody could make sense out of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 Mr. Corsi could. In appointing his "old friend," as he called him, Mr. Dulles noted that for this job Mr. Corsi was the "best qualified man in the United States."

But when Mr. Corsi came to Washington he had two strikes against him. He had been a vigorous and effective opponent of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. Furthermore, he was serious about trying to make the 1953 law

work—and he actually started to do something about it. There are people in Washington who do not want the Refugee Relief Act to work. And Representative Walter, a Pennsylvania Democrat, has apparently not forgiven Mr. Corsi for what he said about the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. WALTER suddenly accused Mr. Corsi of having had Communist associations. Mr. Corsi denied the charges. Preliminary security investigations give Mr. Corsi a clean bill of health, as expected. Yet Mr. WALTER persisted, and Mr. WALTER is an important figure in Congress. We are left to conclude that rather than fight Mr. WALTER and stand up for his personal appointee Secretary of State Dulles capitulated. It is not the first time.

Even in capitulating the State Department says that security is not the issue. Of course it isn't. The issue is a refusal to defend an appointee who was especially called to Washington to do a certain job but who has the administration rug jerked from under him the minute he becomes the target of political attack. Mr. Corsi has been offered some kind of alternate job as a consolation prize. Whether he accepts or refuses it we hope the administration will learn that this is not the way to win the respect of the American people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

KNUCKLING UNDER

Edward Corsi's refusal of a State Department sinecure in place of the important post of immigration consultant from which he was ousted last week by Secretary Dulles heightens the general respect in which he is held. He would have forfeited that respect had he acquiesced in the Secretary's shabby appeasement of Representative FRANCIS WALTER. To treat Mr. Corsi, who has served as Commissioner of Immigration under President Hoover, as director of New York City's Emergency Home Relief Bureau under Mayor LaGuardia, as New York State Industrial Commissioner under Governor Dewey, as though he were some hungry, hat-in-hand jobseeker is as absurd and offensive as to treat him as though he were a security risk.

Mr. Corsi came to Washington at the request of Mr. Dulles to straighten out the emergency refugee program which has been shamefully mishandled by the State Department's Chief Security pooh-bah, Scott McLeod: His experience and accomplishments justified Mr. Dulles in characterizing him as "the best man for the job." Mr. Corsi had long been on record as favoring a much more liberal administration of the emergency relief program and a drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. These views naturally enough won him the hostility of Mr. McLeod and Representative WALTER. The latter, in accordance with a pattern he has followed respecting all critics of his immigration law, recklessly charged Mr. Corsi with being a Communist front.

In ousting Mr. Corsi and knuckling under to Mr. WALTER, Secretary Dulles has done something more than sacrifice one of his subordinates—as he has done on so many occasions in the past—to congressional pressure and intemperance; he has also indicated that he means to soft pedal efforts to repair the bigotry of our immigration procedures. Mr. Corsi could not have allowed himself to be a party to this without prostituting all that he has stood for throughout his public life. Mr. Corsi's reputation remains untarnished. But the administration has contributed to another victory for xenophobia.

[From the New York Post of April 11, 1955]

THE AFTERMATH TO A CLEAR CASE OF POLITICAL MURDER

Secretary Dulles' spineless surrender to the political mobsters who went out to "get"

Edward J. Corsi has created a storm that will not quickly subside.

For one thing, Corsi's ouster has unforgettably dramatized the administration's betrayal of its pledge to liberalize the United States immigration program. Corsi was the man who took that pledge seriously; he lasted less than 90 days.

No doubt President Eisenhower will assure his next press conference that he still favors revisions of the oppressive McCarran-Walter law; that, indeed, no cause is closer to his heart than that of abetting the rescue of the dispossessed everywhere. The men who dominate his administration always grant like the luxury of voicing noble sentiments after the dirty business is done.

But the exiling of Corsi has pointed up the scandalous injustice and inhumanity of our refugee policy more vividly than any speech or editorial ever composed on the subject. In those terms the humiliation to which this decent public servant has been subjected may yet have a salutary aftermath.

In another sense, the Corsi episode underlines the steady moral disintegration of what used to be called The Crusade.

Nothing in the whole story is quite as revealing as Corsi's melancholy picture of the way in which ranking Republicans turned their backs on him the moment that Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and embryo McCarthy of the Democratic Party, opened fire. As Corsi told the Post Saturday:

"Herb Brownell, Sinclair Weeks, Secretary Dulles—I've known them in the party all my years as a Republican. But after WALTER made his unfounded charges nobody spoke out, nobody was around. I've never felt so much a stranger; I've never been so lonesome in this town."

Corsi is only the latest of a long list of worthy men whom the administration has deemed expendable in its cowardly record of capitulation to the know-nothings. What renders his case somewhat unique is his long history of Republican association. He was first appointed to a Government post by Herbert Hoover. He served this State long and well under Tom Dewey. He was his party's candidate for the Senate and the mayoralty.

Yet, in the end, the pillars of republicanism acted as if they had never been formally introduced to him. He had offended both Scott McLeod, Joe McCarthy's ambassador to the State Department, and Representative Walter, a congressional big shot. How could Herbert Brownell or John Foster Dulles dare be caught defending him against such adversaries?

There is little glory for the Democrats in the episode. It was a Democrat—WALTER—who started this infamous attack.

House Leader RAYBURN has silently condoned WALTER's gutter tactics with the benign cynicism that the Republican leadership used to display toward McCARTHY. Only Herbert Lehman, Senator Sparkman, Representative Celler, and a handful of other Democrats have risen to Corsi's defense, just as Jack Javits and Representative Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey, have been almost alone among Republican dignitaries in challenging the Corsi ouster. But great multitudes of Americans who care about the refugee program may make themselves heard before this argument is over.

Let no one pretend that this is a minor skirmish or that Dulles has so many weightier matters on his mind that he cannot be severely called to account for his craven crawl. Our intolerant, small-minded immigration policy is a worldwide issue. Throughout Europe and Asia the Communists have shrewdly exploited the McCarran-Walter law and the restrictive McLeod operation as proof of America's inhumanity to man. The Corsi dismissal will magnify the damage tenfold.

Republican essayists will offer all manner of explanations of the President's role in the seamy affair. They will assert that he didn't know what was happening; that he grieved when it happened; that he wishes it hadn't happened. What none of them can explain is why he continually permits honorable men to be shot down for trying to carry out what he professes to regard as his own program.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S NEW CHINA POLICY SPEECH

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President on the evening of April 11, 1955, former Gov. Adlai Stevenson made a highly important and thoughtful speech on Far Eastern affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

TEXT OF ADLAI STEVENSON'S NEW CHINA POLICY SPEECH

I have not spoken to my fellow countrymen for more than 4 months. And I do so tonight only because I have been deeply disturbed by the recent course of events in the Far East and because many of you have asked for my views. I have waited until the first excitement about the islands, Quemoy and Matsu, has subsided and we can more calmly examine our situation in the straits of Formosa and in Asia. Emotion in matters of national security is no substitute for intelligence, nor rigidity for prudence. To act coolly, intelligently, and prudently in perilous circumstances is the test of a man—and also a nation.

Our common determination, Republicans and Democrats alike, is to avoid atomic war and achieve a just and lasting peace. We all agree on that, I think, but not on the ways and means to that end. And that's what I want to talk about—war, and ways and means to a peaceful solution in the present crisis.

When war lashed at us out of the skies over Pearl Harbor in 1941 we accepted that grim challenge with the conviction that we could at the end help forge a new world of peace and freedom. And tonight on this April evening, I remember that it was in April just 10 years ago that the largest conference in all diplomatic history met at San Francisco to write the charter of the United Nations—a charter of liberation for the peoples of the earth from the scourge of war and want.

The spirit of San Francisco was one of optimism and boundless hope. The long night was lifting; Hitler's armies were on the eve of collapse; the war lords of Japan were tottering. Our hearts were high in that bright blue dawn of a new day—just 10 years ago.

But tonight, despite the uneasy truces in Korea and Indochina, our country once again confronts the iron face of war—war that may be unlike anything that man has seen since the creation of the world, for the weapons man has created can destroy not only his present but his future as well. With the invention of the hydrogen bomb the human race has crossed one of the great watersheds of history, and mankind stands in new territory, in uncharted lands.

The tragedy is that the possibility of war just now seems to hinge upon Quemoy and Matsu, small islands that lie almost as close to the coast of China as Staten Island does to New York. Why are we in this bleak situation? Why is all the world anxious?

Well, the implications of our country's recent Formosa policy cannot be overstated. But I shall not enlarge now on the injury it has done us and the confusion it has

wrought, not only among the uncommitted nations of Asia, but among our allies in Europe.

DIFFICULT DECISION

In brief, having first unleashed Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, presumably for attacks on the mainland, it appears that after some sober second thoughts President Eisenhower is now trying to unleash him and return to the previous policy. Just a couple of months ago when the Chinese Communists made menacing gestures at other coastal islands occupied by the Nationalists, our Government had the disagreeable task of forcing General Chiang to evacuate the Tachen Islands which he had reinforced as a by-product of our own policy of encouraging the threat of invasion.

And today we find ourselves facing another difficult decision over the defense of the Quemoy and Matsu Islands, also presumably fortified by the Chinese Nationalists with our approval and assistance. Having hinted at American intervention in Indochina, and then done nothing; having forced Chiang Kai-shek to evacuate the Tachen Islands; we now face the bitter consequences of our Government's Formosa policy once again; either another damaging and humiliating retreat, or else the hazard of war, modern war, unleashed not by necessity, not by strategic judgment, not by the honor of allies or for the defense of frontiers, but by a policy based more on political difficulties here at home than the realities of our situation in Asia. If we should withdraw under fire from the defense of these islands we again act the "paper tiger"; if we join in their defense we are at war, perhaps world war, without major allies and with most of public opinion in Asia and Europe against us.

Given these unhappy choices it appears that President Eisenhower will decide what to do if and when the attack comes, depending on whether in his judgment it is just an attack on these islands or a prelude to an assault on Formosa.

While our President has great military experience, perhaps it is not improper to ask whether any man can read the mind of an enemy within a few hours of such an attack and determine whether, at some later date, the enemy plans to go further and invade Formosa. Is it wise to allow the dread question of modern war to hinge upon such a guess? Moreover, it would seem to me difficult for any leader to make a rational, calculated decision under fire. In the explosion of emotion it is easy to be swept into war.

Now the President, as usual, is getting a lot of advice these days, and I hope I'm not making his hard task harder. Many of his most influential associates—including the Republican leader in the Senate and the chairman of the Republican policy committee—have been insisting that the President pledge us to the defense of these islands. They say that another bluff and backdown, another retreat in Asia, would add substance to what the Chinese Communists say about the United States being a "paper tiger."

Those who demand a pledge to go to war say that having gone this far with Chiang Kai-shek to let him down now when he is reinforcing these islands and preparing an all-out stand would deal a heavy blow to the morale of his forces and endanger the defenses of Formosa itself.

COUNTERARGUMENTS

Now there is undeniable merit to these and other arguments, but I must say in all candor that they seem to me overborne by the counterarguments, and I have the greatest misgivings about risking a third world war in defense of these little islands in which we would have neither the same legal justification nor the same support as in the defense of Formosa. They are different from Formosa. They have always belonged to China. But Formosa belonged to Japan and

was ceded by the Japanese peace treaty. We have as much right to be there as anybody, except perhaps the real Formosans.

But, of course, the President's judgment must be final. He asked for and got from Congress the sole responsibility for making this decision. As Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Democratic majority leader, has said: "We are not going to take the responsibility out of the hands of the constitutional leader and try to arrogate it to ourselves." So the ultimate decision must rest with the constitutional leader, the President, our Commander in Chief. Yet in a democratic community he is entitled not only to the support, but also the informed judgment of his fellow countrymen.

The President will have my prayers for his wisdom and fortitude in making this critical decision, if he must and when he must. I only hope that inflammatory advice in his party and his administration does not unbalance his consideration of these critical questions:

Are the offshore islands essential to the security of the United States?

Are they, indeed, even essential to the defense of Formosa, which all Americans have been agreed upon since President Truman sent the Seventh Fleet there 5 years ago?

Or is it, as the Secretary of Defense says, that the loss of Quemoy and Matsu would make no significant military difference?

Can they be defended without resort to nuclear weapons?

If not, while I know we now have the means to incinerate, to burn up, much of living China, and quickly, are we prepared to use such weapons to defend islands so tenuously related to American security?

Finally, are we prepared to shock and alienate not alone our traditional allies, but most of the major non-Communist powers of Asia by going to war over Quemoy and Matsu, to which the United States has no color of claim and which are of questionable value to the defense of Formosa?

Are we, in short, prepared to face the prospects of war in the morass of China, possibly global war, standing almost alone in a sullen or hostile world?

These are the questions that must be answered, this time I hope with more concern for realities in Asia and for unity with our allies than for fantasies in Formosa and for placating implacable extremists in America.

At this late date there may be no wholly satisfactory way of resolving the dilemma we have stumbled into over the onshore islands. But if we learn something from this experience, if we realize at last that we have been pursuing a dead-end policy in Asia, then perhaps we can turn our present difficulties to good account and devise an approach more in keeping with the realities of Asia and of the hydrogen age.

And that causes me to say that the division of our coalition over these offshore islands, the weakening of the grand alliance of free nations pledged to stand together to defend themselves, is in my judgment a greater peril to enduring peace than the islands themselves.

I know some politicians who tell us that we don't need allies. Life would certainly be much simpler if that were so, for our friends can be highly irritating. But it is not so. We need allies because we have only 6 percent of the world's population. We need them because the overseas air bases essential to our own security are on their territory. We need allies because they are the source of indispensable strategic materials. We need, above all, the moral strength that support of the world community alone can bring to our cause. Let us never underestimate the weight of moral opinion. It can be more penetrating than bullets, more durable than steel. It was a great general,

Napoleon, who wrote: "In war, moral considerations are three-quarters of the battle."

Should we be plunged into another great war, the maintenance of our alliances and the respect and good will of the uncommitted nations of Asia will be far more important to us than the possession of these offshore islands ever could be. Moreover, the maintenance of a united front is of vital importance to the defense of Formosa itself, since, in addition to the material and military support our friends might contribute toward the defense of Formosa, their moral support and the knowledge by the Communist leaders that they would be facing a united free world, would be a much more effective deterrent to an assault on Formosa than is our present lonely and irresolute position on the offshore islands.

So it seems to me that to repair the broad breach in our ranks should be our first priority, for the supreme aim of the Peiping-Moscow axis is to drive a wedge between America and her friends and allies. To divide and conquer is not yet obsolete strategy.

How shall we mend the walls of our coalition? And is there any hope of a peaceful solution of the offshore island question?

I think so. Senator GEORGE, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has recently pointed the way: "We nations of the free world must understand each other and reach a measure of unity before any hopeful approach can be made to a reexamination of * * * our far eastern problems."

And Governor Harriman, of New York, long familiar with the problems of maintaining a coalition, warned us the other day that in Asia: "The whole world is a party at interest, and that it has been not only illogical but deadly dangerous to arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for decisions which involve the future of many peoples."

So I would urge our Government to promptly consult our friends; yes, and the uncommitted states, too, and ask them all to join with us in an open declaration condemning the use of force in the Formosa Strait, and agreeing to stand with us in the defense of Formosa against any aggression, pending some final settlement of its status—by independence, neutralization, trusteeship, plebiscite, or whatever is wisest.

Nor do I see any reason why we should not invite Soviet Russia, which is united by treaty with Red China, to declare its position, to indicate whether it prefers the possibility of ultimate settlement by agreement to an unpredictable, perhaps limitless conflict, started by an arrogant, foolhardy Communist China, either by miscalculation or by design.

With the assurance provided by such a common position concurred in by the nations whose weight and prestige are essential to the ultimate success of any Formosan policy, neither we nor General Chiang Kai-shek should any longer need to rely upon a militarily precarious position in these little offshore islands to resist the aggressive ambitions of the Chinese Communists toward Formosa.

With such an international declaration denouncing the use of force; with such collective support for the defense of Formosa; with the addition thereby of moral solidarity to military strength in Formosa, I should think Quemoy and Matsu would have little further importance to the Nationalists, let alone to us.

Diplomacy prescribes no rigid formula for accomplishing our objectives, and another major avenue in the quest for a peaceful solution in the Far East remains unexplored; the United Nations. I should think that the United States, together with friends and allies in Europe and Asia, could submit a resolution to the United Nations General Assembly, calling upon the Assembly likewise to condemn any effort to alter the present status of Formosa by force. And I

think we could afford to go further and call upon the United Nations Assembly to seek a formula for the permanent future of Formosa, consistent with the wishes of its people, with international law, and with world security.

One of the weaknesses of our position is that we have been making Formosa policy as we thought best regardless of others. But we can't expect other nations to always support policies they disagree with. We can persuade but we can't coerce. And one of the advantages of joint action would be to put Formosa policy on a much broader basis. In the eyes of Asian nations we would thereby achieve a consistent and morally unquestionable position in providing for the protection of the Formosans according to the principles and ideals of international law.

In the eyes of our European friends and allies we would once more have asserted our full belief in the value, indeed in the indispensability, of maintaining the alliance of the free world against the slave world. And in the eyes of our Nationalist friends on Formosa, surely the understanding and support of the bulk of the non-Communist world is a much stronger defense of Formosa than these islands can possibly be.

But if the Chinese Communists refuse, if they insist on force and reject any peaceful solution, then at least it would be clear to everyone who the aggressors were. And, clearly, if the Chinese are so bent on violence, so intoxicated by their successes, so indifferent to the grisly realities of modern war, then we have no alternative but to meet force with force. But let us at least meet it with our allies beside us and the blame placed squarely where it belongs—not on America's fantasies and inflexibility, but on the unteachable and unquenchable ambition and the indifference to human life of China's Communist regime.

So to repairing the cracks in our walls and recapturing lost confidence, I would attach the first priority. And to profit from this unhappy experience we might ask ourselves how we ever got in this position, how the prestige and honor of the great United States, not to mention the peace of the world, could be staked on some little islands within the shadow of the China coast in which we have no claim or interest.

The answer, of course, is that we have been making Formosa policy lately not only on a unilateral basis but more on considerations of domestic political expediency than foreign realities. Domestic politics should not enter our foreign affairs, least of all factional conflict between the two wings of the President's party, but they have, and too often our hot and cold vacillating behavior abroad has reflected efforts to please both the views that divide our Government and the Republican Party, especially on far-eastern policy.

While I do not belittle some recent achievements in the foreign field, too much of our foreign policy of late has disclosed a yawning gap between what we say and what we do—between our words and deeds.

For example, you remember that as the Communist pressure rose in Indochina, just a year ago, so did our warlike, menacing words. The Vice President of the United States even talked of sending American soldiers to fight on the mainland of Asia. But what happened? Nothing.

Likewise all the bold, brave talk about liberation of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain has long since evaporated, with the loss of half of Vietnam and of our prestige and influence.

So also we hear no more of last year's dire threats of instantaneous and massive atomic retaliation. Instead, the President has spoken lately of pinpoint retaliation with tactical weapons. I fear, however, that the psychological effect of the use of atomic weapons, large or small, will be unfortunate.

But there has been plenty of massive verbal retaliation, and the administration's pol-

icy of extravagant words has alarmed our friends a good deal more than it has deterred the aggressors. For our allies assumed that the great United States meant what it said, and it seems to me that when you compare what we have said with what we have done during the past 2 years it is little wonder that Secretary of State Dulles is fearful lest the Chinese Communists really do think that the United States is a "paper tiger."

Now let me be clear. I am not criticizing the administration for abandoning these extravagant positions; I am criticizing it for taking such positions, for making threats which it is not prepared to back up, for bluffing and undermining faith in the United States.

Another example of these winged words, as we have seen, was President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement 2 years ago that he was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek, taking the wraps off him, presumably for an attack on the mainland to reconquer China. We need not speculate on the President's reasons for thus serving notice on Communist China and the whole world that Formosa was now free to resume the civil war. However, it was apparent to everyone else, if not to us, that such an invasion across 100 miles of water by a small, overage, underequipped army against perhaps the largest army and the largest nation on earth could not possibly succeed without all-out support from the United States.

Since it seemed incredible to sober, thoughtful people that the Government of the United States could be bluffing on such a matter, the President's unleashing policy has caused widespread anxiety that we planned to support a major war with China which might involve the Soviet Union. Hence we find ourselves where we are today—on Quemoy and Matsu—alone.

What, then, are the lessons to be drawn from the past 2 years?

In the first place, I think we should abandon, once and for all, the policy of wishful thinking and wishful talking, the policy of big words and little deeds.

We must renounce go-it-aloneism.

We shall have to face the fact that General Chiang's army cannot invade the mainland unless we are prepared to accept enormous burdens and risk—alone.

The world will respect us for recognizing mistakes and correcting them. But if our present posture in the offshore islands, for example, is a wrong one, who will respect us for stubbornly persisting in it? Our friends have made it clear that so long as fantasy, rigidity and domestic politics seem to stand in the way of peaceful Formosa settlement, they will not support us if, in spite of our endeavors, a conflict should break out. If we cease to deceive ourselves over the hard realities of power in the Formosa situation we shall have taken the first step toward our first essential—the restoration of unity of purpose and action between ourselves and our allies in the free world.

So, finally, let us face the fact that keeping friends these days calls for more statesmanship than challenging enemies, and the cause of world peace transcends any domestic political considerations.

But, preoccupied as we all are with the immediate problems of these islands, we must try to keep things in perspective somehow and not lose sight of our main objectives. For beyond Quemoy and Matsu, and even Formosa, lie the urgent and larger problems of Asia—the growing attraction of enormous, reawakened China, the struggle of the underdeveloped countries to improve their condition and keep their independence and the grave misgivings about America.

If for today the best hope for the world is a kind of atomic balance, the decisive battle in the struggle against aggression may be fought not on battlefields but in the minds of men, and the area of decision may well be out there among the uncommitted peo-

ples of Asia and Africa who look and listen and who must, in the main, judge us by what we say and do.

It is not only over the offshore islands crisis that we need a new sense of direction and to mend our fences. Too often of late we have turned to the world a face of obdurate military power. Too often the sound they hear from Washington is the call to arms, the rattling of the saber. Too often our constructive, helpful economic programs have been obscured, our good done by stealth. Thus have we Americans, the most peaceful and generous people on earth, been made to appear hard, belligerent and careless of those very qualities of humanity, which, in fact, we value most. The picture of America—the kindly, generous, deeply pacific people who are really America—has been clouded in the world, to the comfort of the aggressors and the dismay of our friends.

As best we can, let us correct this distorted impression, for we will win no hearts and minds in the new Asia by uttering louder threats and brandishing bigger swords. The fact is that we have not created excess military strength. The fact is that compared to freedom's enemies we have created if anything too little; the trouble is that we have tried to cover our deficiencies with bold words and have thus obscured our peaceful purposes and our ultimate reliance on quiet firmness rather than bluster and vacillation, on wisdom rather than warnings, on forbearance rather than dictation.

We will be welcome to the sensitive people of Asia, not as soldiers, but as engineers and doctors and agricultural experts, coming to build, to help, to heal. Point four was an idea far more stirring, far more powerful, than all the slogans about "liberation" and "retaliation" and "unleashing" rolled together. Let us present once more the true face of America—warm and modest and friendly, dedicated to the welfare of all mankind, and demanding nothing except a chance for all to live and let live, to grow and govern as they wish free from interference, free from intimidation, free from fear.

Let this be the American mission in the hydrogen age. Let us stop slandering ourselves and appear before the world once again—as we really are—as friends, not as masters; as apostles of principle, not of power; in humility, not arrogance; as champions of peace, not as harbingers of war. For our strength lies, not alone in our proving grounds and our stockpiles, but in our ideals, our goals, and their universal appeal to men of all faiths struggling to breathe free.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has already submitted for the RECORD the text of Adlai Stevenson's great statesmanship speech of the other evening. Therefore, I shall now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a press release I issued regarding that speech; and I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the same point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, commenting on Mr. Stevenson's speech.

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

APRIL 12, 1955.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, issued the following statement today on Adlai Stevenson's speech on the administration's foreign policy in Asia.

"Adlai Stevenson's speech was a great speech by a great statesman. It was true to the historic ideals of American foreign policy. In essence it urged the Eisenhower ad-

ministration to return to a foreign policy within the framework of international law by pointing out that the United States has no legal right to defend Quemoy and the Matsus, and by recommending that we call upon the United Nations to intercede in the interest of maintaining peace in the Pacific and averting, if possible, a third world war.

"Stevenson reinforced the case which Senator LEHMAN and I have made against the administration's foreign policy in respect to the coastal islands from the day that we opposed and voted against the resolution authorizing the President to act outside the framework of international law.

"Stevenson's recommendation that we try to get together with our allies at once for joint action in defense of Formosa, and that we substitute moral principles and economic assistance in Asia for threats of military action points the way to the high road toward peace in contrast with the administration's low road toward war."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 13, 1955]

MR. STEVENSON'S SPEECH

Mr. Stevenson made a very fine speech on Monday on the great issues at stake in the Formosa Straits. But he ought to have made it 2 months ago. At that time the President submitted to Congress a joint resolution on the straits (following the mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek) which complicated the situation that Mr. Stevenson now seeks to clarify and resolve. But in February, along with most of the Democrats in Congress, the titular head of the party stayed silent. It was left to half a dozen Senators, led by Senator MORSE, to raise the questions about both the resolution and the treaty which are now agitating the entire country.

Last February these questions were also agitating our allies in the Western World. It is plain that, as Mr. Stevenson says, we should be left to fight alone if we sought to keep Quemoy and Matsu from falling into Chinese Communist hands. For this among other reasons the Democratic leader implies that he thinks we should not support Chiang Kai-shek there. Whether the President agrees with him is still a debatable question. That was one purpose of the joint resolution—to keep our purposes vague in the hope that the ambiguity would facilitate a cease-fire in the straits. More and more observers feel, however, that the Pekingites will not be so intimidated. If they should attack the islands and fall because of our intervention, they would probably succeed in isolating the United States, in Asia and possibly in Europe.

The case of Formosa is altogether a different proposition. Mr. Stevenson would invite the world to cooperate in the defense of Formosa pending a final determination of its status. Here is a very attractive suggestion. Whether or not it is practicable, however, is a large question. The United States will not let Formosa slip out of its control so long as an aggressive Communist regime in China is threatening free peoples on the continent of Asia and in Japan. If an agreement for international defense of Formosa could be worked out on the basis of this understanding, it would be a great contribution to the cause of peace.

In part, the present situation has resulted from the efforts of the administration to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. The White House clearly wants a peaceful solution. It thought it was working toward it—toward a way out of what Mr. Stevenson calls the dead-end policy on Asia—when it appealed to Congress last February. But far more action is needed on the positive side. It may be that nothing will divert Red China from following her announced course of trying to take Formosa as well as

the offshore islands. However, Mr. Stevenson's statesmanlike speech has the merit of making clear that there is time to try again through diplomatic means to avoid a military showdown.

REPORT OF HOOVER COMMISSION ON MILITARY TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have read with interest the stories in the newspapers concerning the Hoover Commission report on the subject of military transportation costs. I have noticed with particular interest that the Commission states that military transportation facilities are competing extensively with private shipping and the airlines.

Among other things the news stories report that the Commission singles out for attention the so-called waste involved in the hauling of "hitchhikers" in aircraft of the Armed Services. The news story quoted the Commission as stating that more than 4,800,000 passengers were carried as "hitchhikers, or on a leave status."

Mr. President, I yield to no one in desiring to eliminate waste, and to improve efficiency within the military services, and also to bring about a corresponding improvement in our economic structure. However, I am equally opposed to broad and sweeping generalizations which, if effective, would reduce the fringe benefits available to our military personnel. One of the most important factors in the maintenance of morale within the military service is the privilege of taking leave by its personnel. Due to the far flung locations of our military forces, such leave, if to be enjoyed frequently, requires transportation beyond the financial ability of most military personnel.

I personally feel that the question of permitting "hitchhiking," as referred to, if analyzed would be found to involve little or no cost to the Government. Such transportation is normally provided on a basis of space available on flights scheduled for other purposes.

It may be true that in some cases the individuals would have flown commercially if free military transportation were not available. It is much more likely they would not be able to get home in many more instances if military transportation were not available, because of the cost involved.

I sincerely trust that in implementing the generally excellent work of the Hoover Commission, the point of the continuing need to encourage our military personnel to remain as our active and reserve forces will be considered. I believe much good is accomplished at a small comparative cost by permitting service personnel to ride military planes when extra space is available.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the comments made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] regarding the taking away of so-called fringe benefits from military personnel, in respect to making available to them accommodations when they wish to go home and when facilities are

available on air transports to take them home.

When I was a member of the Armed Services Committee I served on a subcommittee dealing with the problems of military personnel. In my judgment, one of the greatest losses of military morale in recent years has come as a result of a very picayunish and parsimonious tightening up on the so-called fringe benefits available to military personnel. Great savings can be made in the military, but I believe it is false economy to make such savings by denying to military personnel an opportunity to have a free plane ride home, shall I say, when a plane is going to the vicinity of their home, anyway. There is nothing more disheartening. We subsidize the commercial airlines sufficiently, without insisting upon an indirect form of subsidy by means of requiring that when military personnel wish to go home for a visit—and all of us know they have little free money in their pockets—they must purchase commercial airline tickets, even though a military plane is going to the same vicinity at the same time.

There are other fringe benefits we are also taking away from military personnel that are very costly to military personnel morale. I refer, for instance, to the cutting down on commissary privileges. In my opinion, that has been very costly to morale, and I hope those commissary privileges will be restored at an early date.

THE WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, 8 years have been written into the history of the Army Medical Service since the Women's Medical Specialist Corps was established by Public Law 36, 80th Congress, on April 16, 1947.

As the eighth anniversary of the corps is at hand, the dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists making up its personnel find themselves integrated completely into the ranks of those responsible for the Army's health.

While achieving this integration, the three sections of the corps have functioned as a single unit, although each remained highly individual within its own specialty. They have unified their educational approach for the procurement of needed personnel, and they have consolidated their long-range functional objectives into a harmonious working pattern.

The Women's Medical Specialist Corps, an all-officer organization, currently has on active duty 210 dietitians, 200 physical therapists, and 135 occupational therapists. There is an immediate need for entrance on active duty of graduate dietitians and occupational therapists who have had 1 or more years of experience in their professional specialties.

It is a matter of deep pride to the corps that 13 percent of its total strength is on duty overseas, caring for hospitalized American soldiers in Europe, the Far East, the Caribbean, and Pacific areas.

Assigned principally to Army hospitals, the Women's Medical Specialist Corps officers perform the duties of their indi-

vidual professions. The dietitians, in charge of food service in Army hospitals, direct the activities of their division. This includes planning diets for patients' individual needs, whether on a regular or therapeutic diet; instruction of patients in correct dietary habits; and performing the administrative duties in personnel and budgetary management which are inherent to a food service operation.

Physical therapists and occupational therapists apply the skills and techniques of their professions, under medical prescription, to the treatment of all types of patients.

The physical therapist uses exercise and massage and the physical agents such as electricity, heat, light, and water in a program of treatment designed to restore maximum usefulness of nerves and muscles.

Through varied creative and manual arts, the occupational therapist teaches and directs the patient in activities prescribed for his physical or mental illness. Both physical and occupational therapists work to hasten the patient's return to normal living through the use of their own specific media.

The corps is also participating in research, procurement of personnel, full-time teaching in professional specialties, and other special duty details. Dietitians are engaged in Army Medical Service research, connected with the nutritional content of the troop ration and the use of irradiated foods, the metabolic response to burns, and a study of human dietary needs in metabolic disorders.

Physical therapists have worked in Korea with the medical-assistance program, instructing ROK personnel in the principles and application of physical therapy. Occupational therapists have contributed to the designs of new equipment adapted to the needs of disabled persons.

Procurement activities for WMSC officers stationed in the Army area headquarters reflect the highest type of liaison efforts. In their contacts with the colleges and universities graduating the young women eligible to enter the corps, they have widened the horizons of career opportunities afforded these graduates. In their many appearances before civic organizations, women's groups, and vocational guidance conferences, they have interpreted the medical specialties of the corps from the level of actual experience.

Each section of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps has its own educational program. The courses are open to selected college graduates who wish to qualify in one of the corps' three specialties. Young women accepted for these courses of instruction are commissioned in the WMSC with a service requirement of 2 years, which includes the training period. Professionally accredited courses in hospital dietetics, physical therapy, and occupational therapy clinical affiliation are offered annually.

Despite the comparative youth of the WMSC as a component of the Army Medical Service, the corps retired 8 officers during the past 12-month period after 20 years service. These officers served with the Army as civilians in the earlier part of their careers and were

recipients of AUS commissions early in World War II. The founding of the corps in 1947 was the culmination of many years of pioneering effort on the part of dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists working with the Army. Their record of service dates back to the Spanish-American War, and is a shining example of dedication to the best interests of humanity and the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the senior Senator from Maine is on the floor, I should like to have her attention for just a moment to say that I am very pleased that the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] inserted in the RECORD today a report by the senior Senator from Maine with respect to the trip she recently took to a good many parts of the world. I happen to be one who believes that the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] performed a great public service in making that trip. I think it was one of the finest examples of good American public relations in the last several years; and I am sure that all Members of the Senate will read with great interest the observations contained in the report. I wish that my friend, the Senator from Maine, would go beyond the report, however, and some day would call together a group of us for a briefing on her observations, because I believe that all Members of the Senate would be delighted to sit down with her and have her give them the benefit of her observations and findings, as a result of that trip.

Having made this comment, I also wish to say that in my judgment she is not deserving of a single one of the irresponsible criticisms regarding her trip that we have heard from some prejudiced minds.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I very much enjoyed and appreciated what he has said about the remarks made by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon is aware that only the great modesty of the Senator from Maine prevented her from mentioning the fact that, as a Member of the House of Representatives, she introduced a measure which resulted in the formation of the Women's Specialist Corps. We should give credit not only to the corps itself, but also to the senior Senator from Maine, who was responsible for initiating that great work.

Mr. MORSE. I was not aware of that fact; but I am not at all surprised to receive the information, because I would expect her to do such a thing.

Mr. AIKEN. I was sure that if the Senator from Oregon had been aware of it, he would have given the Senator from Maine full credit for the contribution she made.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly would, and I thank the Senator from Vermont for supplementing my remarks.

THE STATUS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, genuinely alarmed as I am as to the im-provident status of civil defense in this country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I addressed to President Eisenhower on March 16, 1955.

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

MARCH 16, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT,

*The White House,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: "Civil Defense is dying." This is the report that I have received for the past several months from persons vitally concerned with the problem of civil defense. With great anxiety, I must state that my individual studies clearly re-affirms this conclusion and that unless some decisive action is taken at once, the alternative may be a fate for many millions of Americans far too horrible to contemplate.

"There is no absolute defense against the hydrogen bomb * * * [before its consequences] imagination stands appalled." So said Sir Winston Churchill recently in the British House of Commons. It is undeniably true that men's minds have not yet learned to assimilate the ultimate effect such weapons could have upon civilization. Civil defense need not remain a great enigma. Adequate precautions which could greatly minimize casualties in case of an attack, atomic or otherwise, are firmly within our capabilities if sought with great endeavor and realistic dispatch.

The American people deserve and expect such a program—the most effective, efficient civil-defense program possible of attainment and they are entitled to such safeguards today. Unfortunately, not only is a comprehensive civil-defense program nonexistent, but what is more alarming, the Federal Civil Defense Administration as it is presently situated is manifestly incapable of effectual operation. Last July when plans to move the headquarters of this vital agency to Battle Creek, Mich., were first announced, I wrote you, outlining in detail what I regarded as persuasive reasons as to why this transfer should not take place. Subsequently, the Senate of the United States by a large majority voted against the move to Battle Creek.

My efforts and the vote of the Senate were unavailing and ostensibly, for reasons of economy, the Federal Civil Defense Administration proceeded with plans for moving to the Midwest—an act which unquestionably robbed this agency of the ability to perform the functions assigned to it.

Removed from the operations of this complex agency, as we in Washington are, any evaluation of its work would be extremely difficult and a task I would not attempt to undertake. However, there are collateral means available with which to judge these operations at Battle Creek. As one most convincing example, consider the fact that the work of the Civil Defense Administration is essentially liaison in nature. Twenty-six agencies and departments of the Government, all located in Washington, actually perform the investigations, studies, and other basic responsibilities on instructions from Battle Creek.

Yet, connecting Battle Creek with Washington are only seven telephone lines. As incredible as it might seem, these seven lines must afford adequate communications for several hundred civil-defense employees with associated Government personnel in Washington. Can there be any question as to the inadequacy of these telephone communications?

When civil defense was located in the District of Columbia, it used 25 telephone lines. Comparable telephone communications between Washington and Battle Creek would cost approximately \$500,000 per year. This one cost factor would appear to make retention of the headquarters at Battle Creek economically impossible. What is more, even if these additional telephone facilities were obtained at such an immense cost for the performance of routine, unclassified liaison, proper administration could still not be maintained from Battle Creek because a large segment of the work performed by civil defense is classified and cannot be discussed over the telephone.

Gov. Val Peterson, FCDA Administrator, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 4th virtually admitted that at the present time the Battle Creek experiment was not satisfactory and that another year would be needed to appraise properly the ultimate merit of moving the headquarters to that midwestern location. Does our Nation have a year to waste? Can we afford a lingering 12-month's period in which to determine that this experiment is unfeasible?

Immediate steps, in my considered judgment, must be taken to locate these headquarters somewhere in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital so that the mandate of the Congress and the American people will be capably fulfilled. The administrative machinery essential to an adequate civil defense program must be reoriented and regenerated. The Civil Defense Administration must be returned from exile and given a chance to live and to perform its prescribed functions.

Civil defense is infinitely important to the future of our Nation. The Government agency entrusted with the primary responsibility of providing our Nation with a civil defense program should not be permitted to die a premature death. I believe that the conclusions stated in my letter of July 22, 1954 are now self-evident and that a new, more practical location for this vital agency should be selected immediately—Maryland, as before, is prepared to provide that location. Meanwhile, priceless time is being lost.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Also, Mr. President, in connection with the same critical situation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Bring It Back Home," which appeared in the March 27, 1955, issue of the Washington Sunday Star.

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

BRING IT BACK HOME

Because the original move was illogical, there is a lot of merit in Senator BUTLER's request to President Eisenhower that the Civil Defense Administration be brought back to the Washington area from Battle Creek, Mich. It was illogical to single out Civil Defense for such a drastic dispersal move, while leaving in this target area such sensitive agencies as the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Even more illogical is the splitting up of CDA, with the Administrator and his staff of about 25 assistants staying in Washington and the remainder of the personnel working at Battle Creek. The extra time and expense involved in operating such a divided organization must be enormous. And the quarters at Battle Creek are apt to be needed by the Army in an atomic or other emergency, for they are former military hospital facilities still owned by the Government.

The return of CDA to Washington or its suburbs would contribute to the agency's efficiency. Certainly if the CIA feels that it is safe to remain in Washington metropolitan area, as is indicated by its plans for a new building near Langley, Va., the CDA ought to feel equally secure here.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, to further illustrate the confused reaction to this situation, particularly at the community level, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the April 8, 1955, edition of the Baltimore Sun.

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

CIVIL DEFENSE: STILL A MUDDLE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

The General Assembly had before it, in its recent session, two bills dealing with civil defense. One would have empowered the civil-defense authorities to purchase or otherwise "lawfully acquire" such supplies and properties as might be needed in the event of an acute emergency, which means an atomic attack. The second bill was much more modest. It would have blanketed into the industrial accident system the volunteer workers for civil defense. The cost might have been as much as \$20,000 a year. Anyway, both bills were turned down.

Maybe that is not important in itself. But it does show that, despite efforts at the Federal, State and even municipal level, civil defense has not yet come to be regarded as a matter of urgency. In this State, the organization has probably gone as far as in any. Some thousands of Marylanders devote time every week to spotting planes, manning emergency stations of all sorts, learning rescue and fire-fighting techniques and so on. Public services, utilities and similar corporate organizations have their own plans for the emergency; there are stockpiles of supplies, chiefly medical; everyone knows about the siren and other warning systems here in the city; large buildings have their approved shelters. In short, on the organizational level, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Sherley Ewing, State director, and Col. Frank Milani, who heads the Baltimore organization, much has been accomplished.

But interest lags, so far as most of us are concerned. Maybe the biggest factor is the feeling of hopelessness in the face of the terrific power of the bomb, a feeling greatly intensified by the recent stories of the subsequent dangers arising from "fall-out." But there has been confusion, too, at the highest levels. Told that cities must be evacuated in the event of attack, or even before it if possible, the local authorities duly marked "Civil Defense Highways." Were they to be used or avoided if attack came? That was never made clear. Then the word was given that if the population were to abandon the scene of attack, it should be on foot, so as to avoid highway congestion. The question of "on foot to where?" was never precisely answered. But still later we were told that evacuation was impossible and the thing to do was to prepare shelters in the house, stock them with food and water in advance and stay there until ordered out.

Confronted with such shifting and even impossible suggestions, is it any wonder most of us have done little or nothing? Is it any wonder that in Washington some Senators are now saying the whole Federal civil-defense system is useless and that the problem ought to be turned over to the military? Is it any wonder, indeed, that representative citizens, such as those who make up the General Assembly of Maryland, become bored with the whole subject and refuse to take action on even the simple proposals laid before them?

RESIGNATION OF FEDERAL JUDGE JOHN CLARK KNOX

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday, on the 37th anniversary of his appointment to the Federal bench, Judge John Clark Knox submitted to President Eisenhower his resignation as senior judge of the southern district of New York.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because Judge Knox began his long and honorable career in Greene County, Pa., where he was born.

Judge Knox was a member of a fine old pioneer family of western Pennsylvania. We in the Keystone State are proud of his distinguished attainments and his outstanding record of service to the Nation.

Judge Knox graduated from Waynesburg College, my alma mater, and attended the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania. He was admitted to the bar of Greene County, Pa., in 1906. As a young man he served as a justice of the peace, and from the very beginning he displayed the fine qualities and great ability which won for him the highest respect of the legal profession and his fellow citizens.

He was a careful and painstaking student of the law, kindly and considerate, with a keen desire to work for the best interest of all concerned.

He became an assistant United States attorney in New York in 1913. During the First World War, as a special assistant to the Attorney General, he successfully prosecuted many sabotage and espionage cases.

President Wilson appointed him to the Federal district court in 1918. During his career on the bench he presided over many trials of outstanding national importance, including that of Harry M. Daugherty, former Attorney General of the United States, and the cases growing out of the collapse of the Samuel Insull utility empire.

In these and many other cases, which attracted wide attention, he earned high praise for this ability, courage, and great understanding of the law.

Judge Knox is a man of deep learning and the highest integrity.

He has made a great contribution to the welfare of the United States.

DEVELOPMENT OF HELLS CANYON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just returned from hearings held last week in the Pacific Northwest by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the development of the finest undeveloped power site in North America, Hells Canyon on the Snake River, bordered by the States of Oregon and Idaho.

The issues involved in the full development of Hells Canyon as proposed by Senate bill 1333 are of crucial importance to the people of the Pacific Northwest.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an informative debate between the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and myself, sponsored by the North American Newspaper Alliance,

which was published in the Portland Oregonian April 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the debate and an article entitled "The Great Debate," written by Keith Hansen and published in the Portland Oregonian of April 3, 1955, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT DEBATE—HELLS CANYON HEARINGS NEAR

(By Keith Hansen)

Additional argument in the case of Hells Canyon Dam, a subject responsible for millions upon millions of written and spoken words in the past few years, is scheduled this week in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The new action is occasioned by a series of field hearings by the United States Senate Interior and Insular Committee scheduled in Boise, Idaho, Monday morning; Lewiston, Idaho, Monday afternoon; Pasco, Wash., Tuesday, and Portland, Wednesday.

The hearings will be the first on Senate bill 1333, which would authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River.

FPC RULE AWAITED

Idaho Power currently is awaiting a decision by a Federal Power Commission examiner on its application to build 3 dams in Hells Canyon. The examiner's decision is expected this month or next, and is expected to be favorable to the private utility, since the FPC's legal staff last November recommended licensing of the 3 dams. Any decision by the examiner, however, probably will be appealed to the Commission by one side or the other.

The issue of the Hells Canyon Dam is a critical one in present-day politics, because it represents a clear-cut battlefield for private power versus public power.

There is no "partnership" side road here. Private power and its friends want Idaho Power to build the 3 dams—at Hells Canyon, upstream at Ox Bow and further upstream at Brownlee.

BIG DAM PUSHED

Public power advocates, with strong Democratic Party backing, want Idaho Power Co.'s bid denied and are pushing for Federal construction of a single high dam at a site located very close to the site of Idaho Power's proposed Hells Canyon Dam.

The power company says it can build for \$133 million 3 dams which will generate about 780,000 kilowatts of firm power. Height of the dams—meaning the head of water from the pool behind the dams to the tailrace below—would be 117 feet at Ox Bow, 208 feet at Hells Canyon, and 277 feet at Brownlee.

The new Senate bill would authorize Federal construction of a single high dam at a cost of \$473 million, including \$357 million for the dam, \$68 million for power transmission facilities, and \$48 million for 2 smaller dams and powerhouses on the north fork of the Payette River in Idaho.

Such a Federal dam would be 602 feet high. By comparison, McNary Dam's head is 92 feet.

BILL FAILS TO WIN

Federal Hells Canyon legislation was introduced in both the 82d and 83d Congresses, but never was authorized. In 1950 the dam was included in a reclamation package which President Truman asked Congress to authorize. Congress, however, approved only the public works part of the package, after a floor debate was won by those who contended reclamation and public works projects should be considered separately.

Chief among the Senate's warriors for a Federal dam are the Senators from Oregon and Washington, MORSE, NEUBERGER, WARREN, MAGNUSON, and HENRY JACKSON. Senator HERMAN WELKER, of Idaho, is bluntly opposed, and Senator HENRY DWORSHAK ques-

tions whether the dam would be economic without taking needed Idaho irrigation waters. The Idaho Senators are Republicans.

United States Representatives of the three States are about equally divided.

While the Truman administration plumped for Federal construction of a Hells Canyon Dam and entered the Interior Department as an intervenor against Idaho Power Co., the Eisenhower administration took a different tack. Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay ordered the Interior Department withdrawn as intervenor. He is quoted as saying personally he hopes Idaho Power Co. gets its applications. He has stated categorically that he is taking no official stand but he doubts that Congress will appropriate money for the project.

ANDERSON TO PRESIDE

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and ex-Secretary of Agriculture, will preside at this week's hearings as chairman of the Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation.

He has said it is not the intent of the committee to take technical testimony, but rather to get grassroots opinions from individuals and organizations in the areas to be affected by Snake River dams.

THE HIGH DAM—OREGON SENATOR INVEIGHS AGAINST POWER MONOPOLY

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Hearings will be held in the Pacific Northwest this week by the Senate Interior Committee to decide the fate of one of the most valuable properties belonging to the American people. This property is a vast river canyon, a mile in depth—Hells Canyon of the Snake River, on the Oregon-Idaho border. It contains the finest hydroelectric power site in the United States. Along with 29 other Members of the Senate, I am sponsor of a bill to authorize development of the power resources of Hells Canyon with a high dam owned and operated by the Federal Government, a dam like Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

The national administration prefers that the great river gorge be turned over to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation, which favors 3 pygmy low-level dams instead of 1 lofty structure that will create a 93-mile long lake. Technical data developed at hearings before the Federal Power Commission shows the high dam will produce about 1,100,000 kilowatts of power, compared with only 680,000 kilowatts by the company dams, a difference of about 420,000 kilowatts in favor of the Government project.

FIVE QUESTIONS CRUCIAL

Five crucial questions are at stake in this controversy:

1. Will the power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries—the mightiest hydroelectric stream in North America—be tapped for the public or for a favored few?
 2. Will power sites in the Columbia Basin be used to full capacity or to merely a fragment of their possibilities?
 3. Will the 308 report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the master plan for Columbia Basin development, be followed or will it be abandoned?
 4. Will Columbia Basin kilowatts be available to farmers, manufacturers, and homeowners at low cost or at high monopolistic rates?
 5. Will the generation of hydroelectric power be accompanied by such additional multipurpose benefits as flood control, irrigation, downstream power firming and the protection of wildlife?
- The stakes at Hells Canyon are great. Because of its location in a remote, rock-walled chasm, Hells Canyon provides an unparalleled location for a water-storage reservoir. The huge lake formed by Hells Canyon Dam could store 4 million acre-feet of surplus

Snake River water. Aside from its value for flood control, storage of such a tremendous volume of water would have important economic effects in the Pacific Northwest because it could be released in winter months when normal river flow is down, thereby increasing the power production at all generators located between Hells Canyon and the sea.

The impact of this stored water has special significance at this time. On March 21, the Bonneville Power Administration ordered a drastic reduction in the power it supplies to 14 major aluminum and other industrial users in Oregon, Washington, and Montana. Reason for the order was that the flow of the Columbia was below normal and production from generators had declined accordingly.

FUTURE WELFARE AT STAKE

The stored water at Hells Canyon is its greatest potential asset. Its beneficial effects would be especially important during critical flow periods such as the present one, when the region's important industrial units are threatened by curtailment of operations, workers and their families faced with layoffs, and the entire region suffering the resulting economic loss because of the lack of stored water. The small Idaho power dams provide less than one-fourth the storage capacity of the proposed Federal dam.

Surrendering the Snake River to the partial development proposed by Idaho Power Co. would be especially unfair to future generations.

We live in an age when energy for industrial fuel is a dominant factor in social and economic growth. The Columbia River Basin contains about 42 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric energy. We have developed approximately one-sixth of the possible capacity. Here is a challenge to American ingenuity and farsightedness. Have we the wisdom to carry on the program that will realize the full possibilities of this resource?

Federal development of Hells Canyon is especially important to the people of Idaho, which has lagged behind the other Northwest States. One-eighth of America's hydroelectric power potential runs unharnessed in the canyons of the Snake and its Idaho tributaries. If the much-less-than-full-use proposed by Idaho Power Co. is accepted as the yardstick for the remaining sites, only a fraction of the potential will be utilized.

Cream skimming by the power company would be a barrier to the industrial future of Idaho, which has 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate deposits. With cheap power from Hells Canyon, this ore can be turned into fertilizer badly needed by American farmers.

PER CAPITA INCOME CITED

The high rate structure of Idaho's private utilities has dominated the State's economic life. It is noteworthy that, among the 11 Western States, Idaho ranks 10th in per capita income. Only New Mexico has a lower income figure.

Much of the present opposition to Hells Canyon revolves around the slogan "subsidized power." Interior Secretary Douglas McKay used this phrase in a radio broadcast a year and a half ago to describe Columbia River power projects. But he failed to add that of all the works financed by public funds, only Columbia River power facilities have the attractive feature of paying all costs of construction, all operation and maintenance costs, and interest to the Treasury at 2½ percent.

In fact, McKay's Bonneville Power Administration reports the Federal Columbia power system is \$65 million ahead of schedule in repaying the Federal investment.

The decision on Hells Canyon is one from which there is no turning back. Once established at Hells Canyon, the policy circumscribes our national attitude toward every rivulet that runs to the sea. Shall we

impose a doctrine of inadequacy or shall we look to the future, endorsing a physical structure which symbolizes the meaning of full and comprehensive conservation of natural resources?

THE LOW DAMS—IDAHOAN STRESSES NEED FOR WATER-STORAGE SITES

(By Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, Republican, of Idaho)

WASHINGTON.—Although the average American has heard of the biggest and deepest canyon in North America—Hells Canyon in Idaho—few understand the current controversy concerning the proposed high dam at the site and the views of those most concerned—Idahoans. Much misinformation concerning what a high dam at Hells Canyon would mean is abroad.

I have consistently supported maximum resource development in the Columbia River basin, with emphasis particularly upon upper watershed development. I do not believe the way to insure comprehensive development of the Columbia River basin is to contend that Hells Canyon is the only dam which will provide maximum results. We have available other dam sites such as Pleasant Valley, Mountain Sheep, Nez Perce, Bruces Eddy, and Penny Cliffs in the upper watersheds. Any of these dams would do as much as Hells Canyon, if not more, because these dams would not only impound Snake River water but have the additional advantage of storing water from the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers.

STATUTES INVOLVE RIGHTS

Idaho has four large watersheds—namely, Snake, Salmon, Clearwater, and Kootenai. Only Snake River water is used for irrigation. This means that any proposal to build a downstream high dam dependent entirely upon Snake River water will antagonize irrigation farmers throughout southern Idaho. It is well to reiterate that the menacing flood waters do not originate on the Snake, but on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. Therefore, it is apparent that if a multiple purpose dam is to be constructed to impound flood waters which subsequently can be used to firm downstream power generation, the dam should be built further downstream where the flood waters originate.

Both Federal and State statutes safeguard prior rights of the use of Snake River water for consumption purposes. This means that there will be constant expansion and more reclamation in the Snake River valley in Idaho. If a high Hells Canyon dam is built at a cost of almost \$500 million, it may be necessary at some future time to require the preferential discharge of water to operate the generating facilities at the dam site. Such action would result in a conflict with prior rights in the upper watershed.

Representatives of water districts and canal companies throughout southern Idaho have repeatedly gone on record as being opposed to any downstream development which would jeopardize these upstream prior rights.

1948 FLOOD IDEAS MISLEADING

Those who, by implication in talking of flood control, indicate that in 1948—when there was a loss of life in the Portland, Ore., area and a property loss involving many millions of dollars—that the Snake River and failure to build a high dam at Hells Canyon were largely responsible for that tragic flood, are misleading the public.

The record shows that most of the flood waters which had such devastating effect in the lower Columbia River basin did not originate in the Snake River. They originated in the Salmon River and in the Clearwater River. In fact, five-sixths of the flood waters which course down the Snake River originate in the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. For this reason, the argument that a high

dam must be built at Hells Canyon to avert in the future floods such as that which occurred in 1948 is a spurious one.

Summarizing various arguments against this proposed legislation which should be developed during the field hearings but which surely will be emphasized at the committee hearings in Washington later in this session:

1. The water resources of Idaho should not be disposed of by other States without regard to the wishes of the State of Idaho.

2. There has been no evidence adduced to demonstrate that the project is either economically feasible or desirable from an engineering viewpoint.

DAM SUPPORT QUESTIONED

3. The administration has not recommended this project and, in fact, the previous administration never did anything effective to institute the project during the preceding 20 years.

4. This project is so patently political that so-called public hearings at the "grass roots" are not even going to take into account any technical data, all of which will later be presented at regular hearings in the Capital.

5. The proponents of this legislation are seeking to demonstrate a show of strength by a great number of cosponsors, many of whom have little or no interest in the project.

6. Actually, the proposal is primarily designed to create a seductive campaign issue for 1956.

I believe a serious blunder will be made if the advocates of a comprehensive river development in the Northwest are misled into making an all-out fight for Hells Canyon merely because it has been propagandized as the symbol of public power. We must recognize that before any dams can be built in the upper regions of the Columbia River Basin, funds must be appropriated by Congress. These funds will not be forthcoming unless there is conclusive evidence that water will be available to operate the dam after it is built.

TURMOIL, DISSENSION DECRIED

I shall be glad to join forces with my colleagues from the Northwest in promoting maximum comprehensive resource development in the Columbia River Basin. If we want to build dams which are economically feasible, why do we not build them where they will be most effective, instead of creating turmoil and dissension among those who have as a common objective the maximum use of these natural resources?

For 20 years the Democrats controlled the executive department and with the exception of the 80th Congress also the legislative branch. They did not build Hells Canyon Dam during that period. Now they are obviously proposing this project as a symbol of the political aspects of public versus private power.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, under the order previously entered the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 4876, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had

been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in presenting the committee report on H. R. 4876, it gives me great pleasure to say that the subcommittee and the full committee were unanimous with respect to every detail of the bill. One reason why we had no difficulty in reaching agreement on the bill was that we did not undertake to increase any item provided in the House bill which we did not believe was necessary to be increased in the public interest. Of course, it is traditional that we have less differences of opinion in providing funds for the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department than for any other department, because all of us recognize the essential work of these two agencies of Government.

The total of the Treasury, Post Office, and Tax Court appropriation bill for 1956 is \$3,358,622,000 which is an increase of \$76,069,000 over the amount of \$3,282,553,000, allowed by the House. This is a reduction from the estimates of \$1,763,000 and \$12,789,300 over the 1955 appropriation.

The subcommittee added \$7,530,000 for the Treasury Department to the total of \$595,818,000 allowed by the House, making a total of \$603,348,000, an amount \$1,050,000 under the estimate.

The subcommittee added \$68,404,000 to the \$2,685,700,000 allowed by the House for the Post Office Department, making a total of \$2,754,104,000, an amount \$713,000 under the estimates.

The subcommittee also added \$135,000 for the Tax Court, which was contained in a budget estimate not considered by the House, bringing the total to \$1,170,000, the budget estimate.

The bill contains 9 amendments, 4 of which are for the Treasury Department. Two of these restore the position of Assistant Secretary, the first adding \$30,000 to the Office of the Secretary for the Assistant Secretary and 2 assistants, the second deleting Section 104, inserted by the House, which would not permit the continuation of the position of the third Assistant Secretary. The Assistant Secretary handles almost all the programs formerly handled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, including the synthetic rubber and tin programs in the Federal Facilities Corporation, the defense production loan program, and the liquidation of the RFC. There is still \$246 million in the RFC portfolio, and \$227 million outstanding in defense production loans and commitments. The Department testified that it would be seriously crippled if the office were abolished at this time, and the committee recommends its continuation because it believes the

emergency situation for which the office was created is not yet over, but has expressed in the committee report the hope that the position will be abolished at the earliest possible date.

The committee also recommends two amendments for the Internal Revenue Service. The first of these permits the Service to purchase the budgeted number of 200 new passenger automobiles, rather than the 150 provided by the House, of which 100 are for replacement. Testimony revealed that these new autos are needed to enable 175 new alcohol tax fraud agents, taken out of supervisory work in distilleries and assigned to criminal field work, to do their jobs effectively.

The other Internal Revenue Service amendment restores \$7,500,000 to the House allowance of \$278,500,000, making a total of \$286 million, the budget estimate. This will permit the hiring of the scheduled addition of 1,000 new revenue agents during the year. The Department states that the additional agents will add \$10 for every dollar spent the first year and \$20 for every dollar spent by the third year. The committee believes that an ultimate return of \$150 million for \$7,500,000 is sound economy and consonant with the attitude of all fair-minded taxpayers who are willing to pay their share of running the Government but who do not wish to pay the share of tax dodgers. Expansion of the force in the present year has yielded \$144 million in additional revenue in 7 months and similar results are expected of next year's expansion program.

For the Post Office Department, the committee has added language which will allow the Department to credit postal revenues from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent specific legislation has provided certain items to be carried through the mail free of charge or for amounts less than cost. The item was omitted by the House. It does not increase the total of the bill, as reflected in the 5 appropriation items. It will, however, affect the books of the Department to the extent of decreasing the deficit by \$10,362,000. The Department testified that it will aid in placing the Post Office on a businesslike basis.

The other three amendments for the Post Office Department restore to the budget estimates the appropriations recommended for Post Office "Operations," "Transportation," and "Facilities."

The House report indicates that reductions were made, in large measure, because it was believed that mail volume was overestimated for 1956. The Department, on the other hand, is afraid that their estimate may be too low. Here is the story in brief.

In fiscal 1954 mail volume was estimated at 53.7 billion pieces. The actual volume turned out to be 52.2 billion pieces. The Department took this decrease into consideration in preparing its 1956 estimates. The original 1955 estimate was 55.8 billion pieces. This was revised downward in June of 1954, because of the 1954 reduction, to 53.6 billion pieces. However, present estimates based on 8 months of 1955 operation indicate a possible increase to 55.6

billion pieces, or 6.7 percent over 1954. The Department had budgeted for a smaller increase—5.8 percent in transportation—which it reflected in expenditure estimates increases of only 2.1 percent.

The need for these funds affects the various accounts in a variety of ways.

In "Operations," the reduction of \$36,363,000 by the House from \$1,886,363,000 to \$1,850,000,000 is more than \$14 million under the 1955 appropriation, although mail volume is increasing. Unless the requested funds are made available, the Department states that extensions and expansions of service in city and rural deliveries cannot be accomplished.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the appropriation bill carry funds for the \$100 uniform allowance which was granted last year to the men in the Post Office Department?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It does. That is one of the items I shall mention in a moment. It is one which the House cut out. We believe it should be restored. The men were promised the uniform allowance, and we believe they should have it. It is contained in the bill as it is reported to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Virginia understand that the supplemental appropriation bill, on which the Senate has not yet acted, will carry a uniform allowance for the present fiscal year, ending June 30, 1955?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator understands that item is carried in the supplemental appropriation bill which is being marked up by the full Appropriations Committee this afternoon. The item in the bill now before the Senate is for the fiscal year commencing July 1 next.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, Congress will keep its commitment for both years. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Virginia are concerned, Congress will do it.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In "Transportation," the reduction of \$27,241,000 by the House from the estimate of \$675,241,000 to \$648 million, is \$14 million and \$15 million under the actual and estimated obligations for 1954 and 1955, respectively. Expansion of service to meet the demands of shifts in population and new and growing communities can only be made if adequate funds are available.

In "Facilities," the reduction of \$4,800,000 from the estimate of \$159,800,000 has been restored. The Department states that were this not allowed, the modernization of the Department would be seriously affected, and that in the face of increased mail volume it could only be met by a reduction in the capital expenditures for the light, color, and ventilation program and for new mechanized equipment.

Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate consider the committee amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 6, after the word "operators", to strike out "\$2,650,000" and insert "\$2,680,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Internal Revenue Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "two hundred"; and on page 4, line 4, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "\$278,500,000" and insert "\$286,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions—Treasury Department," on page 11, after line 23, to strike out:

Sec. 104. The number of Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury provided by section 234 of the Revised Statutes as amended is hereby reduced from three to two.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, generally speaking, the minority of the committee, including myself, are in accord with this bill, and I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the excellency of the job he has done. I should like to ask him what section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Section 104, because that contains the language of the House which abolished the position of special assistant to wind up the RFC.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 11, after line 23, to strike out section 104.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department," on page 12, after line 3, to insert:

PAYMENTS FOR SPECIAL SERVICES

For expenses incurred by the Post Office Department in transporting United States mail by foreign carriers at a Universal Postal Union rate in excess of the rate prescribed for United States carriers; and for an amount equivalent to (a) postage for matter sent in the mails free of postage, and (b) the difference between the regular rates of postage and the reduced rates for matter permitted to be sent at reduced rates, under authority of the following laws, to the extent they are not covered by section 1 of the act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), (1) subsection (a) (3) of section 5 of the act of June 23, 1874, as amended (39 U. S. C. 283 (a) (3)), relating to reduced rate of postage on newspapers or periodicals of certain non-profit organizations; (2) sections 5 and 6 of the act of March 3, 1877, as amended (39 U. S. C. 321), relative to certain matter sent free through the mails; (3) section 25 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 286), and subsection (b) of section 2 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (b)), relating to free-in-county mailing privileges; (4) the act of April 27, 1904, as amended (39 U. S. C. 331), relating to free postage and reduced postage rates on reading matter and other articles for the blind; (5) the act of March 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 1359), granting franking privileges to Edith Bolling Wilson; (6) the act of February 14, 1929 (39 U. S. C. 336), granting free mailing privi-

leges to the Diplomatic Corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union; (7) the act of June 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 1395), granting franking privileges to Grace G. Coolidge; (8) the act of April 15, 1937 (39 U. S. C. 293c), granting reduced rates to publications for use of the blind; (9) the act of June 29, 1940 (39 U. S. C. 321-1), granting free mailing privileges to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau; (10) section 212 of title II of the act of July 1, 1944 (42 U. S. C. 213), relating to free mailing privileges of certain officers of the Public Health Service; (11) the act of May 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 707), granting franking privileges to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt; (12) subsection (e) of section 204 of the act of July 3, 1948, as amended (39 U. S. C. 292a (e)), granting reduced fourth-class postage rates to libraries and other organizations or associations, and to films and related material for educational use; (13) the act of July 12, 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. app. 891 and 892), relating to free mailing privileges of members of the Armed Forces in certain areas; (14) the second and third provisos of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (a)), granting reduced second-class postage rates to certain organizations; and (15) the fifth proviso of section 3 of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 290a-1), granting reduced third-class postage rates to certain organizations; \$10,362,000, to be paid to postal revenues on the basis of billings by the Postmaster General at quarterly or other intervals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Current Authorizations Out of Postal Fund—Operations," on page 16, line 2, after the word "law", to strike out "\$1,850,000,000" and insert "\$1,886,363,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] who, as chairman of the subcommittee, has done such splendid service. I wish to commend him and the full Appropriations Committee for bringing in a report which restores some of the amounts cut from the bill in the other body.

Personally, I think the Post Office Department not only justified the restorations, but I think it would be most damaging to the postal service if they had been eliminated.

Mr. President, I think I should also pay tribute to the personnel of the Post Office Department. In the hearings there is a statement which I requested to have placed in the record. We hear much about the inefficiency of the operation of the Post Office Department. After all, the test of a business is the

efficiency of its management and employees. There has been a great increase in the efficiency of the Post Office Department in the matter of handling of mail by individuals; for instance, the number of pieces of mail handled per man in 1950 as compared with 1955. In 1950 the number of pieces handled was 215,443. In 1954 the number was 246,537. Each individual handled 31,094 more pieces, an increase of 14.43 percent.

I think it will be found that that is more than the average increase in efficiency in industry, which I think runs from 7 to 9 percent.

The same efficiency prevails in the collection and delivery service. It has increased 5.03 percent in a 5-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table found on page 18 of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Number of pieces of mail handled per man-year in 1950 and 1954

	1950	1954	Increase	
			Pieces	Percent
Mail handling and window service.....	215,443	246,537	31,094	14.43
Collection and delivery service.....	357,882	376,634	18,752	5.23
Total.....	573,325	623,171	49,846	8.69

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement commending the Postmaster General and those in charge of his department. Splendid progress has been made in the operation and efficiency of the Post Office Department, as attested by the shrinking deficits.

In 1954 the deficit was \$399,146,000, or approximately \$400 million.

The estimated deficit on June 30, 1955, will be \$313,400,000.

The estimated deficit for the fiscal year 1956 will be \$284,638,000.

I think that is a record that is outstanding in the Post Office Department, and the officers and employees are entitled to credit and commendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table appearing on page 46 of the hearings be made a part of the RECORD.

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

Postal Deficit, Workload, and Employment, 1954-56

SUMMARY

Item	1954 (unaudited)	Percent increase	1955 (estimate)	Percent increase	1956 (estimate)	Percent increase
Revenue.....	\$2,268,516,717	8.45	\$2,389,000,000	5.31	\$2,470,362,000	3.41
Obligations ¹	2,667,663,483	-3.16	2,702,460,000	1.30	2,755,000,000	1.94
Deficit.....	399,146,766	-39.80	313,460,000	-21.47	284,638,000	-9.20
Volume of mail (in thousands).....	52,220,053	2.50	53,630,000	2.70	55,240,000	3.00
Special services (in thousands).....	833,828	-2.87	801,205	-3.91	789,432	-1.47
Paid employment (man-years).....	507,809.7	-0.52	510,566.2	.54	513,007.0	.48
Productive employment (hours).....	937,463,555	-0.79	941,607,588	.44	944,815,915	.34

¹ Includes "Judgments, United States courts and court of claims, \$383,832 in 1954 and \$116,350 in 1955, also "Adjusted losses and contingencies" in 1954 of \$97,678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation," on page 16, line 22, after the word "mail", to strike out "\$648,000,000" and insert "\$675,241,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee explain the transportation cost figures? I note in the report the following statement:

The committee recommends that the full amount of the budget estimate of \$675,241,000 be appropriated for "Transportation" in the Post Office Department. This is an increase of \$27,241,000 over the amount allowed by the House. The Department indicated that these funds would be necessary in order to continue to improve transportation services, and thereby speed up delivery of mails, and to expand services essential to prompt mail delivery to new and extended communities.

I wonder if the Senator will explain whether that means particularly changing any of the forms of transportation of the mails, whether it means any fundamental change, and just what the increased cost will be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the subcommittee went quite fully into the requested restoration. We accepted the estimates of the Post Office officials that there would be an increase in volume. But the chairman of the subcommittee, to make assurance double sure, had the Budget Bureau send some of its top experts on this particular budget before our subcommittee so that we could get a competent appraisal or estimate. We accepted the figures—we could not challenge them—that in 1955 the volume of mail would be 2.7 percent over 1954, and in 1956 3 percent over 1955. Reports from the 300 largest post offices which handle 75 percent of the total mail indicate that in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year the mail volume has increased 6.7 percent over the first 8 months of the fiscal year 1954.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the committee was not too sure that we were providing sufficient funds, but, of course, we did not attempt to go beyond the budget estimate. As the name implies, transportation means the hauling of the mail, and this item covers every way in which mail is hauled, by railroad, by truck, by traveling post offices. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] might give us the official record in connection with the system which was inaugurated about 15 years ago, where mail is assorted in trucks which stop at the post office and deliver the mail.

I happen to know that much of the mail from New York which comes into my little hometown of Lexington, Va., which has very poor railroad connections, was brought in by truck a day earlier than it had been coming. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina can tell us the official name of the vehicles which are now being used.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Virginia refers to the highway post offices.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The highway post offices. In any event, the bill provides

some funds for the use of trucks on short hauls, where such movement is quicker and cheaper than by railroad. I would not be frank if I did not admit there are some funds provided in the bill for that purpose. However, no major change in the method of the transportation of mail is contemplated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what assurance has the Senator received that there will be no major change? Has the Post Office Department been notified to report any contemplated change to the full committee or the subcommittee? Just what is the Senator's assurance in that respect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The only assurance I can give is that of the \$675 million, an item of \$3,286,700—a relatively small part of the total—will go for improvements and expansion of services on star routes and highway post offices.

I find I had the name correct. The highway post offices are the big trucks which have traveling post offices installed in them for the purpose of sorting mail on short-haul truck routes.

This sum is also for increased contract transportation rates and for the increased cost of group life insurance. These items are all included in the amount of \$3 million-plus, which is a relatively small amount.

It is a natural deduction that if that is to be the amount to cover all these items, certainly it could not include funds for any major shift from railroads to trucks for the delivery of mail.

Mr. BRIDGES. Regardless of whether it be trucks, railroads, planes, or what-not, do I correctly understand that it is the statement or the contention of the Senator from Virginia that no changes will be involved in connection with the rest of the money; it merely concerns the item of \$3 million?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I regret that the witnesses were not pinpointed or tied down to a statement that if they could effect some economies, while facing a possible deficit of very close to \$500 million, depending upon how large a pay increase Congress finally agrees upon, they might not do so.

My general impression from the testimony of the witnesses, in connection with the small amount which is provided for short hauls by trucks, was that no major shift from railroads to trucks was contemplated. However, I cannot predict what will happen.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not opposed to any methods of economy by which money can be saved; but by reason of inquiries which have been made of me, as they have been made of other Senators, I should like to determine where we stand on this question and to ascertain, if changes are to be made, as they may very well be made in the interest of economy or efficiency, whether the full committee or the subcommittee will be duly advised, and will have sufficient notice of the proposed changes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As chairman of the subcommittee, I shall be glad to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the suggestion made by my distinguished colleague, so that if any major shift in the means of transportation is planned, the committee will have

an opportunity to consult with the Postmaster General about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator has put it correctly when he says the Postmaster General should consult with the committee about such a proposal. I did not mean to intimate that I was opposed to the Senator's suggestion; I merely desired to have the committee advised as the steps were taken.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That assurance can be given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Facilities," on page 17, line 12, after the word "service", to strike out "\$155,000,000" and insert "\$159,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—The Tax Court of the United States," on page 19, line 14, after the word "services," to strike out "\$1,035,000" and insert "\$1,170,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the bill, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for the fine cooperation I received, as chairman, from the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee.

I join with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] in saying publicly that the Committee on Appropriations could not have dealt with a finer group of persons than the representatives of the Treasury and the Post Office who came before our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish heartily to commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for the excellent work they have done on the bill which is now before the Senate. No other committee of the Senate has more difficult problems, requiring painstaking care, prudence, and thoroughness, than has the Committee on Appropriations.

A few minutes ago I was examining the chronological history of appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1955. I observed that last year the bill providing appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office was passed by the House on February 18, but was not acted upon by the Senate until May 13. I believe the first appropriation bill acted upon by the Senate last year was the Treasury-Post Office bill, which was passed on May 13, 1954. If I am not incorrect, today is April 13.

So the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], with the help of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, has brought to the Senate, as a result of thorough committee work, painstaking care, and the exercise of excellent judgment, a bill in which controversy has been cleared away and the Senate is prepared to act.

I am very proud of what has happened, although I am not surprised, because I served in another body for many years with the distinguished junior Senator

from Virginia, and I know how conscientious he is. He always does a good job on any work he undertakes.

I simply wished to pay tribute to him, to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and to other members of the subcommittee, for the promptness and thoroughness with which they have acted, and the concern they have shown for the public interest.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I acknowledge with grateful appreciation the very kind and commendatory words of the distinguished majority leader. Naturally, the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations feel some pride in the fact that the Senate is taking final action on a major appropriation bill at an unprecedentedly early date in a legislative session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I, too, am pleased that the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations, has reported this bill, which is about to be passed by the Senate. Likewise, I concur in what the able majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, has said.

However, I wish to point out also that last year all the appropriation bills were passed in record time. I hope the other subcommittees will so perform their duties that the able majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, forthright individual that he is, will be able to rise in the Senate, commend and congratulate the subcommittees, and send us on our way to our respective States upon the conclusion, at any early date, of this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I concur in the expression of hope by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Before the adjournment of the Senate last year, I paid public tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for the efficiency with which he had conducted the deliberations of what I have already said is probably the committee in the Senate confronting the most difficult problems. I am happy to say that, with its usual spirit of cooperation in whatever questions have arisen, the members of the committee have worked out the problems which have confronted them and have reported to the Senate a bill which has not provoked much controversy on the floor, where matters cannot be handled as efficiently as they can be in the committee room.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair

appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. DIRKSEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I notice the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is still present on the floor. I should like to clarify one matter in the appropriation bill, which has just passed, relating to the Post Office. Can the Senator from Virginia inform me as to how the allowance for postal employees of \$100 for carriers' uniforms is to be made? How is that amount of money to be conveyed to the postal employees? Who is to decide when the employees should get it? Is it an automatic proposition? Could it be delayed until the end of the year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it was explained to the subcommittee that the promise for a uniform allowance was made to carriers in certain cities. All the carriers are not to get the allowance.

Mr. AIKEN. Just the employees who normally wear uniforms would get the allowance. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is our understanding. It was not explained to the subcommittee whether the local postmaster would have anything to do with granting the allowance. It was just assumed that the allowance was going to be an automatic one to all those employees who were entitled to uniforms.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the employee specifically have to prove he wears a uniform, or will he automatically get the \$100 which will be made available for uniforms?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The employee will get the allowance automatically. He will not have to prove anything. As he accumulates a certain amount of seniority, he will be entitled to a uniform allowance.

Mr. AIKEN. At what time of the year does the Senator from Virginia understand the employee will get the uniform allowance?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe I can answer the question.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the answer should be made clear for the record, because questions are already being asked about the allowance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Last year Congress passed a bill which allowed every postal worker who was required to wear a uniform an allowance of \$100. That is what that item in the appropriation bill is for.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina understood as I did, that there was no specific detail as to when the postal employee would get the uniform allowance or who had the authority to determine the question. We merely provided for a uniform allowance of \$100 a year. Naturally, the paying of it would be an administrative function, and the allowance would be made to the employee as soon as the money became available.

Mr. AIKEN. Will discretion be left to each postmaster as to when the allowance will be made available to the post office employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that is an administrative function.

Mr. AIKEN. Was it intended by the committee that the \$100 should be made available to each post office employee who is required to wear a uniform?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It was so intended by the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I understand that the supplemental appropriation bill, which is yet to be reported to the Senate, will very likely carry a similar allowance for the current fiscal year?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator very much for the information. I think the Senate bill has been made as clear as it is possible to make it.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955, ON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event the Committee on Appropriations reports the second supplemental appropriation bill today, it will be in order to consider it in the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to say that the Committee on Appropriations is now meeting. It is hoped the supplemental appropriation bill will be reported this afternoon. If copies of the bill and the report are made available, it is our plan to consider the bill tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement. Then, before I move that the Senate take a recess, if any other Senators have any statements to make, I shall withhold making the motion for the taking of a recess.

Let me say that we had hoped to take up tomorrow the second supplemental appropriation bill. I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he does not believe the committee report can be drafted this evening, but that he does believe that the bill and report can be ready for action on Friday.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered, for the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill tomorrow, be rescinded.

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

INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 125, Senate bill 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 37) to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 37) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 878), is amended by deleting the following: "And provided further, That the increases provided herein shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1955."

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say there have been 4 or 5 minor bills reported by committees which I have cleared, not only through the staffs and the distinguished minority leader, but with the chairmen and the ranking members of the committees.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 121, a bill to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has an amendment to be offered, which would place a limitation on the authorization.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104-106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated each year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission of Fine Arts to carry out its functions under this act."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and substitute in lieu thereof this language:

SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding \$35,000 a year is hereby authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared in connection with the amendment I offered, as well as a communication from Mr. Wilson, secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, and three enclosures in the letter.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GREEN IN EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO S. 1413

When S. 1413 was called up on the Senate Calendar, March 28, 1955, Senator PURTELL questioned the lack of provision in the bill for a top limit on authorization for expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts. He suggested an amendment which would limit the authorization in S. 1413 to \$25,000. The amendment was not accepted at the time in the absence of advice from the Commission of Fine Arts as to the financial limit under which it could operate. The bill was thereafter passed over on objection of Senator MCCARTHY.

I have since communicated with Mr. L. R. Wilson, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, for supplemental information. I offer Mr. Wilson's reply, dated March 29, 1955, and its three enclosures, which together list the members and staff of the Commission, describe the Commission's activities, and indicate the desirability of amending the 1910 act establishing the Commission of Fine Arts so as to provide a limitation on expenditures not exceeding \$35,000 a year, rather than the present limitation of \$10,000.

There appears to have been a considerable increase in the duties of the Commission without any comparable increase in the money available for such items as members' travel expenses, salary increases for the Commission's three paid employees, and an additional urgently needed professional employee.

Section 2 of the act entitled "An Act Establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (36 Stat. 371, 40 U. S. C. 106), reads as follows: "To meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding \$10,000 a year is authorized."

I propose that section 2 of the act be changed to read "\$35,000" instead of "\$10,000." To that end, I now offer an amendment to the pending bill, S. 1413, as follows: Strike out lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 and substitute in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding \$35,000 a year is hereby authorized."

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, Washington, March 29, 1955.

HON. THEODORE F. GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In answer to your inquiry regarding Senate bill No. 1413, which amends section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., sections 104-106), it would be appreciated if the limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated each year could be increased from \$10,000 to at least \$35,000.

During the past 4 years an appropriation of \$21,200 has been provided and the estimate for the fiscal year 1956 is the same. This appropriation provides for only three regular positions, consisting of the secretary, a clerk-typist, and a clerk-stenographer; and approximately \$8,000 for travel expenses, communications, printing, and other expenses. The members of the Commission do not receive any salary but they are reimbursed for their travel expenses to attend the meetings of the Commission, of which approximately 10 are held each year.

Since the act was passed in 1910 there has been a considerable increase in the duties of the Commission caused by the Shipstead-Luce Act (Public Law 231, 71st Cong., approved May 16, 1930) and the Old Georgetown Act (Public Law 808, 81st Cong., approved September 22, 1950), but there has been no increase in the professional assistance in that time. There also have been several increases in salaries and other costs. At present the Secretary is unable to perform his duties adequately and also serve the Commission as he should, even with many hours of overtime. An additional professional employee is urgently needed to assist the Secretary in research and preparation of material for the Commission. This, together with the current proposed increase in salaries and possibly some other small adjustment will require approximately \$30,000, leaving only a small margin of \$5,000 for possible future expansions in workload. It was because of the difficulty of determining what changes may occur in the services required of the Commission during the immediate future that no limitation was placed in the proposed bill. It will be agreeable to the Commission, however, to place a limitation in the bill, but it is felt that it should be at least \$35,000 for the reasons stated above.

Your kind consideration and assistance in this matter is greatly appreciated. If we can be of any further assistance, we will be happy to have you call us.

Respectfully,

L. R. WILSON,
Secretary and Administrative Officer.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

MEMBERS

Hon. David E. Finley,¹ Chairman, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Felix W. de Weldon,² sculptor, Washington, D. C.
Hon. Wallace K. Harrison,² architect, New York, N. Y.
Hon. Emily L. Muir,² artist, Stonington, Maine.
Hon. Douglas W. Orr,² architect, New Haven, Conn.
Hon. Elbert Peets,² landscape architect, Washington, D. C.
Hon. William G. Perry, architect, Boston, Mass.

STAFF

Mr. Linton R. Wilson, Secretary, GS-12, and administrative officer, Washington, D. C.
Two assistants, GS-3 and GS-5.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1955.

Memorandum for: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Subject: Fiscal year 1957 estimates.

The Interior Department has requested us to begin to assemble data as soon as practicable to cover the estimate of appropriations that the Commission will require in fiscal year 1957.

During the 45 years of the Commission's existence 2 public laws and 4 Executive orders have broadened the scope of the duties of the Commission with no corresponding increase in funds and personnel to accomplish the work. As a result the small staff of the Secretary's office has been able to accomplish the necessary work at a very much reduced speed and at the sacrifice of some desirable services the Commission might render. The advent of a new Secretary last June highlighted the shortcomings of the existing administrative procedures and indicated the importance of initiating a modest expansion. A study of the situation has revealed that:

(a) The grades of the 4 civil-service positions now allotted to the Commission are

¹ Appointed June 4, 1951.

² Appointed February 18, 1955.

comparatively lower than the grades of corresponding responsibility in other agencies of the Government.

(b) The present funds allotted the Commission will not permit having an incumbent for the fourth position authorized.

(c) The Secretary is overburdened with too many time-consuming administrative functions that have to be accomplished in working hours, so that all work on reports, legislation, policy, or research must be relegated to off-duty hours.

(d) The capacities of the clerical staff are overtaxed and the traditional minutes of the Commission, for example, can only be produced with undesirable delay. It is difficult to keep an incumbent in the GS-3 clerk-typist job because of the low salary.

(e) The ability of the Commission to supply information is greatly handicapped by inability to maintain an adequate processing and filing system for fine arts material.

Congressional response to increasing agitation in the art world for a broader participation in the Government has swamped the Commission with an inordinate amount of research and reports on proposed legislation not only during the period when Congress is in session, but also during the recess period. The personal attention of the Secretary to this work is required and is very time-consuming at the expense of other duties.

The Commission has operated for so long on a very limited budget that any attempt to expand and increase the amount will probably be looked on with opposition in view of the Administration's desire to reduce spending. A reasonable increase in the Commission's expenditures would not push the overall budget figure above \$35,000 for fiscal year 1957.

The views of the members of the Commission are desired.

DAVID E. FINLEY,
Chairman.

Approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting on March 15, 1955.

OUTLINE OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

MARCH 29, 1955.

The Commission of Fine Arts was created by Public Law 181—61st Congress, approved May 17, 1910. During the 44 years of its existence it has steadily grown in importance as one of the advisory bodies of the Government. The Commission renders expert technical and professional advice to the Government in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, sculpture and painting, in connection with official fine arts projects. The scope of its activity covers not only the city of Washington but also extends to projects outside the District of Columbia, such as the World War I and World War II memorials and cemeteries, the designs for which come before the Commission by authority of Public Law 534—67th Congress as amended.

The functions of the Commission comprise the following: The Commission of Fine Arts advises generally upon questions of art when required to do so by the President, or by any committee of either House of Congress.

The Commission advises on all important plans for parks and all public buildings, constructed by executive departments of the District of Columbia, which in any essential way affect the appearance of the city of Washington.

The Commission carries out the provisions of the Shipstead-Luce Act—Public Law 231—71st Congress, approved May 16, 1930—an act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital.

The Commission also carries out the provisions of the Old Georgetown Act—Public Law 808—81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950—an act to regulate the height,

exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital.

The Commission of Fine Arts advises upon location and design of statues, fountains and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains, and monuments, erected under the authority of the United States and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same; also the Commission advises upon the merit of designs of medals, insignia, and coins produced by the executive departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 126, Senate bill 460.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 460) to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a similar bill was passed last year by the Senate. The present bill is the result of a request by the Treasury Department for legislation which would further improve safety on river steamers.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in summary of Senate bill 460 be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY SUMMARY OF SENATE BILL 460

S. 460, introduced at the request of the Treasury Department, is identical with S. 1763, as passed by the Senate in the 83d Congress, second session. The bill failed to receive consideration in the House.

It would require that any steam vessel navigating rivers only be provided with an approved life preserver for each and every person allowed to be carried on said vessel by the certificate of inspection, including the crew. Such life preservers, it would provide, must be kept in convenient and accessible places on such vessels, so as to be readily available for use in case of accident.

In order to prevent serious economic loss to operators during the changeover period, discretion is permitted the Coast Guard Department Commandant to allow the use of such proportion of approved floats to the total number of persons carried or authorized to be carried as he may determine.

The present statute governing such vessels has been interpreted for years as permitting carriage of either a life preserver or a life float for each person aboard, other than cabin passengers, for each of whom a life preserver was mandatory. According to

Coast Guard testimony presented at the 1954 Senate hearing, the modern life preserver offers far more assurance of security to passengers in emergencies than do floats, in that the life preserver is designed to hold the wearer in an upright position, with head and face out of water, while passengers would have to cling to the handholds on either side of the float, which might be most difficult in case of injury, or where small children are concerned.

No objection has been raised to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered to the bill, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 460) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4482. Every steam vessel navigating rivers only shall also be provided with an approved life preserver for each and every person allowed to be carried on said vessel by the certificate of inspection, including each member of the crew, which life preservers shall be kept in convenient and accessible places on such vessel in readiness for immediate use in case of accident. In lieu of an approved life preserver for each such person, the head of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating may permit the use of such proportion of approved floats to the total number of persons carried or authorized to be carried as he may determine."

LIMITATION OF DATE OF FILING CLAIMS FOR RETAINER PAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 132, Senate bill 800.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 800) to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay."

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill, for the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the committee from which the bill was reported, is not on the floor. He is attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations considering the supplemental appropriation bill. It is my understanding, however, that the bill merely extends to the marines the same privilege which is now available to members of the other armed services with regard to the limitation date, and equalizes the privileges for the members of all the armed services. The bill was reported unanimously from the committee.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. If the distinguished minority leader insists on an explanation, I can give him one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the explanation made by the majority leader is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 800) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), is hereby repealed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1137, Calendar No. 134, extending the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1137) to extend the authority for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question regarding this measure. I know of a particular case in which a Chilean boy wishes to join the United States Marine Corps. He speaks English perfectly. Does the bill provide that a foreigner of any origin will be able to join the Marine Corps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], is present, and can explain the bill. My understanding is that the bill simply would extend the present law. But the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts is more familiar with the bill than I am, and I shall be glad to have him explain it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, I would answer in the negative the question asked by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. The bill applies to the Army alone, and extends for 2 years the present law.

Under this measure, an alien cannot enlist in the Marine Corps, but can enlist only in the Army, after obtaining certain clearance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It happens that the young man to whom I have reference is a great grandson of Artemas Ward, of New England. The great grandson is, however, a Chilean, even though his direct ancestors are the New England Wards. He has applied to the State Department and to the Marine Corps, for permission to join the United States Marines. However, as I understand the explanation given by the Senator from Massachusetts, under the bill, that young man will not have an opportunity to join our Marine Corps. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed by one of the committee experts that such a case will not come under the pres-

ent law to which we are now referring, but that there is no objection to having such a person apply for enlistment in the Marine Corps, and enlisting in the Marine Corps if he can qualify, even though he is not a United States citizen. However, his case would not come under the law to which the pending bill applies.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1137) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of June 30, 1950 (ch. 443, 64 Stat. 316), as amended, is further amended by striking out the words "June 30, 1955," and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "June 30, 1957."

LOAN OF SMALL AIRCRAFT CARRIER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1139, calendar No. 135, extending the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1139) to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I desire to make a brief statement regarding the bill.

The act of August 5, 1953, authorized the loan to the Government of France of a small aircraft carrier. This loan was for a period defined in the act as follows:

Until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, as determined by the President, or 5 years after the date of this act, whichever is earlier.

Although no definite proclamation has been made relative to the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, it is quite apparent that, at least from a practical point of view, those hostilities are no longer in progress. As a result, the authority for the continued retention of this carrier by the French Government requires clarification. The bill proposes to provide such clarification by fixing a definite cutoff date of June 30, 1958. This action will permit the French to complete the building and commissioning of a carrier of their own, and to train the necessary antisubmarine crew.

The Committee on Armed Services received testimony in complete justification for the proposed legislation, the enactment of which is strongly desired by the Department of the Navy, and seems to be quite obviously in the interest of our own national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

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

The bill (S. 1139) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), is hereby amended by striking out the remainder of the sentence after the word "until" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958."

ACCUMULATION OF LEAVE ACCRUED BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHILE PRISONERS OF WAR IN KOREA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1600, Calendar No. 136, relating to leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war in Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1600) to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, in section 2, on page 2, line 17, after the words "Armed Forces," to strike out "who, on or before January 22, 1954," and insert "who," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That leave accumulated or accrued by a member of the Armed Forces of the United States while held as a prisoner of war by any hostile force with which the Armed Forces of the United States engaged in armed conflict at any time during the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending July 27, 1953, shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which he is permitted to accumulate or have to his credit. Cash settlements may be made for such accumulated or accrued leave without regard to the limitations imposed by subsection (b) of section 3 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, and irrespective of whether the person entitled to such settlement has been discharged or released to inactive duty or is on active duty. In the case of any person on active duty on the date of enactment of this act, such settlement shall be made on the basis of the basic pay and allowances applicable to him as of the date of enactment of this act. Leave taken by any member of the Armed Forces entitled to the benefits of this act shall not be charged to the leave accumulated or accrued while he was so held as a prisoner of war, unless he has no other accrued or accumulated leave which may be charged.

SEC. 2. The benefits of this act shall not accrue to any member of the Armed Forces who (1) was interned in a foreign country, (2) had an opportunity to be repatriated, and (3) did not accept repatriation.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect as of June 27, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1600) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the bill which has just been passed.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

During the 83d Congress, I joined with my colleague from Maine in introducing S. 3270. Our objective was to preserve leave credits earned by our service personnel while in a prisoner-of-war status subsequent to the outbreak of the hostilities in Korea. We felt very strongly that the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 was causing a hardship on these unfortunate members of our Armed Forces and that this hardship was entirely unintended.

S. 3270 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services almost a year ago and unanimously passed the Senate. In view of the fact that no action on the bill was taken in the House, my colleague from Maine and I reintroduced the bill with some technical improvements in the language. The new version of the bill—S. 1600—was considered by the Committee on Armed Services on March 31, 1955, and unanimously reported by the committee with a slight amendment.

In explaining the bill, I would point out that the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 overhauled and codified the procedures governing furloughs and leaves of absence for men and women in our military services.

Among other provisions is the limitation of 60 days that was fixed on the amount of leave which could be accrued by any one individual.

This provision while suitable and necessary as a matter of normal routine has operated to the clear disadvantage of men who were captured as prisoners of war during the Korean conflict.

These men obviously could not avail themselves of any leave credits which might accrue to them while in a prisoner-of-war status. As a consequence, they were required to forfeit all such credits in excess of 60 days.

It was most assuredly not the intent of the Armed Forces Leave Act to exact this added penalty from men who were already bearing the hardships of Communist prisoner camps. The bill seeks to remedy this unintended situation by specifically providing that leave accumulated or accrued by a prisoner of war in the hands of any hostile force with which we were engaged in armed conflict at any time during the period June 27, 1950—the beginning of the Korean hostilities—and ending July 27, 1953—the cease-fire date—shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which the individual is permitted to accumulate.

The bill makes it clear that the proposed benefits will not accrue to any person who, having been offered an opportunity for repatriation, had failed to accept such opportunity. As originally introduced, the latter provision of the bill was limited to persons who became prisoners of war on or before January 22, 1954 and had refused repatriation. January 22, 1954, being the end of Operation Big Switch, seemed to provide a definite date upon which to peg the operation of this limiting provision of the bill, but the

committee felt that the elimination of the specific date would obviate possible unforeseen administrative difficulties which might occur in the future.

A full hearing was held on the bill during the 83d Congress, and the bill was discussed in detail by the Armed Services Committee at its regular meeting on Thursday, March 31, 1955. The testimony indicates that the bill will affect approximately 3,500 persons and will cost not to exceed \$1 million.

I am hopeful that the Senate will see fit to give this bill the prompt approval which it received last year and which we feel is still strongly merited.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT AND CONSIDERATION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second supplemental appropriation bill, if reported by the Committee on Appropriations, be in order on Friday.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have authority to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may have neglected to announce it, but it is not planned to have a session of the Senate tomorrow. It is planned that the Senate shall adjourn until Friday.

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will yield, I wish to express my appreciation to Members on both sides of the aisle, and particularly to the able senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], for their indulgence while I have cleaned up the calendar. I am sorry I have had to ask the Senator from Missouri to postpone his remarks until that has been done. However, as usual, he has been most considerate and helpful.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his expression concerning what he characterizes as my consideration. Quite to the contrary, I think I should thank him again, as I have undertaken to do many times, for his unflinching and invariable consideration of the membership of this body.

I have indicated that I desired recognition at this time because I am in the midst of a hearing which I have been asked to conduct, and which is now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. For that reason I ask the indulgence of my colleagues, and suggest that, much as I should like to yield for insertions and other matters, time is pressing upon me, and I must return to the hearing.

Mr. President, I announce to the Senate that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules

and Administration yesterday began hearings on S. 636, a bill proposing a revision of the Federal election laws and the enactment of a new Federal election law regulating financial practices and reporting in connection with elections to Federal office. I should like to extend, once again, an invitation to all Members of the Senate to take part in these hearings, either by personally testifying or by submitting a statement concerning the bill.

The bill which the subcommittee is considering would, if enacted into law, affect the campaigns of all candidates for Federal office. All Members of the Senate who have had personal experience in campaigning can materially assist the subcommittee if they care to do so. Their assistance will be appreciated by all members of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, in order to assist the Senate in understanding the nature and purpose of these hearings, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD a copy of the opening statement which I, as chairman, made on behalf of the subcommittee. I also ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD several editorials and news stories dealing with the purpose of the hearings, as well as with the first day's proceedings.

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

OPENING STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, ON S. 636, THE FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1955, ON TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1955

Today the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration begins hearings on S. 636, the proposed "Federal Elections Act of 1955," which is intended to revise the Federal election laws to prevent corrupt practices in elections, and for other purposes. As chairman of the subcommittee and as the sponsor of this measure, I would like to make a brief statement explaining the background of the bill, its principal provisions, the objectives which the bill is intended to attain, and, in particular, the nature and purpose of these hearings. I might say parenthetically that I have some familiarity with these matters since I am now in my fifth year of service on this committee. I have participated in the most extensive investigations of election practices, including the contested elections in Maryland, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and others. Out of these hearings and investigations, I have had ample opportunity to see the pressing need for substantial revisions in our Federal election laws.

At the present time, financial matters in connection with elections to Federal office in the United States are regulated primarily by two laws—the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939, as amended. The bill which is the principal subject of these hearings, S. 636, expressly repeals the Corrupt Practices Act, and amends certain portions of the Hatch Act.

The legislative history of the existing laws reveals clearly that the Congress in enacting them, had two principal objectives in mind. First, the Congress intended to limit the amount of money which is spent in Federal election campaigns. Second, the Congress desired to make certain that the full facts

concerning campaign finances were made public so that the people might know the cost of election campaigns, and so that no attempt to "buy" an election could be successful. Neither of these objectives has been realized to any appreciable degree. We know that tremendous amounts of money are spent in election campaigns and these amounts are far in excess of what the law intends. Reporting and publicity are so hopelessly inadequate that we can do little more than guess at the actual moneys spent in any campaign. This is a lamentable state of affairs. And yet, such facts do not imply that there is any widespread violation of the provisions of the laws. Actually, these laws are so inadequate, so antiquated, and so riddled with loopholes that they invite evasion. Indeed, they are so unrealistic that they demand evasion, in many instances. The limits placed on campaign spending by these laws are so low that few candidates can campaign on what the law allows, in this day of widespread and costly television and radio communication. Any legal system which makes law evaders of honest men, which forces individuals willing to serve their country to resort to practices which are contrary at least to the spirit of the law, cannot and should not be tolerated in a country such as ours.

Present laws are defective in four major respects: (1) They do not apply to primary elections, caucuses, or conventions; (2) they do not apply to political committees other than those which are national in character, and thus are not applicable in the case of the vast majority of political committees which are active in national elections; (3) although presumably intended to be effective they contain no provisions to ensure enforcement; (the Justice Department in the past has said that they are virtually unenforceable); and (4) the limits which they impose on campaign contributions and expenditures are hopelessly unrealistic.

In view of these defects, it is not surprising that suggestions for the repeal or reform of these laws have been advanced regularly. S. 636 is the latest such proposal. It has been drafted after careful study, and after serious consideration of the many well-written congressional reports and scholarly articles recommending change. It is designed to correct all the defects which I have just mentioned, as well as all others which have come to my attention.

I might point out that when Congress enacted the Corrupt Practices Act in 1925, it specifically provided that the provisions of the act should not apply to primary elections, and conventions and caucuses. This was quite understandable since the law was drafted only a short time after the Supreme Court had ruled in the well-known Newberry case that congressional control over elections did not extend to such primaries and conventions. However, 16 years after the enactment of this law, the Supreme Court, with an understanding of the essential connection between nomination and election, reversed the Newberry decision and specifically affirmed, in *United States v. Classic*, that Congress did have authority to regulate primary elections. Nevertheless, in the 14 years which have elapsed since the *Classic* decision, Congress has not accepted the mandate given it by the Court. Primary elections are, therefore, still unregulated by law.

Thus, the proposed bill applies specifically to primary as well as final elections and to caucuses and political conventions. It applies to all political committees which support candidates for Federal office. It establishes a system of supervision and enforcement, and it raises the ceilings on political contributions and expenditures to levels which are realistic and adequate. In many other respects, S. 636 would revise the present methods of reporting and controlling the use of money in elections.

The bill which we are considering in these hearings does not propose any revolutionary change in campaign practices. It has the same two objectives which all such legislation encompasses. It is designed to make certain that the amounts of money which are spent in connection with campaigns for Federal office are not unduly excessive, and to assure adequate publicity for all such expenditures, as well as for the sources of campaign funds. It has thus been framed with a full realization of the fact that the use of money in elections can be dangerous if excessive or secret. It has also taken into consideration another equally important fact—that election campaigns do have many necessary and admirable results, in that they inform the American people on the vital and important issues of the day, and that they therefore increase the level of understanding of and participation in politics and the affairs of government. S. 636 is thus based on a realization of the fact that campaigns are expensive, and that satisfactory campaigns require the expenditure of large amounts of money. As long as such expenditures are in conformity with both the spirit and the letter of the law, and are used for the purposes which a campaign should really accomplish, they are advantageous and healthy. Therefore, the bill before the committee would raise the limits, so as to provide effective, but reasonable, controls and limits on such spending.

I have long been disturbed by a considerable weight of public opinion which holds that campaigns are suspect, and in some way unclean. A great many people seem to feel—and understandably so—that election campaigns are necessarily corrupt, and that little can be done about such conditions. For my own part, I cannot accept such a defeatist conclusion. I am exceedingly anxious to see the level of political morality raised, and to see the field of politics returned to the position of prestige and respect that it formerly occupied in our society. Better laws can do much to assist in such a return, I am certain.

These hearings are designed to explore fully the problems which arise in connection with campaigns for Federal office, as well as to examine thoroughly the possible means of controlling such problems through corrective legislation. And in view of the widespread attitude of suspicion and disillusionment, we must make certain that the law which we recommend to the Rules Committee and to the Senate is sound, reasonable and workable, and is really designed to bring about a positive and constructive revision in national election practices. Under no circumstances must we be content with a law which will continue to permit evasion, and which will thus further disillusion the American people.

We have extended invitations to testify to persons from many fields who can contribute to the successful accomplishment of the task which faces this committee. We have asked the leaders of the two major political parties to appear, and they have graciously accepted. We have extended an invitation to the Attorney General, and we hope that he will appear and give us the benefit of his views and his experience. We have requested the testimony of newspaper publishers, representatives of the radio and television industry, working journalists, lawyers, political scientists, and political leaders from all levels of political activity, local, State, and national. We have extended invitations to all Members of Congress, and in particular to the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives Republican and Democratic Campaign Committees. Any other interested persons and organizations are invited to communicate with the subcommittee if they wish to appear, and we will certainly give serious consideration to all such requests. We intend to develop fully all of the facts, so that

we may undertake the revision of the laws with a real chance of success.

S. 636 is the principal subject of these hearings, but we do not intend to limit these hearings only to the provisions of this bill. It is our intention, and our aim, to uncover all of the important facts which relate to the matter of campaigning, so that we can thoroughly understand the problems which candidates and political committees face, and so that we eventually can recommend to the Rules Committee and to the Senate a bill which will accomplish the objectives we all seek, and which will, at the same time, allow the parties and the candidates to carry on vigorous and complete campaigns.

We do not intend to draft a law which will further complicate the tasks which our parties face. We are not inclined to penalize the political calling. I feel that politics is one of the highest human endeavors, and I believe that we should assist the parties and candidates for elective Federal office in their efforts to inform the people on the state of this Nation, subject only to reasonable requirements which will prevent the abuses which have occurred in the past.

S. 636 is, in a way, a point of departure for these hearings. I hope that the witnesses who will appear before this committee will state frankly their opinions of the provisions of this bill. I am not wedded to any of the detailed specifications of the bill, but I am thoroughly committed to its objectives. I believe that the hearings will reveal the defects in the bill, where such exist, and will disclose alternatives which may be more satisfactory in solving the problems in the field which we are studying.

I believe that the matter which is before the committee, is, and should be, a bipartisan and a nonpartisan problem. I sincerely hope that no partisan loyalties will arise which will complicate the task of the committee. I realize full well that the problem which we are studying is one which can be utilized for partisan purposes, and I hope that this will not occur. The members of the subcommittee are united in their approach to the problem at hand, and I am sure that these hearings will proceed in a nonpartisan fashion.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 7, 1955]

HEARINGS WILL OPEN TUESDAY ON ELECTION LAW OVERHAUL

(By Robert C. Albright)

The first substantial move to overhaul the Federal election laws since adoption of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 and the Hatch Act of 1939 is getting under way at the Capitol.

A bill by Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, supported by all five Democratic members of the Senate Rules Committee, provides the basis for proposed reforms, ranging all the way from more realistic limits on campaign spending to tightened accountability for amounts contributed and spent.

The proposed modernized election law for the first time would cover primaries, conventions, and caucuses as well as already scrutinized Federal elections, and would attempt to lift supervision of elections out of the horse-and-buggy era.

HEARINGS OPEN TUESDAY

Public hearings on the proposed changes will open next Tuesday before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which HENNING is chairman. Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler and Republican National Chairman Leonard Hall will be the lead-off witnesses. A long list of political scientists, lawyers, business and labor leaders, and representatives of the newspaper, radio and television industries, also have been invited to testify.

HENNINGS and other interested legislators have proposed election law revisions in each of the past several Congresses but seldom has the Senate outlook been more favorable than now.

That is due partly to the fact that no national elections are on the immediate horizon and partly to a growing realization on both sides of the aisle that existing statutes are outmoded.

The Hennings bill, with certain modifications, is virtually assured in advance of a favorable committee report and a place on the Senate calendar. A majority of the Rules Committee has indorsed it in advance of the hearings.

THREE ARE COSPONSORS

Three Democratic members of the group are cosponsors of the bill with HENNINGS. They are Senate Rules Committee Chairman THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, and Senators CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, and ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee. The fifth Democratic member of the Rules group, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, sponsored similar legislation while a Member of the House. "I'm all for it," said MANSFIELD. "I believe it will be passed out of the committee and approved by the Senate, with Republicans coming along."

The lone Republican member of Henning's three-man subcommittee, Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, told the Washington Post and Times Herald he agrees with HENNINGS that present campaign spending limits are unrealistic, and should be modernized in line with modern costs and campaign media. But he said he would like to study further certain other provisions of the bill, notably the proposal to bring primaries within the scope of the act.

"Our election laws must, of course, prevent fraud and corruption," said CURTIS, "but they should not be so written as to prevent either candidates or political committees from taking their arguments openly to the public through the most appropriate media."

The third member of the subcommittee is Senator GORE.

Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, coauthor of the 1946 law modernizing congressional procedures, termed the Hennings bill a "marvelous approach to modernizing our election law." MONRONEY said the committee should be careful to harmonize Federal and State laws on the subject, however.

The proposed revision lifts the present \$3 million spending limit for national political committees to approximately \$12 million, using an elastic formula keyed to the voting turnout in the last previous election.

Following a similar expanding formula, House Members' limits would be from a maximum of \$5,000 to a top of \$25,000 under certain conditions. A Senators' ceiling would step up from the present peak of \$25,000 to as high as \$250,000.

But while granting more leeway on expenses, the bill would sharply tighten accountability by requiring detailed reports at specific intervals. These would be given direct legislative review under a stipulation that summaries of the reports be channeled to appropriate committees of each House.

Sponsors believe the revised reporting machinery would also insure greater publicity on amounts spent—a factor they believe will do more to assure compliance than penalties provided in the bill.

As a double check on the multiple committees that have sprung up in recent campaigns, the bill provides that a candidate must indorse in writing any political committee supporting his candidacy before it can accept contributions or make any expenditures in his behalf.

Like the periodic financial reports required, this authorization must be filed with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. Copies of all statements must also

be filed with the clerk of the United States District Court, in the district where a political committee maintains its principal office.

Penalties up to \$1,000 or 1 year in jail are provided for violation of the proposed act, with this stepping up to \$10,000 or 2 years if the violation was willful.

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1955]

IN THE NATION (By Arthur Krock)

IT CAN'T ALL BE BLAMED ON TELEVISION

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Next Tuesday Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri, will open hearings before his Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in an effort to get fuller disclosure of the amounts spent in the process of choosing the holders of elective Federal office. He calls the present accounting laws "unrealistic, inadequate and antediluvian." To these terms he could add "grossly deceptive," because only an indeterminate part of the money raised and spent is ever acknowledged to Congress.

Congressional Quarterly has just completed the task of compiling partial spending statistics of the 1954 Federal elections from the more than 1,000 reports the laws require. These show that on the record about \$13.7 million was spent to elect the 84th Congress. But there is no doubt that spending illegally concealed, and that which need be reported only to State authorities, amounted to many millions more. When it is noted that the cost of primary campaigns is not accounted for (in some parts of the country these are the conclusive contests) a fair speculation is that the \$13.7 million represents but part of the spending, perhaps the lesser portion.

The high cost of television, to which most candidates now resort, provides one of the reasons why the midterm spending reported to Congress in the 1950 Federal election was \$10.9 million as contrasted with \$13.7 million in 1954. But that is only a contributory clause of the excessive electoral splurges which Senator HENNINGS apparently hopes may be checked by the public shock of fuller revelation.

The compilation by Congressional Quarterly

The statistics compiled by Congressional Quarterly are the more startling because of the inadequacy of the reporting laws. So in considering the following figures it should be borne in mind that much more was spent in each instance:

In 1952 the electioneering costs reported were \$17.5 million in the presidential race, \$5.6 million in the contests for Congress.

Republican groups accounted for \$7,251,590, and Democrats for \$3,798,413, in the 1954 congressional elections. Democratic candidates were most of those assisted by the \$2,057,613 disbursed by 41 union labor committees, and primary contests are not included.

In 5 Senate races in 1954, \$50,000 was the minimum sum reported. The unsuccessful Republican in Rhode Island and 2 assisting committees spent \$105,255.59 to \$13,638.30 in Senator GREEN's behalf. Senator Guy Cordon, defeated by RICHARD L. NEUBERGER in Oregon, was the beneficiary of \$141,264.01 paid out by 30 committees and 4 individuals, and for NEUBERGER a spending of \$87,652.64 was reported. In Illinois the total was \$66,626.75; in New Jersey, \$64,151.99; in Michigan, \$58,523.97. And of these three States, only in New Jersey was more spent for the Republican than for the Democratic candidate.

Senators RUSSELL, of Georgia; ELLENDER, of Louisiana; EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and JOHNSON of Texas reported no expenditures in getting reelected. SPARKMAN, of Alabama; ERVIN, of North Carolina; SCOTT, of North Carolina; and McCLELLAN, of Arkansas reported spending, respectively, \$100, \$100,

\$50, and \$37.50. But ELLENDER, SPARKMAN, and McCLELLAN had to overcome strong primary opposition, the cost not required for accounting to Federal authorities.

Ohio Led New York

New York carried off the doubtful honor of housing the district—the Sixth, Queens—in which the second largest outlay in the Nation was recorded for the choice of a Representative. This amount was \$38,596.24, with the defeated Republican candidate the beneficial object of almost \$34,000 of it. First place was won by the spenders in the Ninth District of Ohio, who reported to Congress the total of \$42,639.42.

Of the 96 political committees which made the required reports to Congress, 27 listed contributions of \$1,000 or more from individuals. The Republican grist from 738 high contributors was \$1,434,084.30, the Democratic was \$418,900 from 244. But these totals are especially misleading because the Hatch Act limit of \$5,000 is merely on what may be given to 1 candidate or 1 committee by 1 individual.

Senator HENNINGS proposes several reforms. He would include primary costs; require Congressional accounting from all committees active in campaigns for Federal office (only those operating in 2 or more States are now covered by the law); and require written authority from a candidate for a committee to operate in his behalf. He wants to raise the widely disregarded spending limits imposed on candidates for Congress and the \$3 million limit now fixed for the official national political committees. Representative Boggs, of Louisiana, has advocated another set of increases to the same purpose.

Both would uncover the local political committees which currently need not report their spending to Congress. Hence, in HENNINGS' words, the Federal law merely lends "false respectability" to a social abuse.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1955]

CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO GET SCRUTINY—SENATE UNIT TO OPEN INQUIRY TUESDAY IN DRIVE TO PUT MORE HONESTY INTO REPORTS

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—The chairmen of the two major political parties were scheduled tonight to be the first witnesses in a new drive in Congress to force more honesty into official reports on what campaigns really cost.

Leonard W. Hall and Paul M. Butler, Republican and Democratic chairmen, respectively, were asked to appear next Tuesday.

An important objective of the new drive is to curb expenditures at least to the levels reported to Congress. Suspicion that actual contributions and expenditures habitually soar far beyond set limits sparked the reform effort. It has been tried before in Congress.

However, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Democrat, of Missouri, is eager to try again. He heads the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. He has scheduled hearings for Tuesday and for April 13, 19, 20, 26, and 27. He will call in political leaders, lawyers, political scientists, and others having contributions to make to the proposed changes.

LEGAL LOOPHOLES NOTED

Present law, Mr. HENNINGS and fellow reformers argue, seems to hold political contributions and expenditures only to limits stated in official reports to the Senate and House of Representatives. These reports come in by the hundreds and appear to stay within the legal boundaries.

But, it is asserted, they concern only the \$5,000 limit on an individual contribution to one candidate or committee and a top of \$3 million by everyone to each national committee.

Not included, it is held, are: Accountings of contributions made in primary election contests, though the primaries usually provide the final election results throughout the South.

Contributions made and expended by local committees fostering the future of a single candidate for Federal office, from President down to the lowest of Federal office seekers.

Contributions to campaign committees whose efforts do not cross State lines.

AIMS OF NEW LAW LISTED

The impending Senate hearings would seek support for a new law that would:

Require the reporting of primary election contributions and expenditures. This proposal appears to be prompted by reports that some southern Senators, after bitter and apparently expensive primary campaigns last year, were able to report to Congress that they spent not a penny to become reelected in November.

Require an official accounting to Congress of all contributions and expenditures made by all committees working locally or within State boundaries.

Demand written authority from a candidate for Federal office to any committee, local, statewide, or national, that raised and expended funds on his behalf.

Increase the present legal limits on contributions and expenditures to a point that might do away with the present cheating on statutory rules.

NEED OF REFORM CITED

Such reforms, Senator HENNINGS declared, might halt a false respectability that attends the present system. The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, he said, was "admittedly inadequate at the time it was framed."

"The years which have passed since the adoption of that law," he added, "have further demonstrated its lack of real meaning. Today, the situation is truly intolerable."

"It is our belief that the hearings will convincingly demonstrate the need for better laws."

"The American public is well aware of the fact that the present laws are meaningless. This is too apparent to be argued. The people are disillusioned with the entire matter of political campaigning."

"They have looked with suspicion on past attempts to revise the laws, because of a general attitude that regardless of what is done, unscrupulous politicians will find a way to evade the law. We must be certain that we . . . eventually report . . . a bill which really will reform campaign practices."

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1955]

**PARTIES SEEK RISE IN VOTE FUND CURB—
HALL, BUTLER TESTIFY LIMIT OF \$3 MILLION
A TICKET IS OUTMODED TODAY**

(By Allen Drury)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—The chairmen of the two major political parties agreed today that the ceiling on campaign spending should be raised.

Paul H. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said the limit should be lifted to at least \$6 million from the \$3 million authorized by present election statutes.

Leonard W. Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee, refused to specify an exact figure, but he denounced the present ceiling as outmoded and unrealistic in an age of television and airplane campaigning.

The two party leaders testified before a Senate Privileges and Elections Subcommittee that is considering a bill by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri.

In addition to allowing the two national committees approximately \$12 million apiece for spending in Presidential elections, the Hennings bill would extend Federal law to

primary elections for President, Senator, and Representative. Present law applies only to general elections.

COVERAGE WOULD BE WIDER

The Hennings bill also would place a limit on spending by all subsidiary committees supporting candidates for Federal office, and would require them to file statements of expenditures with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. At present only nationwide committees must do this.

Aside from a dig by Mr. Hall at the Democrats' Democratic Digest magazine, and a slap by Mr. Butler for what he called the Republicans' seeming to spend more money than the Democrats, today's hearing was filled with the nonpartisan cooperation requested by Senator HENNINGS.

The Senator set the mood in an opening statement in which he said present laws were "so inadequate, so antiquated, and so riddled with loopholes that they invite evasion."

"Indeed," he said, "they are so unrealistic that they demand evasion, in many instances."

The Senator said present laws were "hopelessly unrealistic" because they did not apply to the myriad of State and local committees that organize to support candidates for Federal office. He also said they did not cover primaries in which some candidates, particularly in the South, were assured of victory long before the general elections in the fall.

Also, he said, reporting of expenditures is so inadequate that "we can do little more than guess at the actual moneys spent in any campaign."

SMALL VOICES RESERVATIONS

Mr. Hall said he agreed with the objectives sought by Senator HENNINGS in his bill, but questioned whether making all committees register would not create more "violations of spirit" than under present law.

He said he thought the Republicans would probably spend increased amounts for television in the presidential campaign next year, but thought this would be balanced by expenditures reduced by a shortened campaign. The GOP will meet in San Francisco on August 20, 1956, to nominate its candidates.

Mr. Butler said he thought the spending ceiling should be "at least \$6 million a year, merely to take account of the growth of our country and the increased cost of reaching the voter, especially through the highly expensive medium of television."

He said the present unrealistic ceiling had subverted the original purpose of laws to control politics.

"The necessity of spending more than \$3 million to reach the voting public," he said, "has encouraged the formation of temporary committees which we all know have tended to diffuse and blur responsibility for the tone and content of a campaign away from the head of the ticket and the responsible leadership of the party."

The two chairmen differed over provisions of the Hennings bill requiring a presidential candidate to authorize expenditures by all committees, National, State, and local, supporting him.

Mr. Hall said it would be impossible for a candidate to keep track of all groups backing him, but Mr. Butler said the idea was meritorious.

A similar difference developed on requiring all the committees to file expenditures reports with Congress. Mr. Hall estimated this might mean "a million or more reports each election year," and create an impossible storage problem for the records. Mr. Butler said he didn't think any amount of "inconvenience" could offset the value of having the information available to the public.

He said he thought the law should apply to committees "at least down to the county level."

Mr. Hall's allusion to the Democratic Digest came in the form of a comment that the Republican National Committee had studied the election laws and had come to the conclusion that they prohibited the committee from sponsoring any publication for profit.

Mr. Butler countered that he thought Mr. Hall had left the implication that the Democratic National Committee had been guilty of "loose interpretation" of the law.

Actually, he explained, the Digest, a monthly magazine, is published by the "Democratic Digest Corp."

"It is just coincidence," he said with a smile, "that I happen to be president of the corporation."

He said the Digest had no direct connection with the national committee and did not accept advertising.

Mr. Butler said he hoped the Hennings bill would do something to correct the "financial imbalance" between the two parties. As an example of this, he cited figures for committees other than the two national committees in the 1952 presidential campaign. The figures were prepared by Congressional Quarterly and the New York Times.

The Quarterly showed 22 Democratic committees spending a total of \$5,018,215 and 42 Republican committees spending \$9,740,106. The Times estimates showed 22 Democratic committees spending \$6,847,725 and the 42 Republican committees spending \$18,769,848.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of
April 11, 1955]

**HORSE AND BUGGY LAWS UNDER STUDY—
CONGRESS STARTS TO DIG INTO CAMPAIGN COSTS**

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—A congressional committee is launching what promises to be a determined, documented, and opinion-rousing scrutiny of Federal laws governing political campaign spending.

By admission of almost everybody, these laws are straight from the "horse and buggy era." With the advent of costly television campaigns, with the thousand loopholes in the laws, there is, as ex-Senator Guy Gillette succinctly declares, "No control at all" on election spending.

Nobody really knows how astronomically high campaign expenditures rise in the elections for Senate, House and the President.

FIRST WITNESSES

So the Senate subcommittee on privileges and elections is holding hearings, beginning April 12, at which Democratic National Committee Chairman Paul Butler and Republican National Committee Chairman Leonard Hall will be the leadoff witnesses. An impressive roster of political scientists, lawyers, labor leaders, businessmen, and representatives of the newspaper, radio, and TV media will testify.

Able, energetic Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, of Missouri, who chairmans this subcommittee, terms present election laws—including major portions of the Hatch Act of 1939 and the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—"unrealistic, inadequate, and antediluvian." Senator HENNINGS has his own bill for overhauling the rules.

What is the matter with the election laws? Well, they set a limit of \$3 million on the campaign expenditures of any "political committee." And they declare that individuals may contribute no more than \$5,000 apiece. This means that the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee cannot list expenditures above \$3 million apiece in any election.

Obviously, when it is estimated that television costs in the 1952 election alone cost over \$5 million, the money had to come from somewhere else. The difference was covered by voluntary organizations—there is no limitation on the number of "committees." That is one of the "loopholes" in the law.

COMMITTEES GALORE

So there have been "Lawyers for Dewey" committees and "Red-Headed Men for Roosevelt" committees—each claiming the right to spend \$3 million.

Similar loopholes lift the lid on individual contributions. A rich contributor himself can send only \$5,000 to the national committee, but he can also send \$5,000 to each State committee, and his wife, son, brother, and great uncle can also contribute \$5,000 apiece.

Moreover, the laws do not attempt to cover primaries, which in some southern States are the determinative elections.

HIGHER LIMIT

Senator HENNING'S proposes a number of reforms. He would include primary costs in the totals. He would require congressional accounting from all committees active in campaigns for Federal office, not merely from those (as the law now reads) which operate in two or more States. He would require, before anybody could contribute to anybody's campaign, that the candidate give written authority for the contribution.

Most important, the present totally unrealistic spending limitation of \$3 million would be revised upward for national political committees—to approximately \$12 million, using an elastic formula keyed to the voting turnout in the last previous election.

By a similar formula, the amount a Congressman might spend would be upped from \$5,000 to \$25,000 under certain conditions, and a Senator's ceiling would rise from the present peak of \$25,000 to as high as \$250,000.

This is not the first time Congress has turned the spotlight on election spending. In 1952 a House committee headed by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana called witnesses and heard testimony. At that time Mr. Boggs was saying:

"The recent campaign added jet steps to the whistle stops and expensive TV rhetoric to the fireside chats. The enactors of laws which were passed in 1925 and 1939 could not possibly have foreseen these drastic changes in campaign techniques and the alarming costs of these techniques."

Mr. Boggs set the cost of the 1952 national campaign at somewhere between \$50 million and \$100 million. A 48-State survey undertaken by the New York Times found the 1952 expenditures to be at least \$32 million—this total gleaned from official reports and known contributions.

Yet, by comparison, the electioneering costs which were required to be reported under the election laws amounted to only \$17,500,000 for the presidential race and \$5,600,000 for the congressional contests, according to the Congressional Quarterly. The discrepancy is obviously vast.

The Hennings bill is virtually assured a favorable committee report. Whether spending reform will win out depends on the pressures generated. The Democrats, who see their richer Republican rivals going into future campaign armed with larger campaign funds than they are able to muster, have an obvious special incentive. But members of both parties agree present laws are obsolete.

The reformers want to equalize campaign expenditures, put the spotlight of publicity on splurges, and reduce spending sufficiently so that a man does not have to be wealthy, or even well connected with a labor union, to run for Congress.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 12, 1955]

EXPENSE OF CAMPAIGNS

Senator HENNING'S' attempt to tighten up the Federal election laws merits the most thoughtful support from his colleagues and the public. The existing laws are so unrealistic that they have become dead letters. For example, a candidate for the Senate is

permitted to spend from \$10,000 to \$25,000 to get himself elected. Some candidates for the House are limited to \$2,500. As Senator HENNING'S has pointed out, these are truly ridiculous provisions. In these days of television, radio, and air travel, any candidate who insists on getting his case before the people must violate the law.

The Hennings bill would allow a candidate for the Senate or for Representative-at-large to spend \$50,000 and other candidates for the House to spend \$12,500. These amounts could be increased, however, up to a sum equal to 10 cents per vote cast in the last election, with cutoffs at \$250,000 for senatorial candidates and \$25,000 for House candidates. The spending limitation on national committees would be lifted from \$3 million to approximately \$12 million under a formula allowing 20 cents per vote cast for all presidential candidates in any one of the last three previous elections. The real question is whether these limits are realistic for the years ahead.

Campaigns today without television are unthinkable, and television has proved to be very costly. Even in 1950 the Ohio senatorial campaign cost more than a million dollars. With increasing use of mass communications media, campaign expenses are certain to rise in the next decade, and Congress would certainly not want to say that candidates for the highest offices in the land should not use the most effective means of presenting their views.

Expensive campaigns have been generally deplored because of the danger that money would be used improperly to influence voters. Bribery and buying of votes will always be evils whether they come high or low. But the same cannot be said of expenditures to acquaint the people with the personalities, the views and the records of the candidates. Expenditures of this sort are an asset to representative government so long as the funds used do not place the elected officials under obligation to special interests.

While liberalizing cost ceilings, the Hennings bill would also tighten up reporting and accounting procedures so as to minimize the danger of special interest contributions and corrupt use of political funds. The bill would apply to primaries as well as final elections. Every political committee working for a candidate for Federal office would have to report receipts and expenditures. Even individuals spending more than \$100 for the benefit of a candidate would have to report their contributions. In an effort to compel a central accounting by the groups working for each candidate, committees would be forbidden to accept contributions or to spend for political purposes without authorization from the candidate.

It is by no means certain that these provisions would close all the loopholes in the present law or that all of them would pass the test of constitutionality. But the Hennings bill appears to be the best approach yet made to this very important problem. Certainly the hearings on it should be extensive and thorough. Congress should then pass a bill that will throw a maximum of light upon where political funds come from and where they go, while keeping the door open to adequate financing of means to keep the people informed on political issues.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. HENNING'S. Mr. President, with a heavy heart I rise in tribute to the memory of Joseph Pulitzer—the editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a distinguished leader of our press. To say farewell to Joseph Pulitzer—the man and the citizen—is a heavy and sorrowful task.

For long decades Joseph Pulitzer was an expression of our political conscience, a teacher of political morals, a fighter for progress and welfare.

The death of such a man is an event of many implications. It is a tragic national loss but it is also a reminder and a call for the continuation of his life's work—the fight for a responsible press and for honest, conscientious, unselfish public service.

Our cultural heritage rests on the idea of work and service. We all fulfill our allotted task in life. But there are only a few among us who feel that they are called and who are inspired by their calling. Joseph Pulitzer was one of these inspired. Unassuming and modest, he was a man of unreserved belief in his ideals and of untiring drive to see them live. His inspiration was the source of the serenity of his character. "The words of the wise are serene words" suggests an old saying. Joseph Pulitzer was an outstanding example of its truth.

In his life's work Joseph Pulitzer was the spiritual successor of his great father. They shared the same philosophy of life and the same views on the function of the press in our society. But the son was more than a follower of his father. He was in his own right and by his own work and his own courage, the executor of their common ideas. The greatness of his personal effort becomes clear if we consider the changes of our life since the turn of the century. Only a sovereign mastery of ideas could have permitted Joseph Pulitzer to steer his course without losing touch with reality and without becoming dogmatic.

Our Constitution abolished orthodoxy as a test of worthiness—culturally, politically, and economically. It protects our freedom of thought and belief. It gave birth to a democracy that is conceived as a unity in diversity.

As a legal document, as a charter of our institutions, the Constitution is equally important in all its provisions. But when we look at them from within, in their reciprocal relationships, we discover that the provisions of our Constitution possess different constitutional depth. Thus, in my view, the first amendment is not only an important element of the Bill of Rights, but, I would say, the soul of our Constitution, the spiritual rationale for its existence.

For us Americans the Constitution of the United States is not a passing document. It is the embodiment of our life and existence. Like any other embodiment it is inseparable from the things it embodies. Our adherence to its provisions is not a half-hearted acceptance. It is a belief—an unshakable belief—in its wisdom. Once it was a prophecy and our history has shown that it was a true prophecy. The Founding Fathers succeeded where men in other

countries failed. What is the reason for the greatest of our ancestors' work? I have often thought of this and I have come to the conclusion that it depends on the nature of our Constitution which happily united practical considerations with deep philosophical insights and matters of principle.

The sociologist and the legal scholar realize how closely it materialized the theoretical formulations of Montesquieu and the philosophy of its age. At the same time, the student of our past is impressed by its closeness to the events of political and social reality of American life.

The first amendment, with its all-embracing, unequivocal language is no exception. As an expression of the trust in the free spiritual activity of man, and of the belief in the great ideal that only free thought and free persuasion leads to progress and happiness, it reflected also American practices. We observe this when we study even our colonial past.

Here I have specifically in mind the activity of Benjamin Franklin and of his circle. In 1727, Franklin organized a club first called Leather Apron and later, officially, Junto. It united people interested in literature, science, ethics, politics, and religion. To become a member, one had to declare that he "loved mankind in general, of what profession or religion soever," and that no person should be "harmed in his body, name, or goods, for mere speculative opinions, or his external way of worship." The language of the first amendment is obviously nothing but a reformulation of these ideas and practices.

Also, let me quote some excerpts from Franklin's set of "Rules for the Club Established for Mutual Improvement." Here are some of the questions suggested for discussion:

Do you think of anything at present in which the Junto may be serviceable to mankind, to the country, to their friends, or to themselves?

Have you lately observed any defect in the laws of your country, of which it would be proper to move the legislature for an amendment? Or do you know of any law that is wanting?

Have you lately observed any encroachment on the just liberties of the people? Hath anybody attacked your reputation lately? And what can the Junto do toward securing it?

These questions, do they not, strike us as if they were formulated today? Are they not eternal and fundamental questions of our democracy? Is it not clear that to these questions the Founding Fathers tried to give an answer?

Our history has shown that out of such clubs as Franklin's Junto our democracy has actually developed. We also know that there was a direct road from the activities of Junto to Franklin's paper the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, and this, I think, was a logical development. The free press of our country is an equal necessity for the existence of our democracy as those institutions which were explicitly established by our Constitution.

A society of free thought lives by the dissemination of diversified information and free honest comment. Free spiritual activity and free government dies

when the exchange of information and comment stop. In our midst the press therefore acquires a singularly important position and it is the duty of every generation of Americans to see to it that the freedom of the press is protected and continues unabridged.

Under freedom of the press, I also understand its independence from interests that are extraneous to its primary purpose. Let me explain this.

The growth of the Nation's wealth tends to increase the size of business undertakings and newspaper business is no exception. In fact, the publishing of a metropolitan newspaper has become big business. We often hear, and we know it to be true, that economic considerations sometimes influence editorial policy and persuade some newspapers to yield too readily to the expedient of satisfying tastes and mores which sometimes are incompatible with integrity and the general welfare. It is often forgotten that regardless of the need of every business venture to be financially sound, where the business is peculiarly vested with a public trust as in the case of a newspaper, the primary function should not be sacrificed. It is the primary purpose of the press to report the significant news of the community and in this respect to act as its political conscience. It is the duty of the press to inform and to educate the people of our country, without prejudice or favor, interpreting the important facts of day-to-day life in the light of the total framework of our cultural heritage and possible future.

Our cultural heritage institutionalized in our Constitution presupposes the unique position in our society of a free press. It is not an exaggeration to say that the principles of our Constitution derive in great part from the position of the press which is a structural, and I think I can say, a constitutional part of our society. And the right to be free necessarily imposes on our press strict professional standards.

In this connection, I should like to mention one specific point that in no small degree affects the value of the press to our people. There are reports that in a number of instances publishers and editors try to impose their own opinions on the members of their staff. Insofar as that is true, this practice, in my view, violates the basic principle of free comment and, considering the consolidation of newspaper publishing in our time, is fraught with dangers of regimentation and restraint of spiritual "trade."

Joseph Pulitzer was aware of this danger, and the freedom of thought of his collaborators was as sacred to him as the freedom of the press itself.

The life of society is subject to constant change. There is always a tension between established ideas and new strivings which force their way into life. The soul of democracy is freedom. And democratic freedom presupposes and incorporates change. Every generation rejuvenates our Constitution, and our history is a sequence of new interpretations of its provisions. The possibility to do so is the proof of its depth and greatness. To grow within our demo-

cratic framework without impairing freedom is the paramount goal of a free people. Our people have a right to expect the press to adhere unalterably to these principles and to keep them constantly before us. These were the ideas that guided Joseph Pulitzer in his work as a newspaperman, and he brought us the much-needed proof that a gifted man of business can manage a financially successful paper without sacrificing its ideals.

The ideals of Joseph Pulitzer go back not only to his great father. We are aware that they were present at the dawn of our life as a nation. More than that, they ushered our people into freedom, statehood, and greatness.

In his personal characteristics, Joseph Pulitzer was particularly akin to Benjamin Franklin. They both knew how to intertwine ideals with things practical and possible, and when we contemplate the activity of Joseph Pulitzer we have the reassurance that up to now the spirit of our country was alive. I am convinced that so it will be in the future and that, through the conscious and conscientious activity of our own generation, the spirit of our democracy will continue to be as vigorous as in the past.

In conclusion I congratulate Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.—the third by that name—on his election to the editorship of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, a natural and proper successor to his distinguished predecessors.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks his signed editorial which appeared in the issue of April 4, 1955, under the title "The Tides of Time" in which he so fully covenants that the great tradition of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* will continue undiminished.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial tribute to Joseph Pulitzer from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* expressing the mutual respect and friendship of the publishers of these two great competing newspapers.

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

[From the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* of April 4, 1955]

THE TIDES OF TIME

A flame of integrity was extinguished at the death of my father, Joseph Pulitzer, but its light will always radiate to newspapermen of conscience everywhere.

Joseph Pulitzer was devoted to the journalistic commandments written in 1907 by my grandfather, the first Joseph Pulitzer, and carried daily as the platform of the *Post-Dispatch*. These words are a monument of granite which the tides of time will never efface.

Guided by the platform, my father exerted all the skill, conviction, imagination, force and courage with which he was unusually endowed to make the *Post-Dispatch* responsive to the needs of mankind. He never made a mean decision; on the contrary, his generosity of mind and heart made him a shining guardian of my grandfather's ideals.

Inspiration alone cannot move stones; so my father achieved his distinction by inspiration conveyed to loyal men and women. The *Post-Dispatch* is fortunate to be brought out day after day by people who are devoted to the ideals which gave this newspaper its

character, acclaimed in recent days from near and far.

Today the platform continues to proclaim its proud, timeless message. We of the Post-Dispatch shall abide by the standards we have inherited.

With all the moral strength, the intellectual strength, the professional strength at our command, we will continue to labor as public servants. Not only will we report the day's news but we will illuminate dark places, and, with a deep sense of responsibility, interpret these troubled times.

Opinion will be strong for what we believe to be right, and equally strong against what we construe to be wrong. We also know that laughter is a joy and we hope we will entertain.

For public service our reward will be what each of the men and women of this newspaper and the broadcasting stations will carry within himself. Each will know his voice has merged in a mighty chorus which will resound as heretofore in our city, our State, our Nation and the world.

That chorus, I am confident, will be recognized and I hope it will be found to have added more splendor to the noble profession of journalism.

JOSEPH PULITZER, JR.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

JOSEPH PULITZER

The sudden death of Joseph Pulitzer comes as a personal loss to the publisher of the Globe-Democrat and to those on this newspaper who enjoyed the acquaintance of the 70-year-old publisher of the Post-Dispatch. Only the night before he died, he was the guest of the Globe-Democrat at its traditional reception prior to the gridiron dinner of the Advertising Club of St. Louis. At that time he appeared to be in better health than usual.

Newspaper competition sometimes destroys friendships, in the relentless task of turning out a commodity which will please the public. There is such keen competition in the area of business between the Post-Dispatch and the Globe-Democrat, but the personal relationship between the latter's publisher and Mr. Pulitzer was never disturbed in the slightest. When only a few days ago Mr. Ray disposed of his holdings in the Globe-Democrat and turned over the ownership of the newspaper to another, he received many kind letters. One much cherished by him was from Mr. Pulitzer.

The name of Pulitzer is famous in the field of journalism. The first Joseph Pulitzer was the founder of the Post-Dispatch and of the New York World. Before he died in 1911 he had provided in his will that his sons should carry on, and in 1905 the second Joseph came to St. Louis to learn the business from the ground up. In February, 1912, he became the publisher and editor of the Post-Dispatch and was active in its direction until only a few hours before his death.

He was proud to be called a working newspaperman, who certainly knew his way around the business office but whose chief interest, as he said many times, was in the editorial page and the news. Liberal in his views, he transferred those sentiments to his own newspaper, which has long been identified with crusades and campaigns which Mr. Pulitzer believed were due the public.

Mr. Pulitzer was not a man known by large numbers of St. Louisans. He made few public appearances, due no doubt to the fact that he was approaching blindness, an affliction similar to that of his father. But although he needed a secretary to read to him, he insisted on detailed information on every topic of the day. His zest for living remained with him until he closed his desk at 6:30 on Wednesday night and went home, where he was stricken 2 hours later.

In his departure, St. Louis has lost one of its good citizens. He contributed much to

making it a better city. He will be missed. And as personal friend, his going is sincerely regretted by the publisher of the Globe-Democrat.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Missouri on his remarks concerning Joseph Pulitzer and the elder Pulitzer. As a youngster in the early 1900's my "Bible" was the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World, both being Pulitzer newspapers. I think everything the Senator from Missouri has said carries out the idea Pulitzer had in mind in connection with a free press.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if my distinguished colleague will yield for an observation, I not only wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico for his generous comment and his observation upon my attempt to characterize the late great Joseph Pulitzer, but I also wish to say that it is very reassuring, and, indeed, we of Missouri take pride in the acknowledgment of the Senator from New Mexico of the inspiration given him by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I think the life, the work, the attainments, and the stature of the great senior Senator from New Mexico certainly are an exemplification of many inspirations, and we are very glad indeed to know that a newspaper in the State of my birth had some part in making a contribution to the Senator's tolerance, his deep philosophy, and his understanding of the world in which we live.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the grandfather, the son, and the man who is now editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch contributed to and carried on the American way of life as we would have it. They had the philosophy of Jefferson, the activity of Jackson, and the kindness of Lincoln, and they wanted everyone in the United States to have those qualities.

Mr. President, I now desire to speak briefly on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

OUR RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this hemisphere begins at Hudson Bay and extends clear to Patagonia. South of the Mexican border there are 140 million people. They are people of dignity, who desire to get along with us. They are the ones on whom we shall have to depend in the future. We may talk about Europe and Asia. The people there have been fighting about real estate for 2,000 years. But where are we going to develop our resources unless it is south of the border?

The production and exportation of natural resources have hardly been touched. There are many minerals—gas, oil, copper—and much lumber and other products south of the Mexican border. Is it not to our interest, then, to try to do something with reference to developing those countries so that even we might receive some benefit?

Mr. President, I wish to give credit to the Vice President of the United States for his recent trip into the Central American countries, including Mexico,

Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, and several Caribbean Islands in the area. He did a tremendous job in the way of building good will.

I say this, Mr. President, as a hard-boiled Democrat. He did a fine job. To my way of thinking, I believe the Vice President actually carried the American spirit of good will to Latin America in the best manner and with the best of propriety. Personally, I was thrilled with the reception given the Vice President and his good partner in all the Central American and Caribbean countries. Knowing the cultural background of those who compose the population in those areas, I was not surprised at the reception they gave the Vice President. They are fine, courteous, decent people, and they receive one with open arms. They were only reaffirming what Spanish culture has been doing for thousands of years. By the Vice President's kind words, his mannerisms, and the way he would meet children or men of state, he disclosed something which should bring pride to those who believe in our free institutions and the benefits we expect from Government in matters affecting freedom of mind, freedom of conscience, and of politics. I think the Vice President and his good lady did a fine piece of work in hemispheric relations for the United States of America.

While I appreciate what he did, and without reservations on his public expressions, I still think Uncle Sam should go beyond that and actually prove to Latin America that he wants to be their friend, and that in bringing about good will for free people, we will respect the dignity of the smallest of Latin American countries; yes, even the potential future power of those same countries.

Niceties at embassies and in the halls of parliaments of Latin America are certainly proper, but how best can we prove to those good neighbor countries that we actually mean it? In my opinion there are many ways by which we can tell those good people that it is not economic selfishness on our part, but that we want to cooperate so that economically, politically, and spiritually all the countries to the south and north of us in this hemisphere shall be beneficiaries.

I hate to say this, but I say it advisedly. As you know, Mr. President, there are in Washington representatives of foreign governments from all over the world. I do not know of one that I would not trust. But of necessity, they are bound by diplomatic protocol in their every-day affairs of life. It so happens that I am of the same national, religious, and philosophical origin as the peoples who compose the populations of Latin America. I believe that I know their national reactions, their political reactions, yes, their religious reactions, to what is going on, and which of necessity, can be expressed in public by their diplomatic representatives.

The closest one of the Latin American countries to us is the Republic of Mexico. Mexico, in my opinion, can be the axis of all of our good-will efforts with Latin America. We are next-door neighbors, thanks to highway contacts from eastern Canada, central Canada and

western Canada to the boundary of Guatemala and Mexico. Thousands of American automobiles ride those highways yearly. American businessmen, American mechanics, and American schoolteachers can get into an automobile in Detroit or New England, go on American highways to the Mexican border. First they know the philosophy and the people of their own country. Then they get on a foreign highway that is just as good as the American one and has the same type of motels, the same gasoline, and all of the necessities that are required in our standards of living. They go into Mexico, anywhere in the Republic, and they find that those good people also have a culture. They have universities, museums, and fine musical centers. After they have been through Mexico and have found out these things, they return to their home States—New Jersey, Michigan, Mississippi, Arkansas—and preach the gospel of good will. Thus they do more for better understanding as between the two countries and its peoples than could be accomplished by a hundred years of political discussion by the diplomats and foreign services of either country.

I will pin my faith upon the American people, who do their visiting on good roads. They will know the United States, and they will know the foreign countries.

The same thing can be said as one travels over the old highways of the Spaniard from Mexico City to old Antigua or what was Santiago de Guatemala; in the memorable days of Alvarado and Bernal Dias del Castillo who went from Mexico into this area after following Cortez into Old Mexico. Yes, one will find the ruins of a civilization that Spain brought there in the 16th century. What is left are wonderful convents that were intended not only to lift the spiritual life of the local Indians, but also to help them on the material side. The traveler can proceed on to Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama.

How are we to do these things and carry out the idea of Vice President Nixon that it is our purpose to be good neighbors? One way is to finish the Inter-American Highway from the Mexican border to Panama City. I believe that I have a good conception of the American. I know he likes to travel. I think he wants to know how other people live; but he will not learn how the people of Central America live until the highway is finished to Panama City. American tourists would then go there by the thousands. They would buy, in general, things that are manufactured in the United States—the oil and grease for their automobiles, which possibly were manufactured in the United States, and many other articles. Naturally, the local folks would make money out of the tourist trade, but in turn they would use that same money to bring in American goods for sale to local folks and a mutually satisfactory relationship would result.

I want to give, briefly, some of the mileages—and I am sorry the majority leader is not in the Chamber at the moment. From Laredo in Texas to Mexico City, there are now 765 miles of

paved roads. From Mexico City to San Cristobal on the Guatemala border, there are 727 more miles of paved road, making a grand total of 1,492 miles from the American border to the Guatemalan border, all paved. In Guatemala there are 67 miles of paved roads, 242 miles of all-weather roads, and 25 miles of impassable roads. One could not get through them if he wanted to. This 25-mile stretch on the border of Mexico and Guatemala should be one of the "musts" in our efforts of cooperating in the construction of roads in Central America.

I am happy to note that the President, after speaking with the Vice President, has recommended that something be done about the condition. Congress also can do its share in the effort to cooperate in the construction of roads in Central America.

In El Salvador there are 174 miles of paved roads, and 21 miles of all-weather roads. In Nicaragua there are 132 miles of paved roads, and 106 miles of all-weather roads. In Costa Rica there are 60 miles of paved roads, and 206 miles of all-weather roads. East of Cartago and San Isidro to the Panama border there are 134 miles of impassable roads at the moment. From the Costa Rican border to the city of David there are 14 miles of impassable roads, but there are, between David and Panama City, 88 miles of paved roads and 214 miles of all-weather roads; and, of course, there are 14 miles of impassable roads between David and the Costa Rican border.

One must visualize the geography of the region. He must be in the country in order to understand what improved roads would mean to the United States and how they would affect our good neighbor policy. The automobiles which would travel this road would be built in Detroit, Cleveland, Dayton, and other cities of America.

David is the headquarters of the Province of Chiriqui in Panama. This is the richest province in the isthmus and could provide sufficient food and produce to feed Panama City if the province had an opportunity of getting the farm products into Panama City. What they need is a road.

How would such a road affect the security of the United States? Would we not like to have a road in case, for example, an enemy had a fleet of submarines operating in the Caribbean? Would it not be to our interest to have a road into Panama City, aside from the economic need for such a road?

Let us forget about good will for a moment. Let us think that we shall be taking care of our national defense interests. Would it be good for the United States national defense to have an all-paved road from the Mexican border to Panama City or not? The question answers itself. With modern weapons, including new types of submarines, what would we do in an emergency if there were submarines in the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean, as there were during the late war, and we did not have transportation facilities from the United States to Panama City? That question answers itself.

The help of the United States in finishing this highway would prove advanta-

geous, first, from a national and a hemispheric defense standpoint. It would prove advantageous from an economic standpoint, not only for ourselves but for all the countries through which the road would pass. It would prove advantageous from the standpoint of getting people acquainted with one another, and thereby bring about the neighborliness and the good will about which we love to brag but do so little. The Vice President was representing the United States on that trip, whether he meant to do so or not. He went with Presidential approval, and what he said and did was official in the eyes of the people whom he visited. I trust the President and the administration will back up every action. If the action which follows is effective, the Vice President will have made a great contribution. If it fails to come, he might as well have stayed home. I look forward to the result.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL BY MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make to the Senate. I have just been informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that a report on the supplemental appropriation bill can be filed by midnight tonight. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee be authorized to file a report up to midnight tonight.

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

CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the supplemental appropriation bill on tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I heartily approve of the expedition of this matter by the distinguished majority leader, I should like to have it understood that the bill will be considered on the assumption that the report will be available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the assumption, Mr. President. If the unanimous-consent request is granted, I shall then propose to ask that the previous order to meet on Friday next be rescinded, and that the Senate meet tomorrow, Thursday.

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

MODIFICATION OF ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the order previously entered, that when the Senate concluded its business today it stand in adjournment until Friday next, be modified to read that the Senate will stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there be no further business to be transacted, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, April 14, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the state of Viet-Nam.

UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960, vice Nelson Lee Smith, term expiring June 22, 1955.

COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Robert E. McLaughlin, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Renah F. Camaller, term expiring May 26, 1955.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George E. C. Hayes, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1955, vice Robert E. McLaughlin, resigning.

George E. C. Hayes, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, expiring June 30, 1958. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Benjamin M. Tashiro, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, for the term of 4 years, vice Philip L. Rice, elevated.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard Newton Abrahams

Kenneth Donald Albritton

Gordon George Allen

Donald David Anderson

Joseph Nicholas Andrassy

William John Bickford

Charles Anthony Biondo

Carmen Joseph Blondin

Alan Dorr Breed

Richard Lee Brown

Theodore Gregg Brown, Jr.

Edward Hegeler Carus, Jr.

Arthur Ernest Champagne, Jr.

Daniel Buell Charter, Jr.

Joseph Leo Coburn, Jr.

Robert Lee Cook

Donald Clair Cunningham

Leon Thomas Dankiewicz

Stephen John Dasovich

Kenneth Roy Depperman

John Joseph Dirschel, Jr.

John Martindale Duke, Jr.

James Joseph Dunlop

Gary Benbow Erekson

Ralph Walston Eustis

Joseph Francis Fallon

Charles William Fead

James Edward Ferguson

David Brockman Flanagan

Francis Duane Forbes

Kenneth Wahlin Forslund

Carlos Anthony Garcia

Ronald Nicholas Gaspard

Arthur Edwin Gerken

Charles Bertram Glass

Donald Leroy Gordon

David Loranee Green

Henry Haugen

Frederick Ferdinand Herzberg, Jr.

Bobby Flynn Hollingsworth

Robert Louis Johanson

John Bennett Jones-Bateman, Jr.

Leo Jordan

Martin Jay Kaiser

Robert Allan Knight

Herbert Herman Henry Kothe

Ira Leslie Krams

Alban Landry

Robert Earl Larson

Thomas Stanyer Latham

Charles Leddy

Edward Francis Lewis

Irvin Wayne Lindemuth

Thomas Channing Lutton

Charles Franklin McFadden

Thomas Joseph McKey III

Charles Anthony Millradt

Edward William Murphy

Richard Nielsen, Jr.

Daniel Carl Olson, Jr.

Robert Henry Overton III

Richard Rounseville

John William Sheedy

Ralph Elmer Slater

William Neil Spence

Edmund Joseph Spillane, Jr.

Henry Suski

Joel Richard Swanson

Ira Edward Thompson

Howard Benton Thorsen

Howard Michael Vellette

George Edward Walton

Robert Ireton Welsh, Jr.

Norman Randolph West

Jimmie Dale Woods

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

X Abbott, Richard S., O66648.
 X Absher, Richard L., O66649.
 X Ackerson, Robert L., O66297.
 X Adams, Adran DeT., O66651.
 X Adams, Floyd C., Jr., O66652.
 X Agnew, James B., O66653.
 X Ahearn, David C., O66374.
 X Aker, John R., O66265.
 X Alderman, Craig, Jr., O66347.
 X Allen, Frank A., 3d, O66656.
 X Allen, James L., O66654.
 X Allen, Loma O., Jr., O66655.
 X Allen, Terry de La M., O66606.
 X Amundson, Donald M., O71435.
 X Anderson, James L., O66656.
 X Anderson, Norman R., O66657.
 X Anderson, Olaf C., Jr., O66658.
 X Anderson, Robert W., O66659.
 X Anderson, Ronald W., O68805.
 X Anderson, Thomas E., O66660.
 X Anderson, Thomas E., O66661.
 X Angel, Jack F., O68806.
 X Anson, Richard W., O66662.
 X Applegate, Walter V., O66663.
 X Arkley, Robert J., O66665.
 X Armstrong, James E., O66521.
 X Arnold, Harvey L., Jr., O66214.
 Aron, Fred W., Jr., O66667.
 X Asensio, Manuel J., Jr., O66574.
 X Ashkenaze, Bernard M., O66570.
 X Ashton, Thomas W., O66402.
 X Atkinson, Dean M., O66668.
 X Atkinson, Frank W., Jr., O66669.
 X Atkinson, Norman F., O66670.
 X Atkinson, Robert V., O66671.
 X Auld, Stuart D., O66672.
 X Austermann, William D., O66673.
 Ayers, Thomas D., O66329.
 X Baccl, John J., O66674.
 X Badger, Robert L., O66675.
 X Badgley, John H., O66676.
 X Baer, Martin D., O66677.
 X Bahr, Bobby J., O66678.
 X Bailey, Vincent P., O66452.
 X Baird, Harry H., Jr., O66562.
 X Bal, Roscius I. D., O68807.
 Ball, Ray E., O66680.
 X Bardis, Michael J., O66681.
 X Barkley, George F., O66516.
 X Barrell, Edgar A., 3d, O66683.
 X Barrick, Richard O., O66684.
 X Bart, John F., O66529.
 X Bartel, George B., O66397.
 X Bartlett, Fred O., Jr., O66686.
 X Barton, Harold B., O66687.
 X Baughman, Larry J., O71442.
 X Beardsley, Stephen G., Jr., O66688.
 X Beasley, Horace B., O66689.
 X Beasley, James M., O66485.
 X Beasley, Lewis E., O66377.
 X Beaulieu, Richard E., O67985.
 X Becker, Ronald E., O66691.
 X Beckett, Eugene F., O66692.
 X Beelman, Dale C., O66694.
 X Beiser, George R., O66217.
 X Bell, James D., O67986.
 X Bell, Kermit W., O66587.
 X Belt, Charles M., O67987.
 X Benedict, Frank C., O66419.
 X Bennett, Arthur M., Jr., O67988.
 X Bergeson, Raymond O., O66494.
 X Bergman, Edward, Jr., O66699.
 X Berke, Henry H., Jr., O66700.
 X Berrier, Jerry A., O66701.
 X Berry, Billy E., O66702.
 X Bethea, John D., O66375.
 X Betts, George A., O66703.
 X Biddle, Albert G. W., Jr., O66561.
 X Bieber, Werner F., O66704.
 X Billman, Ervin L., O66705.

- × Blakely, William R., Jr., O67891.
 × Bland, Ivan C., O66706.
 × Bliss, Hugo S., O66708.
 × Block, Ted S., O66709.
 × Bochniak, Thomas R., O66710.
 × Bond, David C., O66410.
 × Bond, Gene T., O67896.
 × Bookman, Edmund B., Jr., O66711.
 × Boos, Michael A., O66573.
 × Bouffard, Robert L., O66714.
 × Bovard, John O., O66385.
 Bowen, John W., O66715.
 × Bowers, Richard K., O66717.
 × Boyer, Frank A., O66442.
 Boyland, William G., Jr., O66719.
 × Boyles, William B., O66491.
 × Bracy, Alfred McR., O66508.
 Bradford, Charles R., O66721.
 × Bradley, Don McL., O66365.
 × Brake, John W., O66722.
 Branch, Ben E., O66723.
 × Brant, Charles E., O66724.
 × Bremer, James H., O66518.
 × Brennan, William F., O66725.
 × Brest, Clarence A., Jr., O67792.
 × Brewer, John F., Jr., O66259.
 × Brewington, Charlie W., O66727.
 × Brewster, Vann A., O66572.
 × Bridges, Bennie R., O66729.
 × Bridgman, Earl N., Jr., O67793.
 × Bridwell, Arthur W., Jr., O66730.
 × Briggs, Philip D., O66731.
 × Brisman, Jerome L., O66519.
 × Britten, Gerald H., O68328.
 × Broadbent, Carl DeL., O66366.
 × Broadhurst, Hugh H., Jr., O66466.
 × Brock, Oliver D., O66732.
 × Brodigan, Peter A., O66733.
 × Brodin, Thomas T., O66530.
 × Brooks, Howard J., O66734.
 × Broome, George C., Jr., O67794.
 × Brown, Bernard F., O66735.
 × Brown, Brisbane H., Jr., O66737.
 × Brown, Bruce L., O66738.
 × Brown, Edward A., O66292.
 × Brown, Horace W., O66559.
 × Brown, Paul J., O66307.
 × Brown, Sam P., O66739.
 × Brown, William W., O66740.
 × Bryan, Lawrence E., O67795.
 Bryan, Louis C., Jr., O66524.
 × Bryant, Arthur R., Jr., O66742.
 × Buck, Horatio S., Jr., O69872.
 × Buck, Kent L., O68329.
 × Buckley, Blair, Jr., O66421.
 × Bullock, Richard S., O66242.
 × Burke, Martin J., O66745.
 × Burke, Robert J., O67993.
 × Burke, Robert L., O66597.
 × Burkhalter, Thomas H., O66746.
 × Burkhardt, Alfred E. S., O66541.
 × Burkheimer, Jack W., O66436.
 × Burnett, George H., Jr., O67901.
 × Burnett, George W., O66747.
 × Burns, Gilbert L., O66309.
 × Butler, Albert C., O66749.
 × Butler, Chestine H., O66750.
 × Butler, Everett A., Jr., O66751.
 × Butler, John D., O66229.
 × Byron, Joseph P., O66752.
 × Cade, Alfred J., O66753.
 × Cain, James W., O66594.
 × Calahan, James E., O66754.
 × Campbell, James E., Jr., O66517.
 × Campbell, James P., O66755.
 × Campbell, Paul G., O66756.
 × Cannon, John L., O66239.
 × Carley, George A., O66759.
 Carlin, Robert S., O67902.
 × Carlson, John E., O66256.
 × Carmichael, Robert B., O66760.
 × Carnie, Sidney K., O66761.
 × Carpenter, Gordon D., O66353.
 × Carroll, Kelso A., Jr., O66596.
 × Carter, John B., O67994.
 × Carter, Robert H., O66764.
 Carter, Ulysses B., O66765.
 × Carter, William D., O66766.
 × Cartland, Harry E., O67998.
 × Casey, John P., Jr., O70079.
 × Catterson, James M., Jr., O67798.
 × Catts, Elmer P., Jr., O66768.
 × Caughron, Walter E., Jr., O71457.
 Cerrri, Theodore A., O66770.
 Chamberlain, William C., O70173.
 Chaney, Donald G., O66771.
 × Chasteen, Paul C., O66773.
 Chatman, David L., O66774.
 × Chavez, Joseph D., O71460.
 × Cheaney, Frank H., Jr., O66775.
 × Child, Paul W., Jr., O66303.
 × Chung, Donald Y. B., O66778.
 × Ciccolo, William N., O66779.
 × Claggett, William, O67906.
 × Clardy, Lawrence L., Jr., O68181.
 × Clark, Chapin DeW., O66780.
 × Clark, James M., Jr., O66781.
 × Clark, Joseph H., O66782.
 × Clawson, James W., O67799.
 × Claybrook, John H., O66593.
 × Clement, Joseph T., 2d O66579.
 × Clendenin, Paul E., O66784.
 × Cline, Ralph M., Jr., O66373.
 × Clyne, Norman G., Jr., O66785.
 × Coffman, King J., O66295.
 × Cole, Thomas F., O66249.
 × Coleman, Philip D., O66482.
 × Coleman, Richard C., O66484.
 × Collier, Thomas W., O66225.
 × Collins, Robert O., O66786.
 Colombo, James L., O66787.
 × Compton, James McV., O68336.
 × Comstock, Keith L., O66488.
 × Condina, Ernest F., O66496.
 × Condit, Richard B., O66788.
 × Conner, Coffee R., O66790.
 × Conner, Donald H., O66791.
 × Conner, MacPherson, O66549.
 × Cook, Robert S., O66793.
 Cooke, Herbert J., O67803.
 × Cooke, John W., Jr., O66540.
 × Copthorne, William A., Jr., O66539.
 × Corbridge, Leith J., Jr., O66526.
 × Cordell, Glenn A., O68391.
 × Costin, Richard W., O66795.
 × Cotten, Francis W., O67806.
 × Cottey, Robert J., O66379.
 × Courant, Thomas E., O66236.
 × Covington, Edward B., 3d, O66796.
 × Cowan, Joseph C., Jr., O66798.
 × Cox, Cloyd W., Jr., O66799.
 × Cox, Rodney E., O66800.
 × Craig, Malcolm B., Jr., O66316.
 × Crair, Morton L., O66801.
 × Crannell, William G., O66802.
 × Crawford, Elder T., Jr., O67997.
 × Cross, John S., O70134.
 × Crow, James E., O66331.
 × Crowell, Chester D., Jr., O66805.
 × Croxford, Ernest R., O66806.
 × Cuevas, Ramon N., Jr., O66807.
 × Culbertson, Sam R., O66808.
 × Cully, Frederick R., O66809.
 × Custis, Arthur B., Jr., O66551.
 × Cutter, William S., O66811.
 × Dadmun, Edward T., O66813.
 × Dalston, Jephtha W., O66814.
 × Daly, John B., O66815.
 × Danford, Howard H., O66438.
 × Daniell, Sidney C., O66817.
 × Danielson, John N., O66818.
 × Dannemiller, Leo M., O68338.
 × Davey, Robert A., O66819.
 × Davidson, William W., Jr., O68182.
 × Davies, Billy T., O66821.
 × Davis, Clifford A., O67999.
 × Davis, Dale T., O66822.
 Davis, Fred J., O65821.
 × Davis, George R., O66823.
 × Davis, Graham C., O66824.
 × Davis, Louis McA., O66489.
 × Day, James O., O66602.
 × Day, Robert E., O66291.
 × Day, Robert L., O66829.
 × Dean, Fred E., O66830.
 × DeAngelis, Joseph A., O66364.
 × DeBoalt, Richard F., O66407.
 × Deiss, Herbert, O66258.
 × DeLapp, William C., 3d, O66832.
 × DeLaune, Elton J., Jr., O67808.
 × Demmons, Jack L., O66800.
 × Derbes, Daniel W., O66287.
 × DeShazo, Thomas E., Jr., O70086.
 × Dethlefs, Henry J., O66835.
 × Deverill, Arthur P., Jr., O66369.
 × Devine, Donald W., O66837.
 × Devins, Joseph H., Jr., O66558.
 × DeWald, Arthur B., O66515.
 × Dietz, DuWayne E., O66838.
 × Dietz, George R., O66357.
 × Dietz, James J., O66306.
 × Dingle, Peter, O66839.
 × DiSerafino, Giulio L., O66840.
 Dixon, Marshall E., O66841.
 × Dombrowski, Edwin H., O66842.
 × Dombrowski, Albert J., Jr., O66400.
 × Donovan, Paul, O66843.
 × Doody, Richard F., O66571.
 Dorman, James, O66844.
 × Dowler, Thomas W., O66232.
 × Dowling, John H., O66845.
 × Driskill, John G., O66231.
 × Dubie, Richard H., O66847.
 × Duerr, Michael G., O66279.
 × Duffy, James J., Jr., O66848.
 × Dughl, Charles H., O66849.
 × Duncan, Dorman L., Jr., O67565.
 × Duncan, William H., O66550.
 × Dunmire, Thomas S., O66532.
 × Dunn, Robert H., O66449.
 × Dupke, Carl F., Jr., O66305.
 × Durant, Oswald D., 2d, O66851.
 × Durie, Robert E., O66535.
 × Dutchyshyn, Harry V., O66300.
 × Dyer, Edward R., Jr., O67812.
 × Dyer, Freddie A., O68183.
 × Dyson, William E., O66852.
 Eachus, David A., O66459.
 × Earle, Marsden P., Jr., O66600.
 × Earnest, Clyde T., Jr., O66285.
 × Easton, Harr McC., 3d, O66853.
 × Ebel, William E., O66854.
 × Eckert, Edward N., O66460.
 × Edgerton, John D., O66855.
 × Edwards, Charles A., Jr., O66439.
 × Edwards, David F., O68340.
 × Edwards, Robert A., O66857.
 Edwards, William H., O66858.
 × Ehlert, Richard A., O68184.
 × Eichhorn, Ralph F., Jr., O66859.
 × Eiken, Marcus A., O66860.
 × Eisele, Robert P., O66861.
 × Eisenhart, Warren H., O66429.
 × Eley, Claud E., Jr., O66862.
 × Elliott, Wayne H., O66560.
 × Elliott, Wilburt L., O66863.
 Ellis, Thomas N., O66468.
 Ellison, Thomas B., O66864.
 × Elmore, Arthur C., O66431.
 × Englesby, Howard E., O66865.
 Erickson, Arne B., O66867.
 × Erickson, Arthur LeR., O66368.
 Espey, John R., O66386.
 × Espy, Carl L., Jr., O66868.
 × Evans, John C., O66870.
 × Evans, Thomas J., O66871.
 × Evans, Timothy L., O66872.
 × Evans, Winston K., O66873.
 × Everhart, Tommy L., O66874.
 × Everingham, Neil G., O66875.
 × Evrard, James A., O68341.
 × Falconer, Walter J., O66878.
 × Faught, William F., O68003.
 × Fawcett, John A., O66879.
 × Feaster, Jacob L., Jr., O66880.
 × Ferguson, Jerry, O66882.
 × Ferguson, William H., Jr., O66883.
 × Fiala, Thomas F., O66261.
 × Finch, Richard B., O66884.
 × Finn, William G., O66575.
 × Fischer, Frank J., O66887.
 × Fischer, William H., O66888.
 × Fitzpatrick, Thomas E., O66544.
 × Flanagan, Eugene P., O66601.
 × Fleming, John A., O66890.
 × Fleming, Mills L., Jr., O66891.
 × Flemming, Daniel B., O66892.
 Floro, Lawrence A., Jr., O66893.
 Foley, John V., O66237.
 Fonshell, William R., Jr., O66897.
 × Ford, Allan T., O68186.
 × Frankeberger, John R., O66903.
 × Franklin, Chester A., O66904.
 × Frederick, Austin, O66905.
 × Friend, Donald F., O66907.
 × Fulwyler, Niles J., O66908.

- × Gambaccini, Louis J., O66910.
- × Garcia, Efrain S., O68005.
- × Garibay, Raul A., O66913.
- × Garland, Donald E., O66914.
- × Garrison, Robert M., O67818.
- × Gartman, Frank T., O67921.
- × Garver, John B., Jr., O66408.
- × Garver, Ralph T., O66284.
- × Garwood, Kenneth J., O66916.
- × Gaskill, Robert C., O67819.
- × Gaskins, Leonard L., O66917.
- × Gearey, Thomas P., O66918.
- × Geatches, William H., O66268.
- × Geller, William A., O66920.
- × Gelke, Donald E., O66921.
- × Gerhardt, James M., O66223.
- × Germond, George F., O67923.
- × Gibbs, Gerald G., Jr., O66420.
- × Gibley, John K., O66923.
- × Gibney, John V., O66514.
- × Gilbert, Edgar A., 3d, O66216.
- × Gile, Rexford R., O66926.
- × Gilkey, Clarence D., O66262.
- × Gillespie, Marc S., O66927.
- × Girdner, Ralph W., O66359.
- × Glad, Amos D., O67574.
- × Glahe, Robert W., O66928.
- × Gleason, William P., O66580.
- × Glover, Frederick J., O66929.
- × Glynn, William P., 3d, O66930.
- × Goebel, Werner W., O66932.
- × Goff, Richard W., O66933.
- × Golden, Harold R., O66935.
- × Goldman, Fred, O66936.
- × Goliash, Joseph F., O66938.
- × Gooch, Kaye W., O66939.
- × Good, Kenneth N., O66334.
- × Goodall, Arthur L., O66940.
- × Gorby, Alvin R., O66409.
- × Gotschall, Wellington J., O66942.
- × Gottsche, John S., O66943.
- × Gould, David C., O66944.
- × Grafton, Benjamin McL., Jr., O66440.
- × Gray, Donald J., O66503.
- × Gray, George E., Jr., O66961.
- × Gray, Paul A., O66472.
- × Grayeb, George A., Jr., O66605.
- × Green, Moses R., O66947.
- × Green, Roy G., O66948.
- × Greene, Merle R., O67820.
- × Greer, George D., O66949.
- × Gregory, Theodore O., O66425.
- × Griffin, Alfred C., O66456.
- × Griggs, Grady E., O66953.
- × Grissom, Charles C., O66954.
- × Groninger, Dwight L., O66955.
- × Gross, Francis P., 3d, O66350.
- × Gruver, Mead S., O66956.
- × Guertin, J. A. Richard, O66958.
- × Guess, Carl E., Jr., O66599.
- × Guinn, William D., Jr., O66959.
- × Gulley, Willard C., O66960.
- × Gustafson, William G., O66961.
- × Hackbarth, Richard O., O66962.
- × Haessler, Rodolfo, O66351.
- × Hahn, Gordon M., O66396.
- × Hahn, James R., O66963.
- × Hains, Peter C., O66401.
- × Hairston, Charles, O66964.
- × Haley, George R., O66965.
- × Hall, Henry R., Jr., O66011.
- × Halley, Frank H., O66964.
- × Hamilton, Philip W., Jr., O66534.
- × Hamilton, Wilson S., O66967.
- × Hampton, Norman A., O66969.
- × Hand, Robert P., O66458.
- × Hannan, Joseph A., O66276.
- × Hansard, David G., O66378.
- × Hanson, Harvey LeR., O66971.
- × Haras, Robert J., O66250.
- × Harbuck, Robert L., O70095.
- × Hare, John F., O66972.
- × Harrick, Joseph W., O66973.
- × Harriman, William C., O66974.
- × Harris, Bobby J., O68188.
- × Harris, Clyde E., Jr., O66975.
- × Harris, Daniel D., Jr., O66976.
- × Harris, John R., O67927.
- × Harris, Nat, 3d, O66977.
- × Harrison, William J., O66330.
- × Harrison, Williams L., Jr., O66465.
- × Hartin, Edward W., Jr., O66978.
- × Hartzell, Edwin Y., Jr., O66979.
- × Haskell, Richard B., O66552.
- × Hastings, Wallace H., Jr., O66581.
- × Hatch, William T., O66981.
- × Hatton, Robert E., O66507.
- × Hauser, Ernest W., O66983.
- × Hausknecht, Richard H., O66985.
- × Hawkins, Jeremiah B., O67821.
- × Hayford, Warren J., 4th, O66230.
- × Hays, James D., O66987.
- × Hazen, Carl M., Jr., O66988.
- × Heathcock, James T., O66989.
- × Heflin, Henry G., Jr., O66990.
- × Hegberg, Donald E., O66238.
- × Heilman, Robert L., O66991.
- × Heineke, Hilton E., Jr., O68820.
- × Heiss, Clarence LeR., O66992.
- × Helms, Jay F., O66993.
- × Henderson, Lewis J., O66584.
- × Henderson, William J., Jr., O66994.
- × Hendrickson, Joe D., O66555.
- × Hennigan, John R., O67825.
- × Hensley, Rayburn K., O68821.
- × Hermann, John R., Jr., O66553.
- × Herrgesell, Oscar, O66996.
- × Herron, Dan P., O66997.
- × Herstrom, Frederick W., O66998.
- × Hess, Robert G., O66999.
- × Hettinger, John A., Jr., O66435.
- × Hewell, Robert E., O68014.
- × Hicks, Edson C., O67000.
- × Higgs, Irwin L., O67001.
- × Hildebrand, Graham, O66326.
- × Hiley, Thomas E. Sr., O67002.
- × Hill, Don K., O67004.
- × Hill, John G., O66538.
- × Hill, Lloyd H., O71514.
- × Hill, Roy W., Jr., O68015.
- × Hill, Thomas R., O66255.
- × Hodgskin, Howell L., Jr., O66234.
- × Hoenstine, Charles A., Jr., O66351.
- × Hoffmann, Joseph A., O67006.
- × Hogan, Henry W., O67007.
- × Hoge, Daniel H., Jr., O66563.
- × Holden, William B., O66565.
- × Hollander, Herbert C., O66299.
- × Holle, Bradford, O67009.
- × Holle, Kendrick, O67010.
- × Holleran, Owen C., Jr., O66537.
- × Holley, William T., O67011.
- × Holmes, Ashley W., Jr., O67012.
- × Holmes, Robert S., O66302.
- × Holt, Winfield A., O66533.
- × Holtz, Edward S., O67013.
- × Hooker, John D., O67014.
- × Hope, Leon MacK., O67015.
- × Hopkins, David A., O67016.
- × Horan, Edwin P., Jr., O66512.
- × Horlick, Robert C., O67017.
- × Horn, William L., O66267.
- × Horne, Jasper C., Jr., O67018.
- × Howard, Max L., O66247.
- × Hubbard, Samuel J., O66411.
- × Huch, Charles G., O67022.
- × Hudson, William R., O68189.
- × Hukkala, Tenho R., O67023.
- × Hulley, Robert N., O66525.
- × Humble, Graham L., O66585.
- × Hunt, Frizell, O67024.
- × Hurley, Robert D., O67025.
- × Huskerson, Guy M., Jr., O67026.
- × Hutchins, John A., Jr., O67027.
- × Hyde, Orion J., O67028.
- × Hylton, Irvin L., O67029.
- × Ireland, Orville F., Jr., O66497.
- × Irwin, Thomas G., O68253.
- × Jackson, Arthur G., O66564.
- × Jackson, Carroll V., O66470.
- × Jacobson, Reginald C., O67032.
- × Jagers, Joseph N., Jr., O66493.
- × Jameson, John G., Jr., O67033.
- × Jarvis, James W., Jr., O67035.
- × Jelen, Edward J., 2d, O66527.
- × Jelinek, Howard C., O66566.
- × Jenkins, Wallace E., O67037.
- × Jenkins, William E., O67833.
- × Jess, Raymond C., O66501.
- × Johnson, Frank F., Jr., O68254.
- × Johnson, Howard D., O67039.
- × Johnson, Hunter C., Jr., O68017.
- × Johnson, John G., O67040.
- × Johnson, Oscar A., Jr., O67041.
- × Johnson, Raymond E., O67042.
- × Johnston, Douglas E., O67045.
- × Jones, Charles P., O67834.
- × Jones, Lynn W., 2d, O67047.
- × Jones, Wesley G., O66557.
- × Jordan, Joseph L., O66346.
- × Jorgensen, LeRoy, O67048.
- × Joyner, Floyd, O67049.
- × Juvenal, Michael P., O66477.
- × Kaltenthaler, John H., O67051.
- × Karlson, Ernest E., O67052.
- × Kaser, William T., O67053.
- × Katz, Jason H., O67054.
- × Keating, Kenneth J., O66441.
- × Keeler, Phillip R., O67055.
- × Keeler, Robert B., O67056.
- × Keeley, John B., O66340.
- × Keenan, John A., O67057.
- × Kelley, William D., O67058.
- × Kelly, Keith S., O67059.
- × Keltz, Richard E., O67060.
- × Kennedy, Edmund J., 3d, O67062.
- × Kennedy, John L., Jr., O67936.
- × Kenney, John F. C., Jr., O66275.
- × Kenz, Herbert W., O67064.
- × Kersey, Walter G., O67065.
- × Kidwell, Birtrun S., Jr., O66323.
- × Kiefer, Homer W., Jr., O66327.
- × Kiernan, Thomas A., O66304.
- × Kilgour, Jordan McL., O67066.
- × Kimmel, Robert G., O66464.
- × King, Ivan W., O66543.
- × King, Peter C., O66455.
- × Kirklighter, Gerald W., O67067.
- × Kitts, James R., Jr., O71536.
- × Kitts, Richard A., O67068.
- × Kleberg, Jack C., O66338.
- × Klinner, Enzo F., Jr., O68193.
- × Klussendorf, John R., O67070.
- × Knight, Daniel B., Jr., O66528.
- × Knight, O'Ferrall, Jr., O66447.
- × Knipe, William A., Jr., O67071.
- × Knipp, Fred M., O67072.
- × Knutson, Karl, O67074.
- × Knutson, Kent G., O66318.
- × Kochanek, Louis J., O67075.
- × Koerner, Star C., Jr., O67076.
- × Korchek, Robert L., O66520.
- × Kraft, Donald E., O67077.
- × Kraska, Richard J., O68824.
- × Kreidler, Clark F., O67078.
- × Kuick, Stanley J., O66422.
- × Kurz, Ralph E., O67079.
- × LaBarbera, Albert, O67081.
- × LaFrance, Raymond J., O71542.
- × Lahr, John A., Jr., O67083.
- × Lamb, Richard F., O66542.
- × Lamp, Harold R., O66349.
- × Lane, Edward E., O66335.
- × Lane, John W., O67087.
- × Lang, Richard N., O66424.
- × Lang, Vaughn O., O67088.
- × Lange, Karl F., O67089.
- × Lank, Joseph M., O67090.
- × Larkin, Richard J., O67091.
- × Larkin, Richard X., O66417.
- × LaRosa, Reginald A., O67092.
- × Lash, Raymond E., O66582.
- × Lasher, Donald R., O66430.
- × Lavernoch, Valerian J., O67094.
- × Lawrence, Alfred F., Jr., O66235.
- × Lawrence, Paul S., O71545.
- × Lawson, Harold F., O67095.
- × Lax, William M., O67096.
- × Layman, George G., O67097.
- × Leach, Jack H., O68371.
- × Leach, Robert W., O66380.
- × Leary, Arthur J., Jr., O67099.
- × LeDoux, Ramon M., O67101.
- × Lee, James B., O66227.
- × Lee, James M., O67102.
- × Lee, Williams S., Jr., O67103.
- × Leggett, William T., Jr., O66361.
- × LeGrand, Kenneth L., O67104.
- × Lehan, James F., Jr., O66345.
- × Lehman, Albert C., O66312.
- × Lennon, Leo H., O66444.
- × Lentz, John J., O66395.
- × Leroux, Francis, O67105.
- × Lespasio, Neal A., O66583.
- × Letourneau, Joseph A., 3d, O67106.
- × Levin, Kenneth C., O67107.

- × Lewellen, William H., O67108.
 Lewis, John H., O67838.
 Lewis, John H., 3d, O66498.
 × Lichtenwalter, Leon E., Jr., O66322.
 Liebl, Arthur F. W., O67109.
 Lilliker, Thomas W., O68024.
 × Lillis, William J., O67839.
 × Littlejohn, James N., O67111.
 × Livsey, William J., Jr., O68025.
 × Loewy, Arthur F., O67112.
 × Logan, Andrew H., O67113.
 Lombard, Charles F., O67114.
 × Longmore, Myron J., O67116.
 × Lopkoff, Alexander, Jr., O68374.
 Lorenzen, Albert L., Jr., O66554.
 × Love, John D., O67117.
 × Lovis, Richard S., O67118.
 × Lowder, Henry I., O66381.
 × Lunsford, Lee R., O67119.
 × Lupton, Edward R., O67120.
 × Lush, Rolla S., O67121.
 × Luther, Jay E., O66301.
 × Lycan, Daniel L., O67122.
 × Lynch, Francis J., O68379.
 × Lynch, James McG., O66603.
 × Lyon, David K., O66243.
 × MacDonald, Kenneth W., O67124.
 × MacDonald, John C., Jr., O67123.
 × MacGarrigle, George L., Jr., O66545.
 × Madison, Jack V., O67126.
 × Magoni, John C., O67127.
 × Mahan, Gary C., O68196.
 × Mailer, James R., O67129.
 × Malmgren, Alfred C., O67840.
 × Malone, Paul B., 3d, O66324.
 Malone, William E., O67937.
 × Maloney, James W., O66228.
 × Mangum, David C., O67938.
 × Manifold, Rodney M., O67130.
 × Manning, Thomas J., O68197.
 × Mansfield, Eldon L., Jr., O68026.
 × Marden, Richard H., O67133.
 Margraf, John A., O67134.
 × Markley, Richard E., O67135.
 × Marks, Robert P., O67136.
 × Martin, David H., Jr., O66434.
 × Martin, George L., O67138.
 × Martin, James J., O68381.
 × Matteucci, Albert, O67140.
 × Matthews, Mack O., 3d, O67141.
 × Matthews, Richard F., O67142.
 × Maurer, John C., O66469.
 × Maxham, Robert L., O67145.
 McAndie, James L., O66260.
 × McBride, Frank A., O67147.
 × McBride, James S., 2d, O67148.
 × McCaffrey, Charles T., Jr., O67149.
 × McCauley, Fred S., Jr., O67150.
 × McCauley, Paul J., O67151.
 McClung, Edgar B., O66388.
 McCluskey, Thomas C., O67153.
 × McCormack, Harold J., O70211.
 × McCrindle, Robert, O66314.
 McDonnell, James E., O66487.
 McElroy, Robert I., O68030.
 × McGarry, Robert S., O66257.
 × McGowan, Robert S., O66360.
 × McGregor, Frank A., 3d, O68200.
 × McGuire, Raymond F., Jr., O67845.
 × McKinley, Hall F., Jr., O67157.
 × McKnight, Clarence E., Jr., O66367.
 × McKnight, Robert D., O67158.
 × McLain, Charles I., O67159.
 × McMahan, Daniel P., O66476.
 × McManus, Richard J., O67847.
 × McMenemy, Alexander E., O67160.
 × McMurray, James H., Jr., O70111.
 × McNeil, Frank H., O71558.
 × McNickle, Robert J., O67164.
 × McSpadden, William A., O67942.
 × Meagher, Clyde R., Jr., O67165.
 × Mechtly, Ivan R., Jr., O66241.
 × Medaris, Oliver J., O68384.
 × Meek, Ben F., Jr., O67167.
 × Meikle, Charles E., O66352.
 × Mellinger, Dale E., O67943.
 × Merian, John A., O67170.
 × Mersch, Robert J., O67171.
 × Mess, John A., O67172.
 × Messner, Warren A., O67173.
 Meyer, Alvin J., O67174.
 × Meyer, Henry R., O66270.
 × Michel, James A., O66333.
 × Mickel, Larry S., O66387.
 × Middleton, Wilbur A., O70141.
 × Millan, Jerome C., O68272.
 × Miles, Charles D., O67175.
 Miles, Edgar G., O67176.
 × Miller, Bruce McK., O67178.
 × Miller, Duane H., O67182.
 × Miller, Edwin N., O67183.
 × Miller, George W., O66354.
 × Miller, John J., O69989.
 × Miller, Pat C., O68829.
 × Miller, Richard J., O66288.
 × Miller, Wayne B., Jr., O67184.
 × Miller, William W., O67185.
 × Mills, Darrell H., O67186.
 × Milne, Robert S., O67187.
 × Mintz, Arthur L., O67189.
 × Misch, John M., O66272.
 × Mitchell, Corwin A., O66320.
 × Mitchell, William L., Jr., O66414.
 × Mittelstadt, Russell J., O67851.
 Moffatt, Edwin G., O68830.
 × Mohler, Robert L., O67192.
 × Moore, James E., O68032.
 × Moore, Richard D., O66220.
 × Moore, William C., O66382.
 × Moorer, John D., Jr., O67193.
 × Moran, Otis A., Jr., O66398.
 × Morano, Frank T., O67196.
 × Morgan, James R., O67197.
 × Morgan, Robert L., O66233.
 × Morin, Louis F., O66461.
 × Morris, Hubert, O71567.
 Morrison, George E., 3d, O67199.
 × Morrissey, Robert L., O67200.
 × Morton, Richard E., O68831.
 × Moseley, Bernard R., O68388.
 Moseley, Henry G., O66423.
 × Moser, Alexander J., O67202.
 × Motta, Paul R., O68033.
 × Mueller, James W., O66412.
 × Mullane, Denis F., O66315.
 × Mullen, Raymond C., Jr., O67205.
 Mullins, Billy P., O67206.
 × Munsel, Harold M., O71574.
 × Murnighan, Richard L., O67207.
 × Murphy, Paul A., O67208.
 × Muslin, Melvin G., O67209.
 × Myers, William A., O67210.
 × Myers, William A., O66511.
 × Nabors, Alphonso W., Jr., O67211.
 × Naughton, Dennis E., O67212.
 × Neal, Albert, O67213.
 × Neal, Robert W., O67214.
 × Neander, Herbert A., O67215.
 × Nelson, Thomas W., O66226.
 × Nelson, William D., O67217.
 Nestlerode, George H., O68035.
 Neumann, Bernhardt E., Jr., O67220.
 × Neuvar, Erwin W., O67221.
 × Neville, James C., O67222.
 × Nichols, Stephen E., O66358.
 Nikkel, Roy G., O68036.
 Nims, Richard H., O70146.
 × Nixon, Donald A., O66509.
 Noakley, Don H., O67225.
 × Noble, Edwin L., Jr., O67226.
 × Noel, James S., O67227.
 × Nolan, William L., Jr., O67228.
 × Nolde, William B., O68037.
 × Nord, Alan A., O67229.
 Nunn, David H., O67231.
 × Nys, Robert E., O67232.
 × Obach, Ronald M., O66453.
 × O'Brien, Donald J., O67233.
 × O'Brien, Thomas E., O67234.
 × O'Connor, Theodore E., O67235.
 × Oglesby, Lenox W., O67236.
 × Olson, George C., O67237.
 × Oltman, Richard M., O67238.
 × O'Mary, Paul R., O67239.
 × Opel, Donald M., O67242.
 × Orr, Carson D., O67243.
 × Orr, Jerry C., O68835.
 Osborne, Paul R., O67244.
 × O'Sullivan, Warren S., O66264.
 × Ousley, Thomas J., Jr., O67246.
 × Overby, Charlie K., O67247.
 × Overdahl, Norman L., O67248.
 × Overholt, Eugene F., O67948.
 × Owre, Peter T., O70147.
 × Ozaki, John, O68393.
 × Pace, Thomas D., O66500.
 × Pack, Ishmael, O67249.
 Pafford, Donald V., O66454.
 × Palmer, Glenn H., Jr., O66290.
 × Palmer, Leslie A., O67250.
 × Paluh, Joseph R., O66350.
 × Panton, William E., O70218.
 × Paparone, Cono R., O67251.
 × Paquette, Dean R., O71583.
 × Park, Alan H., O67252.
 × Parks, Walter G., O66343.
 Parmentier, Stanley J., O67253.
 × Paterson, Stewart, Jr., O66371.
 × Patrick, George H., 3d, O67255.
 × Patrick, William L., O67256.
 × Patterson, James H., O67257.
 × Patton, Robert S., O67258.
 × Payne, Charles R., O67261.
 × Peat, Douglas W., O67262.
 × Peel, Marvin M., O68039.
 × Pehrson, Alan R., O67263.
 × Pelton, John DeW., O66588.
 × Pendleton, Freeman L., O66463.
 Perko, John A., O67266.
 Ferrin, William S., O68040.
 × Perritt, Harvey H., Jr., O66450.
 × Peters, Harold K., O66506.
 × Petersen, Donald F., O67267.
 × Peterson, James M., O66372.
 × Petrenko, Glenn, O67853.
 × Petro, Peter P., O67268.
 Pettit, James S., 2d, O66480.
 × Petty, Thomas B., O67269.
 × Pfanzelter, Max R., O71586.
 × Pfeil, Robert P., O66446.
 Phillips, James W., O68041.
 Pickering, Phillip B., O66334.
 × Pickett, Dayton S., O66317.
 × Pierce, Robert W., O67270.
 × Pierce, Samuel M., O67271.
 × Pilk, Jack R., O66308.
 Piotrkowski, Joseph L., O71589.
 × Piske, David F., O66244.
 × Plackner, William V., O67273.
 × Plotkin, Nathan, O67274.
 × Plunkett, John J., O70017.
 × Pollard, Arnold R., O67276.
 × Ponton, John W., Jr., O67277.
 × Poor, William T., O68042.
 × Potts, William L., O67279.
 × Powell, Bill C., O67280.
 × Prather, William R., O67281.
 × Price, Douglas E., O67282.
 Price, James E., O67283.
 × Price, John E., Jr., O67604.
 × Price, Robert W., O70148.
 × Prince, Ivan R., Jr., O67284.
 Pritchett, Charles C., O68043.
 × Prohaska, Andrew M., Jr., O67285.
 Puckett, Robert B., O67286.
 × Purple, Robert A., O67950.
 × Purvis, Gerald W., O70479.
 × Putnam, Lawrence H., O66383.
 × Quinn, John T., O66591.
 × Rafferty, Robert E., O67290.
 × Raiford, William R., O66328.
 × Rainbolt, Harry E., O67291.
 × Rainey, Charles N., O66504.
 × Rajchel, Louis J., Jr., O66568.
 × Rallens, Larry D., O67292.
 × Rametta, Thomas P., O68045.
 × Ramirez, Raul P., O67293.
 × Ramsey, William S., O67294.
 × Rathbun, Rex H., O67297.
 × Ray, Richard B., O66556.
 × Reaves, James B., O66289.
 × Red, Dale S., O67299.
 × Reece, Carroll K., O67300.
 Reece, Laurence H., Jr., O67859.
 × Reece, Wendell D., O67301.
 × Reeder, Franklin L., O66499.
 × Reese, Grady G., O68286.
 × Reeve, John H., O67303.
 × Rehm, Thomas A., O66426.
 × Reid, James A., O67305.
 × Reilly, William F., O66219.
 × Reinhalter, Edmund J., O66445.
 × Reinstein, Vincent P., O67306.
 × Relyea, George R., O66245.
 × Rende, Richard M., O67307.
 Renz, Ray H., O67308.

- Repko, John J., Jr., O67860.
 × Reynolds, James M., O67309.
 × Rhiddlehoover, Loyd P., Jr., O66522.
 × Richards, Everett D., O66332.
 Richardson, William F., 3d, O67310.
 × Ricketson, Wayne E., O67312.
 × Rickman, James H., O67313.
 × Riddick, Mills A., O67314.
 × Ridgeway, William M., O67315.
 × Riese, Paul E., O67316.
 × Riker, James J., O67317.
 Riley, Robert S., O66598.
 × Rink, James H., O66392.
 × Rippel, George W., O67319.
 × Risch, Theodore D., O67320.
 × Ritter, William H., O66548.
 × Rizzo, Paul J., O67321.
 × Robbins, Albert W., O67952.
 × Roberts, Lee W., O68398.
 × Roberts, Ovid E., 3d, O67324.
 × Robertson, Daniel E., O67325.
 Robertson, Robert E., O67326.
 × Robertson, Victor M., Jr., O67862.
 × Robinson, Eugene E., O67328.
 × Robinson, Frank E., O66413.
 × Rochester, Earle F., O67331.
 Rodney, Richard M., O67332.
 × Rodolph, John E., O67333.
 × Rodrigues, James A., O66467.
 × Rogers, Fred C., O67334.
 × Rogers, Richard J., O66433.
 × Rogers, Roy D., O67336.
 × Rollins, Robert L., O67337.
 × Romero, Louis J., O67338.
 × Roper, Harry McK., Jr., O66246.
 × Ross, Donald H., O66348.
 × Ross, Eugene, O67339.
 × Ross, Wilbur A., O66546.
 × Rouse, William C., O68205.
 × Rowe, James R., O68206.
 Rowland, Louis N., O67341.
 × Rowland, Richard O., O67342.
 × Royals, Gerald E., O67343.
 × Ruff, Clarence G., O66263.
 × Runion, Roger C., O67344.
 × Runquist, Joseph J., O67345.
 × Rushing, Robert K., O67346.
 × Russell, Lawrence, 3d, O66282.
 × Russell, Robert L., O66403.
 × Russomano, Richard J., O66254.
 × Ryan, Thomas A., O67349.
 × Sadler, John W., O66271.
 × Sagul, John C., O67350.
 × Salley, Donald B., O67351.
 × Samisch, Hillel, Jr., O67352.
 × Sammons, Anthony J., Jr., O68207.
 × Sandhaas, John J., Jr., O67864.
 × Santilli, Joseph F., Jr., O66505.
 × Sarber, William R., Jr., O67354.
 × Sayers, Robert L., O67355.
 × Saunders, Norman C., O67356.
 × Sawtelle, Thomas K., O67357.
 Sayre, John R., O67358.
 Schandler, Herbert Y., O66296.
 × Schexnayder, Edmond P., O67865.
 × Schlim, Albert W., O67360.
 × Schloss, Charles M., Jr., O67361.
 × Schmalhorst, Joseph H., O68401.
 × Schmidt, Richard H., O67362.
 × Schoebel, James G., O70229.
 × Scholz, Rudolph J., Jr., O67363.
 × Schrack, Neil W., O70230.
 × Schroeder, William S., O66589.
 × Scott, Gilbert T., O66337.
 × Scott, Julien A., Jr., O67955.
 × Seamands, George A., O67364.
 × Sears, Robert L., O66475.
 × Sell, Charles E., Jr., O66293.
 × Selleck, Clyde A., Jr., O66218.
 × Sells, Donald E., O66248.
 × Senna, Jozef F., O67366.
 × Shackleton, Ronald A., O67367.
 Shannon, John F., O67368.
 × Shattuck, William M., O67369.
 × Shea, John J., Jr., O67370.
 × Sherman, Anthony, Jr., O67371.
 × Shores, Richard L., O67372.
 × Shull, Wesley B., O67373.
 × Shultz, Robert H., Jr., O67374.
 × Shy, John W., O66215.
 × Sigwalt, Paul H., O67376.
 × Simmons, Thomas R., Jr., O67377.
 × Simons, Gerald S., O67379.
 × Simpson, John A., O67380.
 × Simpson, Richard R., O67381.
 × Singletary, R. M., O67382.
 × Slingerland, Douglas A., O66473.
 × Sluga, Leonard A., O66298.
 × Smallwood, Eugene F., O67960.
 × Smallwood, Grady L., O67383.
 Smallwood, Paul L., O67384.
 × Smith, Billy R., O67961.
 × Smith, Frank B., O66399.
 × Smith, John D., O66310.
 × Smith, Millard H., O67387.
 × Smith, Ralph H., O68049.
 × Smith, Robert W., O67389.
 × Smith, Vincent K., O67390.
 × Snyder, Oscar P., Jr., O67391.
 × Snyder, William P., O66274.
 × Sobel, Joseph I., O67392.
 × Solley, Bill, O67393.
 × Spannuth, Steven H., O67394.
 × Sparks, Jackson M., O67395.
 × Spaulding, Warren A., O66252.
 × Speir, Ashley C., Jr., O66294.
 × Spell, James M., Jr., O66325.
 × Spencer, William H., Jr., O66586.
 × Spero, Paul G., O67397.
 × Spirito, Leonard A., O68208.
 × Spitzer, Robert N., O67398.
 × Sprague, John T., Jr., O67399.
 Spurlock, William W., Jr., O67400.
 Stanaland, William A., O67401.
 × Stanford, Daly H., O67402.
 × Stanier, Richard E., O66432.
 × Stebbins, Arthur E., O66356.
 × Steen, Charles S., Jr., O66513.
 × Steinport, George L., O67404.
 × Stephens, George R., Jr., O67406.
 × Stephens, Jack V., O67407.
 × Stephens, James H., Jr., O68053.
 × Stephens, Louis M., O67408.
 × Sterling, Norris P., Jr., O67409.
 × Stevens, Charles LaF., O67410.
 × Stevens, Frederick A., Jr., O66479.
 × Stevens, Richard S., O67411.
 × Stevenson, Joseph M., O67871.
 × Stockman, Bonny R., O67413.
 × Stokes, Eugene J., Jr., O66278.
 × Stoll, Joe D., O67415.
 × Stone, Lawrence J., O67416.
 × Stone, Walter D., Jr., O67418.
 × Story, Richard E., O67419.
 × Stovall, Johnnie N., O67420.
 × Strauss, Stephan N., O70151.
 × Strickfaden, Wellington J., O70153.
 Strickland, George E., O67421.
 × Stromfors, Robert E., O67422.
 × Strong, William R., O67423.
 × Stubblebine, Albert N., 3d, O66363.
 × Sullivan, Albert W., O67424.
 × Sullivan, John J., O66462.
 × Sullivan, Milton D., O66394.
 × Sullivan, Robert A., O67425.
 × Sundt, Thoralf M., Jr., O66283.
 × Sutherland, Fred G., O67426.
 × Swank, Sheldon E., O67428.
 × Swanson, Kermit D., O66344.
 × Swygert, Donald R., O66280.
 × Sykes, Cecil R., O66355.
 × Szalwinski, Ambrose A., O67429.
 × Szymczyk, Norbert J., O66576.
 × Takasumi, Tetsuo N., O67430.
 × Tanner, Eugene P., O67431.
 × Tasset, Warren J., O67433.
 Tausch, William H., Jr., O67434.
 × Taylor, Arthur E., Jr., O66437.
 × Taylor, George E., O67436.
 × Taylor, Robert A., O67437.
 Tellifero, George J., O67438.
 × Tensfeldt, Raymond J., O66471.
 × Tervin, Wallace, O70124.
 × Thieme, Alfred L., O66457.
 × Thomas, Otto J., O67441.
 × Thomas, Raymond G., O67442.
 × Thomas, Reynold, Jr., O66451.
 Thomas, William E., O71610.
 × Thompson, Dwight S., O67443.
 × Thompson, Edmund A., O66376.
 × Thompson, Edmund R., O66277.
 × Thompson, Egbert H., O67444.
 × Thompson, Luther C., O67445.
 × Thuston, William O., O67448.
 × Tice, Norman R., O67449.
 × Tickler, Robert S., O66313.
 × Tierney, Robert R., O67450.
 × Tignor, Forrest D., Jr., O68803.
 × Tilley, Derald A., O67452.
 × Tipton, John H., Jr., O66370.
 × Todd, John A., Jr., O67453.
 Toepel, Adalbert E., Jr., O66486.
 Tomasetti, Louis V., O66253.
 × Tow, James L., O66495.
 × Towne, Richard S., O67456.
 × Trepagnier, Jules C., Jr., O68057.
 × Trimble, Rae C., O67457.
 × Tripp, Perry D., Jr., O67458.
 × Tronsrue, George M., Jr., O66240.
 × Trotti, Robert S., Jr., O67969.
 × Truax, Robert H., O66478.
 × Turner, Frank D., Jr., O67877.
 × Turner, James J., O66523.
 × Turner, Robert C., O66587.
 × Tuttle, Roger L., O67461.
 × Tyree, John B., O67462.
 × Tyson, Wallace S., O67463.
 × Ulmer, Walter F., Jr., O66389.
 × Underhill, George E., O66362.
 × Underwood, Bibb A., O68209.
 × Upton, Edwin J., O66393.
 × Urruela, Mario L., O68408.
 × Uzee, Richard J., O67465.
 × Vagins, Milton, O67466.
 × Vance, Larkin B., O70055.
 × Van Meter, Maurice R., O67467.
 × Van Ness, Richard E., Jr., O67468.
 × Van Trees, Harry L., Jr., O66213.
 × Vanwinkle, Herbert N., O67470.
 × Verlautz, Sidney J., O67472.
 × Vermillion, Russell G., O67473.
 × Vitetta, Eugene J., O67474.
 × Vogel, Herbert D., Jr., O66502.
 × Vuley, Ernest A., Jr., O67476.
 × Waara, Ralph C., O67477.
 × Waggoner, Roger C., O67478.
 × Wagner, Harry D., O66592.
 × Wagner, Julian F., O67479.
 Wagon, William M., Jr., O67480.
 × Wakefield, Hobson M., O67481.
 Walker, Donald A., O67482.
 × Walker, William A., Jr., O66321.
 × Wallace, Raymond E., O66342.
 × Waller, Bogue M., O67483.
 × Wallis, Charles R., O66221.
 × Wallwork, James H., Jr., O66224.
 × Walter, James N., O66404.
 × Walters, Thomas E., O67485.
 × Walton, Fred H., Jr., O67879.
 × Ward, Charles R., O67486.
 × Ward, Leon T., O67487.
 × Warner, Nelson M., O67489.
 × Warren, William R., O67491.
 × Wasiaak, Joseph E., O66481.
 × Watkins, Charles E., O66339.
 × Watts, David E., O67493.
 Webb, Harold T., O67880.
 × Weber, Edmund G., O67495.
 × Weed, Mahlon G., O66510.
 × Weeks, Asa J., O67496.
 × Wehmeyer, Rubin R., O67498.
 × Wehr, Arthur J., Jr., O67499.
 × Weikert, Jerry L., O68410.
 × Weindorf, Donald W., O67500.
 × Weinert, Donald G., O66281.
 × Weiser, George T., O67501.
 × Welch, Deane E., O66311.
 × Welch, Robert L., O67502.
 × Wellford, Armistead L., 3d, O67503.
 × Wells, Edward C., O67504.
 × Wells, Parker H., O67505.
 × Wells, Robert N., Jr., O66416.
 × Wendell, Charles R., O67507.
 × Wensyel, James W., O66336.
 × Werner, Donald R., O67508.
 × West, Wilfred W., O67510.
 × Wetzel, Robert L., O66448.
 × Weyhrich, Richard J., O66415.
 × Whalen, Thomas R., O67511.
 × Wheeler, Robert J., O66483.
 × Wheeler, Robert J., O67513.
 × Whipple, Deryle T., O66341.
 × White, Horace R., O67514.
 × White, Joseph D., O67515.
 × White, Wayne N., O66490.
 × Whitener, Hubert J., O68411.

× Whiting, Frederick D., 3d, O67516.
 × Whittemore, Olin S., O67517.
 × Wiard, Robert C., Jr., O67519.
 × Wigman, John M., O67521.
 × Wilcox, Nelson I., O67523.
 × Wiles, Richard I., O66531.
 × Wilkinson, Paul F., O67524.
 × Williams, Albert F., O67526.
 × Williams, Bruce F., O67527.
 × Williams, Charles E., O67528.
 × Williams, Donald L., O67529.
 × Williams, Fred A., O67530.
 × Williams, Green B., Jr., O67531.
 × Williams, Joel J., O67532.
 × Williams, John R., O67533.
 × Williams, Lewis A., O66273.
 × Williams, Royce C., O68061.
 × Willis, Maurice L., O67534.
 × Willis, Robert V., O68849.
 × Wilson, Drake, O66286.
 × Wilson, Harry S., Jr., O66266.
 × Winemiller, Paul L., Jr., O67535.
 × Wirth, Gustav A., Jr., O67536.
 × Wirth, Paul R., O67537.
 × Witherell, John R., O66251.
 × Withers, Peter C., O66492.
 × Wohlfarth, Howard K., O68063.
 × Woltersdorf, Karl A., Jr., O66406.
 × Wood, Raymond D., Jr., O67538.
 × Woodhill, William R., O67540.
 × Woodruff, William R., O67541.
 × Wooley, Wilson C., O67542.
 × Wooten, James P., O71631.
 × Wright, Robert E., O66269.
 × Wuthrich, Edward E., O66222.
 × Yaden, Jesse L., Jr., O68064.
 × Yantis, William J., O68316.
 × Yarbrough, Charles Van Der V., O69604.
 × Yocum, Charles W., O66319.
 × York, Thomas R., O67887.
 × Young, Melvin A., O66578.
 × Yuille, Ryan S., O67543.
 × Zaice, Joseph E., O67888.
 × Zelle, Steven, O66569.
 × Zielonka, Alfred W., O67890.
 × Zimmer, Charles E., O67977.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

× Barron, John W., O66635.
 × Borg, Lavern G., O66713.
 × Burke, James C., O70291.
 × Gilley, William F., O68347.
 × Grigas, Alfons A., O66952.
 × Hawkins, Lewis L., O66986.
 × Jenkins, Russell I., O67036.
 × Leach, Bertram G., O67098.
 × Marble, David W., O68027.
 × McClure, Warner D., O68199.
 × McGlade, Joseph G., O67843.
 × Miller, Norman G., O67945.
 × Mulrenin, Bernard K., O68800.
 × Ramthun, Gerald A., O67857.
 × Rutkowski, Roman B., O67348.
 × Wilbarger, Edward S., Jr., O67522.
 × Zollman, William M., Jr., O67545.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

× Broyles, Emma L., L450.
 × Hooker, Betty J., L459.
 × Lippman, Renee E., L457.
 × Patterson, Betty A., L451.
 × Payne, Ruth W., L447.
 × Rees, Eleanor V., L452.
 × Thome, Alice C., L456.
 × Thompson, Martha J., L454.
 × Williams, Thelma M., L449.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, approved May 16, 1950. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

× Brown, Barbara R., N2589.
 × Casey, Marguerite C., N2569.
 × Doyle, Mary E., N2579.

× Farland, Vivian, N2574.
 × Fuller, Catherine E., N2582.
 × Geldseth, Betty M., N2583.
 × Ginsberg, Miriam K., N2590.
 × Hill, Louise, N2584.
 × Holtz, Dorothy M., N2575.
 × Kuehn, Dorothy M., N2571.
 × McLean, Mary F., N2572.
 × Polidorl, Joan M., N2580.
 × Schairer, Margaret L., N2586.
 × Smith, Nancy V., N2578.
 × Starkey, Elizabeth J., N2587.
 × Suess, Helen V., N2591.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

× Adams, Rachel H., M10148.
 × Anderson, Marylyn J., M10133.
 × Foegen, Dorothy, McC., M10146.
 × Lambertson, Elizabeth L., M10139.
 × McKinley, Harriet J., M10147.
 × Reynolds, Cora D., M10141.
 × Sherburne, Jeanne, R10157.
 × Wakefield, Patricia, M10143.
 × Westhoven, Mary F., M10144.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 625, 80th Congress:

To be major

Phillips, Richard J., MC, O1775263.

To be first lieutenant

Rutledge, Elizabeth J., WAC, L1010536.

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

To be captain

Schug, Willis E., Jr., O28039.

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

Bouzard, Walter C., O4029294.
 Brown, William C.
 Deubler, Keith F., O4030392.
 Goldsmith, Ralph S., O2273768.
 Hatch, Robert P., O4038150.
 Joy, Robert J. T., O4038152.
 Kristeller, Adrian R., O2201121.
 Levin, Herbert J.
 Myers, John E., Jr., O2273733.
 Parsons, Robert W.
 Rodriguez, Ariel, O4030408.
 Sadler, Dean L.
 Sanders, Lester W., Jr., O2273711.
 Sorenson, Roger W.
 Tweedy, Franklin V., O4033384.

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

To be first lieutenant

Shiveley, Charles B., O2014603.

To be second lieutenants

Callis, Bennie E., O4006025.
 Chipps, James H., O4020931.
 Moore, Robert L., O1892107.

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

Bragalone, Raymond A.
 King, Olin B., O4023822.
 McDowell, Thomas E.
 Wallace, Malcolm B.
 Watson, Henry G., O4033155.

IN THE NAVY

Robert D. Harrop (Naval Reserve aviator), to be an ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

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

Robert B. Aikens	Edward R. Fink
Robert P. Best	Gardner M. Haight
Donald R. Bradshaw	Walter B. Harris
James W. Buchanan	George S. Lundin
Gordon A. Evans	Charles T. Pearson, Jr.

Dock T. Hatcher, Jr. (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Giles D. Morrill (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

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

John K. Bontrager
George E. Haroldsen

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Paul S. Fauks
James H. Morris
Phillip Steinberg

ENSIGN

Bruce R. Banks	Roger M. Sudduth
Jerome L. O'Brien	Charles Z. Webb

Joseph A. Puleo (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William A. Bourne (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.
William C. Fuller (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Jane C. Hessel (Naval Reserve officer), to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named women officers to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Joyce B. Parker
Cecily J. Smith
Nancy L. Warner

Eugene LeR. Walter, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer), to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Gerald Fink for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

The following-named Reserve and temporary officers for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Maurice H. Alexander	Harlan C. Chase
Louis J. Bacher	Jerry P. Chene
Freddie J. Baker	William C. McClelland
Roger H. Barnard	Doyle H. Cole
Elena D. Brigotti	Charles F. Cresswell
Richard N. Bueth	William M. Cryan
William O. Butler	George D. Cumming
Guy R. Campo	George A. Dimsdale
Frank S. Cannon	Roy L. Doering
John C. Cawthron, Jr.	Joseph R. Donaldson

Mark P. Fennessy
 Charles R. Figard
 David D. Finne, Jr.
 John J. Finnegan
 John E. Forde, Jr.
 George E. Fuller
 Orvis O. Gaugh, Jr.
 David G. Geddes
 Edward Z. Grabowski
 Edward M. Guell
 Frederick M. Haden
 John R. Hansford
 Richard E. Hemming-
 way
 Donald H. Hildebrand
 Max J. Hochenauer
 Page H. Holmes
 George Hubbard
 Paul G. Janssen
 Mary G. Johancen
 Joseph S. Jordahl
 Robert J. Keller
 Alan B. Kimball
 Walter E. Kiracofe
 Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
 Howard A. Korlitz
 Dudley N. Kyle
 George G. Long
 James F. Mahoney
 Frederick F. Mallard
 Joseph V. Manis, Jr.
 Clarence E. May, Jr.
 Thomas E. McNally
 Max McQuown
 Edward J. Megarr
 Robert E. Miller
 Thomas G. Mooney

The following-named reserve and temporary officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. Alber
 James O. Allison
 Eugene W. Andersen
 William C. Ashby, Jr.
 James P. Austin
 Carl J. Beaver
 Kent M. Beckman
 Joseph P. Beno
 Wyman U. Blakeman
 Charles F. Bogg
 William O. Bonsall
 Charles L. Booth
 John R. Braddon
 Jack A. Brandon
 Virgil B. Brandon
 Margaret A. Brewer
 Carroll E. Brown
 Dickinson Buell
 James D. Calder
 Laurence A. Campbell

III
 Gary L. Carlson
 Francis M. Casey
 Logan Cassidy
 Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr.
 William H. Chisholm
 Eual R. Christian
 Merideth M. Clark
 Holly Clayton
 John E. Clewes
 William F. Coffey
 Francis E. Coit
 Marcus H. Cook
 Donald E. Coombe
 John F. Cornish, Jr.
 Richard G. Courtney
 Jack O. Curtis
 Samuel E. Dangelo
 David L. Day
 Carl W. DeLaughter, Jr.

William L. Diebels
 Walter E. Dillow
 John V. Dinan, Jr.
 Winfield S. Ditch III
 Thomas A. Doyle
 Lawrence T. Drennan, Jr.

Rowland M. Murphy
 Donald E. Newton
 Bruce C. Ogilvie
 Wilford E. Overgard
 Charles R. Puckett
 Ernest R. Reid, Jr.
 Charles M. Reitz
 Charles C. Renshaw II
 Robert C. Rice
 William L. Robbins
 Richard L. Robinson
 Walter F. Rogers
 Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
 Leonard Schoenberger
 Richard C. Schulze
 William F. Sheehan
 Wilson E. Shepherd
 Vernon C. Shortleaves
 William G. Siegfried
 William J. Spiesel
 Broman C. Stinemetz
 Wylie W. Taylor, Jr.
 Speros D. Thomaidis
 George W. Troxler
 Gerald W. Vaughan
 Timothy S. Vogt
 Carroll R. Vorgang
 Douglas E. Wade
 Anthony G. Waite
 Vonda Weaver
 James J. Weiry
 Morgan W. West
 Norman C. Willcox
 Estas L. Williams
 Rondell K. Wood
 Jack G. Woolery

Billy R. Duncan
 Hollis T. Dunn
 Russell M. Dunn, Jr.
 Robert J. Eitel
 Vincent M. Ernst, Jr.
 Paul G. Fahlstrom
 Bob W. Farley
 William E. Farris
 Michael J. Fibich
 Wallace E. Fogo
 Chester A. Folck
 David T. Forbes, Jr.
 James F. Forhan
 Paul H. Fraser
 Richard A. Freeman
 John R. Fridell
 George W. Fritschl
 Donald G. Gascoigne
 Clarence U. Gebsen
 Herbert H. Geister
 Robert A. Gillon
 John J. Giubilato
 George E. Goodall, Jr.
 Richard J. Gowdy
 Wallace H. Graham
 Arthur L. Graves
 Edward F. Grayson, Jr.
 Robert P. Green
 James C. Greene, Jr.
 Michael W. Gubany
 Robert J. Hafey
 Roger C. Hagerty
 William P. Haight
 Richard E. Haislip
 Robert D. Hanson
 Jerry M. Harrison
 Donald L. Harvey
 Webster C. Heath
 Robert W. Heesch
 Donald C. Heim
 Robert G. Hendricks, Jr.

John A. Herber
 John C. Hergert, Jr.
 Edward C. Herthberg
 Herbert M. Herther
 Wesley F. Hixon
 Walter G. Horais
 Ivan F. Horne

John Hubner
 Rayburn A. Hudman
 Ralph L. Hughes
 Earl R. Hunter
 Thomas K. Jefferson
 Joe L. Johnson
 Victor J. Johnson, Jr.
 Therin H. Jones
 Harold E. Juedeman
 Martin D. Julian
 Louis K. Keck
 Albert W. Keller
 Samuel G. Kelley, Jr.
 John F. J. Kelly
 Harold L. Kendrick
 Hunt S. Kerrigan
 Robert W. Kirby
 Paul E. Kisner
 John R. Kline
 John K. Knope
 Donald E. Koelper
 Carol A. Kramer
 Albert C. Krause
 Herbert W. Kress
 Donald W. Kron
 Eddis R. Larson
 Raymond F. Latall, Jr.
 John B. Lavelle
 John J. Lawendowski
 Richard J. Lee, Jr.
 Richard P. Lee
 Robert D. Leibold
 Donald L. Lindemuth
 Thomas G. Logan
 Aubrey L. Lumpkin
 Dan J. C. Lyttle
 Arthur D. Malovich
 Richard S. Mariasy
 Leonard R. Markwitz
 Joseph F. Mayfield, Jr.
 James P. McBride
 John J. McCarthy
 Charles A. McCluskey
 James G. McCormick
 Gerald E. McDonnell
 Frederick J. McEwan
 George X. McKenna
 Thomas J. Medina
 Franklyn E. Meyer, Jr.
 John H. Miller
 Richard L. Moeller
 Ralph F. Moody
 Neil E. Moore
 James M. Moriarty
 Ellen B. Moroney
 John R. Mounie, Jr.
 Wilbur L. Mundell
 Michael J. Needham
 Lawrence F. Nelson
 William T. O'Rourke, Jr.
 James D. Page
 Lowell W. Parish
 Frederick D. Patterson, Jr.
 Norman E. Payne, Jr.
 Matthew B. Peck, Jr.
 Ernest F. Piskorski
 James W. Pitsenbarger
 James E. Prather, Jr.
 Richard L. Prather
 Ralph D. Proctor
 Joseph T. Quinn
 Richard E. Rainbolt
 Clifford E. Reese
 Edmund J. Regan, J.
 John P. Reichert
 Donald N. Rexroad
 Wesley E. Rhine
 Fred C. Rilling, Jr.

Gerald Pink for temporary appointment to the grade of major in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Maurice A. Alexander
 Freddie Baker
 Louis J. Bacher
 Roger H. Barnard

Duane J. Ring
 Charles S. Ritter
 Otto W. Ritter
 Robert P. Rose
 William H. Ross, Jr.
 William W. Rubrecht
 Wesley M. Rush
 James N. Ryder
 Dale W. Sanford
 Melvin H. Sautter
 William K. Schief
 Beverly Schofield
 Charles E. Schwob
 John E. Seissiger
 Leon R. Sellers
 Walter C. Service III
 John C. Shaffer
 Robert P. Sherman
 Marvin S. Shinbaum
 Jack A. Simmons
 William E. Smilanich, Jr.
 Jack P. Smith
 Louis G. Snyder
 Ralph B. Spencer
 Richard L. Spreitzer
 John K. Springer
 Cameron Standish
 Alfred J. Stashis
 Merlin V. Statzer
 Raymond B. Steele
 Walter R. Stendahl, Jr.
 Arthur C. Stephens, Jr.
 Ray N. Stewart
 Donald C. Stgermafn
 John C. Streed
 Richard A. Sulik
 Bennie W. Summers
 Theodore D. Svoboda
 Rudolf S. Sutter
 Robert W. Swayne
 Harry E. Taylor
 John L. Thatcher
 Joseph H. Thompson
 Lester H. Thompson, Jr.
 Roy L. Thompson, Jr.
 Dale Thornton
 Larrance M. Todd
 Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
 David S. Twining
 James R. VanDenelzen
 Edwin J. VanZandt
 John L. Vibberts
 Henry R. Vitali
 David H. Wagner
 Raymond D. Walters
 George W. Ward
 James W. Warner
 George J. Waters
 James A. Wells, Jr.
 Albert Whalley
 Robert E. White
 James A. Whitmer
 George A. Wickman
 Richard A. Wieland
 Kenneth H. Wilcox
 Donald G. Williams
 Charles W. Wilson
 George M. Wilson
 Jenny Wrenn
 Dennis W. Wright
 Frank H. Wright
 William J. Wright, Jr.
 Willard J. Wyatt
 Martin V. Young, Jr.
 Eugene H. Zimmerman

Elena D. Brigotti
 Richard N. Buethe
 William O. Butler
 Frank S. Cannon
 John C. Cawthron, Jr.
 Jerry P. Chene
 William M. Clelland
 Doyle H. Cole
 George D. Cumming
 George A. Dimsdale
 Joseph R. Donaldson
 Mark P. Fennessy
 Charles R. Figard
 David D. Finne, Jr.
 John J. Finnegan
 John E. Forde, Jr.
 George E. Fuller
 David D. Geddes
 Edward Z. Grabowski
 Edward M. Guell
 Frederick M. Haden
 John R. Hansford
 Richard E. Hemming-
 way
 Donald H. Hildebrand
 Page H. Holmes
 George Hubbard
 Mary G. Johancen
 Walter E. Kiracofe
 Carlisle G. Kohl, Jr.
 Dudley N. Kyle
 George G. Long
 James F. Mahoney
 Frederick F. Mallard

Joseph V. Manis, Jr.
 Clarence E. May, Jr.
 Thomas E. McNally
 Max McQuown
 Edward J. Megarr
 Robert E. Miller
 Thomas G. Mooney
 Rowland M. Murphy
 Donald E. Newton
 Bruce C. Ogilvie
 Wilford E. Overgard
 Charles R. Puckett
 Ernest R. Reid, Jr.
 Charles M. Reitz
 Charles C. Renshaw II
 Richard L. Robinson
 Joseph F. Schoen, Jr.
 Leonard Schoenberger
 Richard C. Schulze
 Wilson E. Shepherd
 Vernon C. Shortleaves
 William G. Siegfried
 William J. Spiesel
 Broman C. Stinemetz
 Speros D. Thomaidis
 George W. Troxler
 Gerald W. Vaughan
 Timothy S. Vogt
 Carroll R. Vorgang
 Douglas E. Wade
 James J. Weiry
 Norman C. Willcox
 Estas L. Williams
 Jack G. Woolery

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. Alber
 James O. Allison
 Eugene W. Andersen
 William C. Ashby, Jr.
 James P. Austin
 Joseph P. Beno
 Charles F. Bogg
 William O. Bonsall
 Charles L. Booth
 John R. Braddon
 Margaret A. Brewer
 Carroll E. Brown
 James D. Calder
 Laurence A. Campbell

III
 Francis M. Casey
 Logan Cassidy
 Ernest C. Cheatham
 Eual R. Christian
 Merideth M. Clark
 John H. Miller
 Richard L. Moeller
 Ralph F. Moody
 Ellen B. Moroney
 John R. Mounie, Jr.
 Michael J. Needham
 Lawrence T. Drennan,
 Jr.

Billy R. Duncan
 Hollis T. Dunn
 Robert J. Eitel
 Paul G. Fahlstrom
 William E. Farris
 Michael J. Fibich
 Chester A. Folck
 Paul H. Fraser
 Richard A. Freeman
 John R. Fridell
 George W. Fritschl
 Herbert H. Geister
 Wallace H. Graham
 Edward F. Grayson, Jr.
 Michael W. Gubany
 Robert J. Hafey
 William P. Haight
 Donald L. Harvey
 Webster C. Heath
 Robert W. Heesch
 John C. Hergert, Jr.
 Wesley F. Hixon
 Walter G. Horais
 Ivan F. Horne
 Rayburn A. Hudman

Louis G. Snyder
 Ralph B. Spencer
 Cameron Standish
 Merlin V. Statzler
 Raymond B. Steele
 Donald C. Stgermain
 Richard A. Sulik
 Rudolf S. Sutter
 Robert W. Swayne
 Harry E. Taylor
 John L. Thatcher
 Joseph H. Thompson
 Dale Thornton
 Stanley G. Tribe, Jr.
 James R. VanDenelzen

John L. Vibberts
 Henry R. Vitali
 David H. Wagner
 Raymond D. Walters
 George W. Ward
 Charles J. Werger
 Albert Whalley
 Robert E. White
 James A. Whitmer
 George M. Willson
 Jenny Wrenn
 Dennis W. Wright
 Willard J. Wyatt
 Eugene H. Zimmerman

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the United States Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond C. Baker, Jr.
 Richard M. Camper
 Warren L. Comstock
 John S. Gary, III
 Joseph M. H. Irby
 William T. Kerlin
 Thomas L. LeCleir
 Charles R. Martin
 Richard C. Martin
 Thomas G. McFarland, Jr.
 James L. McManaway

Arthur T. Mixon
 Herbert W. Moore
 Reginald H. Ridgely III
 Sidney W. Rossuck, Jr.
 Travis M. Russell
 George H. Scherer
 Robert A. Sisk
 Harry C. Valentine, Jr.
 John R. Wright

The following-named officers of the United States Marine Corps and United States Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John C. Archbold
 David B. Ballash
 Don G. Bangs
 Aloysius J. Bannigan
 III
 Arnold L. Belgium
 Francis N. Berdanier
 Ralph A. Berninzoni
 Patsy J. Boglioli
 Stephen Bosbons
 Robert A. Bowman
 Richard A. Burns
 Donald N. Callendo
 John R. Carr, Jr.
 Joseph A. Cole
 Richard O. Compton
 Jack W. Crayne
 Basil F. Dally
 Dave Dichter
 Robert C. Dinsmore
 James L. Doody
 Kenneth R. Erickson
 James E. Frazier
 Lawrence Furstenburg
 Ronald D. Green
 Patrick D. Guifoile
 James C. Hitz
 Joseph P. Jester, Jr.
 Orville B. Johnson
 John F. Kahoun
 Richard M. Kaleta
 Gerald E. Kepler
 Leonard E. Korenek
 Louis C. Kressin
 Arthur B. Kulla
 Jerrel W. Lear
 Hugh N. Leuin
 Bobby F. Long
 John R. Loose
 Warren C. Mahan
 Gordon M. Martin

Willard L. Mattmiller
 Donald A. Mayo
 James R. McQuillan
 Paul F. Melcher
 Bruce B. Miller
 James R. Miller
 Jacob W. Moore
 Marlon C. Morgan
 George S. Morita
 Thomas D. Murphy
 Thomas E. Nessmith
 Donald J. Norris
 Bidie C. Paige, Jr.
 Jimmie L. Pappas
 Alfred R. Parent
 Robert J. Patrick
 Marvin E. Peacock
 James W. Persons
 Robert L. Ray
 Thomas A. Reeves
 Charles D. Riordan
 Harold W. Robbins
 John H. Roberts
 John G. Rudel
 Warren G. Sanborn
 Robert G. Sedan
 John W. Sewell, Jr.
 Gerald D. Shaw
 Spencer W. Smith
 Howard L. Snider
 Calvin B. Steiner
 James B. Talley
 Ronald M. Thompson
 Alvin G. Thorson, Jr.
 Frederick G. Towle
 Henry A. Wheat III
 Bobby W. White
 Kenneth R. Williams
 Richard A. Wilson
 Milton A. Wolfgang
 John M. Wood

with hearts full of praise and gratitude, for Thou hast been our ever-present help and everlasting hope in all our yesterdays.

We are facing new days challenging us with many needs, but we are confident that those needs will be far outnumbered by the abundance of Thy grace and mercies.

May we daily yield our life humbly and gladly to the inspiration and counsel of Thy divine spirit, to be touched to nobler issues and to be used in the service of Thy holy will.

Grant that our minds may be filled with eager and earnest desires to do good unto all mankind in its longings and struggles to find the way of blessedness and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 4, 1955, was read and approved.

PUTTING "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON OUR CURRENCY

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced H. R. 619, to provide that all United States currency shall bear the inscription "In God we trust." This matter was first brought to my attention by the Honorable Donald K. Carroll, president of the Florida bar. He told me that the matter had been brought to his attention shortly after a speech that he had made in Gainesville, Fla. I promptly brought this suggestion to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey, and received a letter in January of this year from the Honorable E. F. Bartelt, Fiscal Assistant Secretary, speaking on behalf of Secretary Humphrey. In Mr. Bartelt's letter he said:

Provision was made by law in 1865 for placing this motto on coins. Another act providing for the inscription became law in 1908. During debate on the 1908 measure, the suggestion was made that the motto be placed on currency, but no action was taken on this point.

From the record of this legislation, which has received careful study recently, the conclusion has been reached that a clear precedent was set for congressional action and that in the absence of action by Congress, no change of that nature should be taken in regard to currency.

I have just received some encouraging news from the Honorable W. Randolph Burgess, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs. He advises me that the President has been interested in this matter and "the principle of having this inscription on our currency is one with which we would all be in agreement, and we have been reviewing with great care the practical problems." Mr. Burgess has further advised me today that a good opportunity for making this change at a negligible cost is now afforded because

new processes for the printing of currency are underway and they find that "the inscription 'In God we trust' can be included in the design with very little additional cost, if it is timed along with these technological changes."

In view of this I sincerely hope that Congress will take speedy action in enacting House Joint Resolution 619 so that our printed currency will henceforth bear the inspirational phrase, "In God we trust."

In these days when imperialistic and materialistic communism seeks to attack and to destroy freedom, it is proper for us to seek continuously for ways to strengthen the foundations of our freedom. At the base of our freedom is our faith in God and the desire of Americans to live by His will and by His guidance. As long as this country trusts in God, it will prevail. To remind all of us of this self-evident truth, it is proper that our currency should carry these inspiring words, coming down to us through our history: "In God we trust."

THE LATE ROBERT B. ARMSTRONG, JR.

Mr. CANNON. 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. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am certain every Member of the House learned with regret of the death of Robert B. Armstrong during the recess of the Congress. Bob Armstrong was one of the best-known reporters of our times and passes on at the untimely age of 52.

Mr. Speaker, there is no provision in the Constitution for the participation of the fourth estate in our form of government. But under unwritten law, more irrevocable than any recorded statutes, the newspapermen who serve with us here in Washington carry a responsibility as important and as effective as that of any who serves in the other three branches of Government. And Bob Armstrong discharged the duties of that responsibility with singular fidelity.

We have an abiding faith that when he handed in his last copy the Great Editor wrote below the finish mark "Duty well performed."

PROPOSED MEDAL OF HONOR TO DR. SALK

Mr. DEROUNIAN. 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. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a suitable medal of honor to be awarded Dr. Jonas Salk for his great contribution to mankind in the discovery of poliomyelitis vaccine. I have

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1955

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

Almighty God, we are coming unto Thee in the sacred attitude of prayer