these same taxes are not paid proportionately by users through the REA power companies. So it would seem that the preference clause subsidizes the users of public power and these people pay less in taxes through their power supplier to create the dams which provide the power on which they have a preference.

If the above interpretation is correct, how is it that you, who have charged yourself with looking out for the interests of the people, are only concerned with protecting the unfair advantage of the 20-percent minority?

Perhaps you will straighten us out in our fallacious reasoning on this preference matter because we know you want to represent all of the people as well as the squirrels.

NEUBERGER ON JOHN DAY

To the EDITOR:

I have read your editorial of May 11 criticizing my opposition to the Coon partnership bill for John Day Dam. I believe your readers may be interested in some facts which the editorial did not disclose.

You infer that—because the Northwest gets one-third of the Nation's Federal funds for multipurpose river projects—this is too much. I contend that—because of the power potential and the need in the Northwest—this is too little. We have 42 percent of the Nation's waterpower potential, and the volume of water carried by the Columbia poses one of the worst flood-control problems in the Nation. Would you propose that the money be spent where there is no power potential and no flood-control problem, merely to equalize geographically the distribution of funds

You said there are no funds for John Day as a Federal project. The total cost of John Day as an authorized Federal project would be about $310 million. Yet you do not explain why Secretary McKay is urging Congress to authorize $1,815,000,000 worth of Federal projects on the upper Colorado River.

Evidently, according to McKay and COON, there is not $310 million in the United States Treasury for John Day Dam, but there is 6 times this much for projects on the upper Colorado.

Of course, the real reason for this contrast is easy to see. John Day is a marvelous power site coveted by the private utilities. The sites on the upper Colorado are marginal and of poor quality. McKay is quite willing to have these developed as Federal projects.

The Cordon-Coon John Day bill of 1954 provided that power companies would put up $164 million to get the power facilities for 50 years. The bill was defeated when Senator MORSE and others opposed it. Now, the Coon John Day bill of 1955 provides that the companies put up $273 million. Isn't this a bald confession that the 1954 version tried to deprive the public of $109 million? How much will the 1956 bill offer?

According to the Army Engineers, the power facilities of John Day are worth $25,538,000 annually. Over 50 years this would amount to a total of $1,276,900,000 worth of electricity at wholesale, for the utilities to sell at a profit. No wonder the reactionary political forces in our State are trying so hard to put across the Coon bill for the private power companies. What a bargain they would get.

Partnership power would be high-cost power. Private utilities pay more interest for their money than does the Federal Government. In addition, partnership power would not be pooled as to costs with the extremely cheap energy now obtained from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Furthermore, piecemeal use of the river reduces administrative efficiency, increases conflicts over use of this great national asset.

Your editorial did not mention the outstanding farmers' rural electric cooperatives, like the Benton-Lincoln Cooperative, which are dependent on the Columbia River Federal dams for their energy. Yet, under the Coon bill for John Day, the preference clause protecting these co-ops will die. The kilowatts will be monopolized by private companies. Where will the co-ops turn for power? They have no generating sources of their own.

As a United States Senator, I regard myself as charged with protecting the public interest. That is why I oppose the Coon bill to surrender the John Day power facilities to private utility companies for half a century.

I appreciate the fine willingness of the editor of Gazette-Times to open his letter columns to discussion of this crucial issue to our State.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

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

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

Our Father God, for this hallowed moment at the day's beginning we would step aside from the crowded highway, with its clamant voices, to seek the garden of the soul; that we may become conscious of Thee, claiming the assurance that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee. As we pause now in reverent silence may this high place of governance, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the hearts of men, where are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves: Cleanse Thou our hearts by Thy grace; feed our minds with Thy truth; guide our feet in Thy paths; teach us that there is no peace save in Thy will. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

John F. Kennedy, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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 the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 6, 1955:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

On May 7, 1955:

S. 948. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

On May 11, 1955:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

On May 23, 1955:

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6063. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 6063. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations may be permitted to hold hearings at any time during this week while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committee, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AUDIT REPORT ON NAVY INDUSTRIAL FUND, NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, BUREAU OF SHIPS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Navy Industrial Fund, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, for the period July 1, 1953, to November 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN PORTIONS OF CAPITOL GROUNDS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to transfer to the District of Columbia jurisdiction over certain portions of the United States Capitol Grounds and other grounds belonging to the United States for use in connection with the widening of Independence and Constitution Avenues and the rechannelization of Union Station Plaza (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Legislative Resolution 32

"Resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation for the improvement of wheat

"Whereas the United States wheat producers have lost much of their foreign markets for wheat; and

"Whereas Nebraska is one of the major quality wheat-producing States; and

"Whereas much of this market is lost because of the poor quality of wheat offered for sale in foreign countries; and

"Whereas present grain standards have not been revised to reflect technological improvements in the handling and processing of wheat: Now, therefore, be it

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

"1. That the Members of Congress and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture be urged to provide the necessary legislation and regulations to achieve an improvement in the quality of product offered for sale in foreign markets by raising the standards, and lowering the tolerances for foreign material, damaged grain and mixed varieties, and to tighten inspection procedures in the case of export shipments to insure that wheat moved on a grade basis actually meets the official requirements for the grade assigned to it.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture.

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

A resolution adopted by the Northern California Culinary Arts Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 4944, to recognize as professionals the National Academy of Chefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and, under the rule, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 7

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 Columbia River is the main navigation artery for Astoria, Portland, and other great Oregon ports; and

Whereas a bar-depth of 48 feet is essential to safety and continued commerce on the Columbia River: 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 be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to deepen the bar at the mouth of the Columbia River to the necessary depth of 48 feet; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by house April 22, 1955.
Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LOW,
Chief Clerk.
E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.
CLINE E. SMUTS,
President of Senate.

House Joint Memorial 9

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 Congress of the United States, acting upon the advice of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, had the vision and foresight to authorize in 1937 a deep-draft ship channel in the Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., for the purpose of creating an extension of the sea lanes of the world to encourage navigation and commerce; and

Whereas completion of this ship channel, originally scheduled for 1942, was deferred because of the military requirements of World War II and subsequently of the Korean conflict; and

Whereas the most recent estimate of the Corps of Engineers is that the sum of $2,764,000 is required for prompt completion of the authorized channel from the lower entrance to the Bonneville Dam locks to The Dalles, with a comparatively small additional maintenance fund appropriation necessary for maintenance work in the completed channel between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville Dam; and

Whereas immediate completion of the authorized project is crucial to the continued progress of development of the Columbia Basin and vital to the economic welfare of the State of Oregon and the entire Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Senate of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to assure completion of the authorized Columbia River ship channel from below Bonneville Dam locks to The Dalles, Oreg., without further delay and to permit the Corps of Engineers to maintain the channel below Bonneville Dam at its authorized depth and width, that the Pacific Northwest may continue to grow and fulfill its destiny as a vital component of the economy of the United States; and be it further

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

Adopted by house April 21, 1955.

Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LAW,
Chief Clerk.

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

ELMO C. SMITH,
President of Senate.

House Joint Memorial 13

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 a substantial majority of the residents of Curry County and Southwest Oregon desires, approves and indorses a construction program for the development of the Chetco River in Curry County in order that there be constructed at the mouth of the river a small craft harbor designed for the use of the public for recreational enjoyment, sport fishing and as a haven for commercial fishing boats, sport fishing boats and other small craft; and

Whereas heretofore the proper designated Federal governmental agencies have investigated the project, and approval of the project has been submitted by the agencies to the Congress of the United States of America, but that further progress of the project has been necessarily deferred because of the emergencies of the World War II and the Korean conflict; and

Whereas the prompt completion of the project is crucial to the continued progress and development of Southern Oregon and Curry County and of the entire Pacific Northwest and is now expedient; and

Whereas the governmental agencies previously approving the matter have estimated that the cost of completion would be less than the sum of $200,000; and

Whereas the construction program for the development of Gold Beach Harbor at the mouth of the Rogue River in Curry County has the wholehearted support of the people of Curry County and the entire Southwest Oregon area together with the lumber and fishing industries of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the United States Army engineers have found a high ratio of benefit to expenditure in connection with the Gold Beach Harbor project; and

Whereas the Gold Beach Harbor project has been authorized by Congress and now needs only the appropriation of funds before construction can begin on the project: 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 be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds necessary to complete the Chetco River harbor development and construction and that provisions be made forthwith by Congress for the construction of the development in accordance with the plan heretofore submitted to Congress and suspended because of national and international emergencies; and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds necessary to carry out the Gold Beach Harbor project already authorized by Congress; and be it further

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

Adopted by house April 22, 1955.

Adopted by senate April 28, 1955.

EDITH BYNON LAW,
Chief Clerk,

E. A. GEARY,
Speaker of House.

ELMO C. SMITH,
President of Senate.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; with amendments (Rept. No. 374).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 34. A bill providing for the leasing by Indian owners of restricted Indian lands in the State of Arizona for certain purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 375).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 2046. A bill to further encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic lead and zinc; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2047. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2048. A bill for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 2049. A bill to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, the first national monument established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2050. A bill to authorize male nurses and medical specialists to be appointed as Reserve officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2051. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Demetrios K. Georgaras; and

S. 2053. A bill for the relief of Ivan Gerasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2054. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by the McGuire Act, so as to declare it to be an unfair method of competition for manufacturers or distributors of commodities subject to resale-price-maintenance contracts to willfully and knowingly sell or deliver such commodities (A) to persons selling same at less than prices prescribed in such contracts or (B) to persons selling same to others who so sell, and to provide for injunctive relief and damages to those injured thereby; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2056. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Wolfe, Jr., et al.; and

S. 2057. A bill for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2058. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to increase the amount of the annuities payable thereunder, and to provide full annuities at age 60 for men who have completed 30 years of service and at age 55 for women who have completed 25 years of service; and

S. 2059. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees, and the survivors of deceased employees, by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2060. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 2061. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2062. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2063. A bill for the relief of Ljuba Kevdzija; and

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Spiros Ferentinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to correct basic deficiences in that act which were repeatedly called to the attention of the Banking and Currency Committee during its recent hearings upon the stock market.

Today an investor in a company which has its stock listed and registered for trading on an exchange gets the following protections:

First. Current information about the financial condition of the company.

Second. Information necessary to enable him to vote intelligently upon matters which are mentioned in proxy solicitations.

Third. Information about trading by officers, directors, and large stockholders in the equity securities of the company. If these persons seek to take advantage of inside information by engaging in short-term trading, their profit may be recovered by the corporation.

Investors in securities not listed on an exchange do not, save for a few minor exceptions, get these protections. No matter how large the corporation, how widely its stock is distributed, or how great the public interest in it, the disclosures I have mentioned need not be made unless the corporation has stock listed on a securities exchange.

The bill I am introducing is designed to end this double standard, which has neither logical foundation nor reasonable basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2054) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF WORKING CAPITAL FUND BY NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2060) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADMISSION OF SPAIN TO MEMBERSHIP IN NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

The concurrent resolution is bipartisan in authorship. It calls for the admission of Spain to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO presently consists of 15 member nations. They are the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

The concurrent resolution would put Congress on record as favoring the admission of Spain to NATO. It would specifically require the Department of State to take all necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO is a tangible recognition of the fact that the free nations of the Western world have a common objective in the struggle against communism.

Spain is of increasingly strategic importance as a valuable ally in the fight to maintain freedom, whether it be cold war or hot war, and it is entirely proper that she should assume full partnership in this effort.

It should be remembered that the United States has made a tremendous investment in Spain, both in the construction of military bases for our possible use and in direct economic aid. In my judgment, the admission of Spain to the community of free nations of which NATO is composed would not only serve to protect that investment but would strengthen our western lifeline of defense as well.

I believe the concurrent resolution is worthy of favorable consideration by the appropriate committee of the Senate, which I assume will be the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope that committee will give the concurrent resolution its prompt attention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators in sponsoring the concurrent resolution directing the Department of State to take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Several weeks ago the final documents were deposited with the Federal Republic of Germany in Bonn, completing years of hard work and negotiation. West Germany has now regained its sovereignty; it has become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and it is now a full partner in the community of free nations in Western Europe.

West Germany has formed an important link in the chain of free nations organized within NATO along the northern perimeter of the Atlantic Ocean and more recently in the Mediterranean. NATO forms a united front beginning in the Western Hemisphere with the United States, north to Canada and Iceland; then across to Norway, down to Denmark, West Germany, the Benelux, the United Kingdom, France, Portugal; then east to Italy, Greece, and Turkey along the Mediterranean. It is rare indeed in the history of mankind that such a large number of nations should be so united. After studying a map of the North Atlantic and Western Europe and taking note of the arrangement of these NATO countries, I fully realize that there is a glaring omission from this roster of free nations. I refer to Spain.

Spain is of great strategic importance. She controls the western entrance to the Mediterranean and could thereby have considerable effect on traffic to the Near East. Spain is strategic from many points of view. She controls the southwest approach to Europe. Portugal, a member of NATO, is isolated from its allies on the Iberian Peninsula. As things now exist, Portugal protrudes like a sore thumb, unprotected. Spain is the only major missing link in this chain of nations.

In recent years normal relations have flourished among the NATO countries and their Spanish neighbor. The Spanish people are contributing and cooperating in the channels of world trade. I can see no sound reason why Spain should not be allowed to contribute to the defense of Western Europe through NATO if she so desires.

The United States has a great deal at stake, economically and militarily, in

Spain. The American Government has invested heavily in the form of grants and loans for economic development and technical assistance. The United States is building four large airbases on the Spanish mainland, in addition to other military installations. If an emergency came up tomorrow or next week through Communist aggression in Europe, American planes could use these bases, which, under the Spanish-American agreements of September 26, 1953, are being enlarged, improved, provided with living quarters for aircrews, with underground fuel tanks and pipelines to the north.

Spain today is one of our strongest partners in the mounting effort of the free world to create a less precarious peace. Spain's position in history and influence on international relations and trade are important to the free world.

It is not important to labor on its importance as a European defense outpost. What is important is that Spain should be a part of NATO. The resolution submitted today would pave the way for an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and United Kingdom are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the primary objective of the treaty is to contribute to the maintenance of peace by making clear the determination of the parties collectively to resist armed attack upon any of them; and

Whereas the parties have joined, pursuant to the treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a collective defense arrangement for the North Atlantic area established within the framework of the United Nations Charter and based upon the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the charter; and

Whereas the membership of Spain would strengthen the strategic position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Department of State should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

INCREASED EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $100,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it prior to July 1, 1956, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF CERTAIN COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any Senators who wish to join in the sponsorship of the bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, be granted permission to do so if they notify the clerk today.

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

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, under authority of the order of the Senate entered earlier today, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] have requested that their names be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 414.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 24, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

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. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the 20th annual meeting of the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss., on May 12, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement entitled "Poland's Constitution of 1791," prepared by him.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Address delivered by him at the Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1955, on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

QUORUM CALL

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

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

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	George	McNamara
Bender	Goldwater	Monroney
Butler	Gore	Morse
Carlson	Hayden	Pastore
Chavez	Hill	Robertson
Clements	Holland	Saltonstall
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lehman	Thurmond
Ellender	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	
Flanders	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the United States has always taken justifiable pride in its merchant marine. It has been a potent factor in the development and progress of our country.

Lately, as on some occasions in the past, it has fallen upon poor times. In an effort to save this precious shipping, legislation has been enacted over the past several decades to guarantee to our American ships, whenever possible, a modest percentage of cargoes exported or imported. This 50–50 legislation, as it is known, applying exclusively to Government-financed cargoes, has helped somewhat. But it is pertinent to note that our United States-flag ships are not carrying one-half of cargoes leaving or coming to this country. Latest avail-

able cargo records show that our ships are transporting little more than 25 percent of all cargoes.

What other maritime nation would permit such a situation without initiating drastic steps to correct it? Yet the United Kingdom and some other nations which have received the beneficence of our Nation's generosity are continually attacking this 50–50 bill, which seeks only a reasonable percentage of Government-financed cargoes, with respect to which a requirement of 100 percent for American vessels would be entirely in order.

The Journal of Commerce, in its issue of last Friday, May 20, has editorially answered the latest bleat from Britain's highest shipping official, Sir Colin Anderson, who levels a charge of discrimination against this country. I ask unanimous consent that this masterful answer to a baseless charge be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks. It probably will not stop our British friends from misrepresenting the situation, but it will set the record straight for our own people who may have been misled by the ceaseless and unfounded clamor about 50–50.

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

SHIPPING OUTLOOK: THE 50–50 LAW

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Discrimination is a dangerous word to bandy about at any time unless you happen to be talking about the finer things in life, like art or music, when it assumes a certain majesty.

We find it necessary, however, to discuss discrimination today—flag discrimination particularly—and how it is being applied specifically to the United States ever since the Butler-Tollefson so-called 50–50 law was enacted last year.

The criticism that has been leveled against this measure abroad during recent months has mounted steadily. It reached a new peak this week when Sir Colin Anderson, president of the International Chamber of Shipping, told delegates from 35 nations representing some 17 million tons of shipping, who attended the Baltic and International Maritime Conference at Copenhagen, that "one of our biggest problems today is United States flag discrimination."

Since this use of the word in a depreciatory sense before such an important group can only result in a false and misleading statement coming to be accepted as genuine by many, unless challenged, it is time to state a few facts.

First. This law does not provide that American-flag ships are to get 50 percent of certain types of cargo to which it applies. The American-flag ship "must be available" and at "reasonable rates." Otherwise, the shipment can move on a foreign ship, as many of them have been handled. Last year, for example, 82 percent of this country's tramp-borne commerce moved in foreign ships, because the 50 tramps still under the United States flag were not able to handle the allowed percentage.

Second. The law applies only to overseas cargo paid for or guaranteed as to payment by the United States Government, including American surplus commodities that are sold for local currency and hence must be covered by dollar appropriations out of the United States Treasury. This local currency is either spent by the United States in that foreign country or allowed to stay there as a grant or long-term loan. Regardless of the final disposition, it is a tab that the American taxpayer must meet.

Third. Cargo preference of the type just mentioned has been applicable in one form or another over several years, or ever since this country engaged on its policy of helping friendly nations at the end of the war. American ships had a priority up to 50 percent of all aid cargo. We do not recall any great furor being raised abroad during this period though the surrounding circumstances, basically, were little different than they are today.

Yet, despite this effort to assist United States shipping, the percentage of our dry cargo trade handled by American bottoms has steadily dropped. In 1946, for example, American ships handled 60.9 percent of our exports and 56.3 percent of our imports. The figures for November 1954, the latest available, show American ships handling 24.4 percent of dry cargo exports and 29.1 percent of imports.

This is rather ironic in view of another observation by Sir Colin at the Copenhagen conference that world trade is 20 percent greater than in 1950 and 50 percent greater than prewar.

United States-flag shipping certainly hasn't been doing too well in this expanding market.

So we have a situation in this 50–50 law where United States flag shipping is not guaranteed any percentage of cargo but must meet certain conditions: Where the cargo involved is directly tied to the taxpayer's dollar; where the so-called preference has been in effect for years; and where, despite this misnamed discrimination, the fleets of every leading maritime nation have expanded while that of this country has declined.

Surely this has not resulted in any restraint of trade. Competitive forces have been freely at work around the world outside this country as the statistics covering the handling of our waterborne commerce indicate.

Overlooked in all this hullabaloo is the fact that whatever flag a vessel flies, it is placed at no disadvantage with American ships in normal trading with this country. We do not have any special port dues, consular fees, berthing preferences and other dodges to aid our shipping.

This is discrimination in the proper meaning of the word as we see it, for these gimmicks are aimed to divert all cargo to a particular nation's shipping, not 50 percent of taxpayers' financed cargo which, in turn, is a small percentage of all cargo moving in and out of our ports.

Our friends abroad have every right, of course, to criticize this statute, but we believe that in labeling it flag discrimination they are putting on a handle that does not fit. In so doing they are letting loose impressions that are not warranted by the simple truth.

FOUR-POWER MEETING OF "SUMMIT" LEADERS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the last few days we have been treated with a blast in Pravda against the United States and its role in preparing for a four-power meeting of the "summit" leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

In the report of the Secretary of State to the President and the Nation over television last week, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it was made abundantly clear that the top-level four-power meeting would be brief and simply identify the areas of friction which might lead to international trouble but would definitely not make any decisions. The matter of procedures and decisions, if any, would be left to be negotiated by the Foreign Ministers of the respective countries.

It is vitally important that this limitation be publicized to the American people because of the fears in many quarters of this top-level conference. In the Herald Tribune of Tuesday, May 23, there appears an editorial entitled "Pravda on a Four-Power Meeting." This editorial brings out clearly the issue as to the scope of the four-power meeting and the proper limitation as set forth by Secretary Dulles and as approved by the President.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be included in my remarks at this point.

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

PRAVDA ON A FOUR-POWER MEETING

Pravda's weekend blast against the United States and its role in preparing for a four-power meeting will hardly be taken as a withdrawal. But it will properly be understood as an advance warning (if warning were needed) that the Soviets will use the conference for their own propaganda purposes.

The note of the Western Powers inviting Russia to attend a top-level meeting set forth th enature of the talks: general conversations, limited to a few days' duration, with the actual work of attaining agreements left to other groups. Now Pravda cries out against the absurd proposals and the unreasonable suggestions of the United States. In particular, it indicates that the heads of States must themselves negotiate substantive solutions, and not confine themselves to preparing the ground for the negotiations of others.

One of the hopeful aspects of the proposed conference was that lengthy arguments over procedure and agenda were to be eliminated. It will be regrettable now if such arguments are revived—and carried on by public charge and countercharge. The Russians may hope to stir dissension within the Western alliance by their attacks on the United States. In that they can hardly have much success. But they do certainly have it in their power to make any conference fruitless.

If that is their plan, they must realize that they will stand under the judgment of the great masses of the world's population who long for peace and look for good faith in the world's leaders.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON ATOMIC DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to proceed briefly under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. President, on February 23, 1955, I introduced in the Senate S. 1200, a bill calling for the establishment of a Commission on Atomic Defense. This would be an 18-member Commission comprised of Members of Congress, the executive department and private industry, charged with the task of making a thorough but rapid study of the problems of industrial dispersal and civil defense. Under the bill, the Commission would report its recommendations to Congress by January 31, 1956.

Earlier in the year the Committee on Armed Services heard the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization urge such a study. The dramatic developments in the field of thermonuclear

warfare make such a study imperative. Only when a body commanding nationwide prestige and respect recommends a practical yet effective program can the people feel assured that what is being done is wise, and, more importantly, that all that can be done is being done.

Since the introduction of my bill, the Secretary of the Air Force on several occasions has called for the movement inland of future airplane and guided missile factories, pointing up the dangers of the geographical concentration of that industry. Now, over the weekend, the chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, Mr. Donald Hughes, has urged "a thorough and realistic study by a special commission" whose job it would be "to recommend how much dispersal we need and how it can be obtained." I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Hughes' letter to the President be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

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

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1955.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last February, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, proposed to Congress that a special commission be appointed to study the problem of industrial and population dispersal. This proposal has not yet been acted upon, and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Senate committee which would make recommendations on such a commission, has informed us that there are no current plans to consider it.

We, the Federation of American Scientists, heartily endorse Dr. Flemming's proposal, and we commend your administration for its awareness of the need for the study of dispersal. We urge you to use your good offices to encourage prompt and effective action by the Federal Government to secure an increased discussion and comprehensive study of population and industrial dispersal as an aid to the defense of the United States.

Dispersal is a means of saving lives and protecting our capacity for defense if war should come. It also makes enemy attack less effective and therefore less likely, giving us time to work out peaceful solutions to our international problems. Economic forces in the United States are already causing some dispersal, but not enough in proportion to the need. The longer we delay in launching an adequate program, the more drastic it would have to be to meet the danger of intercontinental missiles.

Dispersal is a defense that new methods of attack are unlikely to make obsolete, whereas conventional military arms become out-of-date in a short time and must be replaced by new ones at great expense. We are now spending many billions of dollars each year just to maintain our weapons in a state of readiness, while hardly a cent is being applied to the one measure that has a reasonable prospect of lasting effectiveness.

We believe that the following measures should be adopted by the Federal Government:

1. A thorough, realistic study by a special commission to recommend how much dispersal we need and how it can best be obtained. This commission should be composed of recognized experts on military, economic, industrial, and governmental affairs. As specific examples of the areas of policy that should be considered, we would like to suggest the following: (a) Effective dispersal of the Federal Government, (b) Federal aid and initiative in construction of highways and other transportation and communication facilities out of and around target areas, (c) more substantial tax differentials to encourage industrial building in nontarget areas, and (d) Federal aid for hardship cases resulting from the dispersal program.

2. A clear, frank statement to the people by the highest governmental authority with respect to our vulnerability and the measures, such as dispersal, that must be carried out to reduce this vulnerability to a lower level.

It has been almost 10 years since the first atomic bomb explosion made doubtful the survival of large concentrations of population and industry in the case of a major war. The need for all measures to reduce the probability of attack is apparent; the security of the United States is too vitally involved to permit further delay.

Respectfully yours,

DONALD J. HUGHES,
Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to whom my bill was referred, has requested reports from the Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Defense Administration.

I believe congressional action establishing this Commission during the current session would be most prudent. There are many collateral programs through which the Government can encourage industrial dispersal, such as the expansion of our highway system, which the Senate is now considering. The sooner Congress can determine the type of program we need to protect our Nation in the event of atomic attack the sooner we shall be able to pass implementing legislation. I believe, Mr. President, in the event of thermonuclear war that the Nation with the greatest and most rapid powers of recovery after the initial holocaust is the nation which will determine the outcome of such a war. I am therefore urging Congress not to act impulsively on this measure, but at least to authorize its study and thus prepare ourselves to legislate wisely in this field.

PULITZER AWARD TO WILLIAM S. WHITE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago I was greatly gratified to learn that the Pulitzer award had been granted to Mr. William S. White, of the Washington bureau of the New York Times. Mr. White has long been one of the most distinguished and respected members of the Senate press. I believe every Member of the Senate will agree that his reporting has been invariably fair, objective, and accurate.

The award was given to Mr. White for his leadership in letters, specifically in biography, for his book, the Taft Story, published by Harper's. The citation reads:

For your distinguished American biography teaching patriotic and unselfish service to the people, illustrated by an eminent example.

Mr. White's many friends will rejoice in the signal honor which has come to him and wish to join me in congratulating him heartily on this further recognition of his talent as a writer and biographer.

LOOPHOLES IN THE TAX LAW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, later in the week the Senate will consider the recommendation of the Committee on Finance that certain provisions of the tax law which are responsible for two big loopholes be repealed. These loopholes were discovered by Representative MILLS and Representative ZELENKO, and they deserve a great deal of credit for it. Reluctantly, the Treasury Department finally admitted its error of last year.

Now Representative MILLS has discovered another possible windfall. I ask that a statement which he made, which is quoted in an article published in the Evening Star of May 20, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CORPORATE TAX LOOPHOLE COSTING BILLIONS SEEN

Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, said today he has found a new and highly dangerous loophole in last year's tax revision act.

Mr. MILLS said it would cost the Government more than a billion dollars a year in revenue in the future and would give corporations many billions of dollars of tax-free profits from speculating in their own stocks.

Mr. MILLS said Treasury Secretary Humphrey only recently reviewed and approved this revision, and he added in an interview:

"The only conclusion I can reach is that this section was deliberately proposed to provide a windfall for corporations. In all probability, the bigger the corporations are, the more they will make."

There was no immediate comment from the Treasury.

WAS FOE OF ACT

Mr. MILLS was a leading foe of the 1954 act rewriting almost all tax laws, proposed by the Eisenhower administration and backed by most Republicans in Congress. He is a veteran member of the Ways and Means Committee.

The section to which he referred provides that for income tax purposes "no gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation."

The term "treasury stock" means the corporation's own stock, held in its treasury.

Mr. MILLS said it is a common practice among the Nation's 450,000 corporations to buy some of their own stock on the open market and retain it for a time in the company's treasury.

WIDE OPEN INVITATION

The new law, he said, is a "wide open invitation for corporations to speculate and invest in their own stock."

Corporation officials knowing of their firm's plans, he contended, could well buy their own stock at low prices, before taking some action that would tend to increase stock prices, and then sell it for tremendous profits.

Under the old law, Mr. MILLS said, the Government usually tried to collect taxes on all profits from a corporation's dealings in its own stocks. Sometimes courts declined to uphold the tax where the stock transaction was considered a regular part of the business

operation. But the courts always have held that such profits are taxable, he said, if the main purpose of the stock transaction was to make a profit.

He said there is "no limit" on the amount of tax-free profits under the section and "the language is so emphatic, so broad and so definite there is no possibility of recovering the revenue by any Treasury regulation."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Journal of Commerce of May 19, 1954, in its News Letter column stated:

Here's a hot tax tip for profit-minded corporation treasurers and comptrollers, one that appears to have been entirely overlooked by students of the new tax code.

Collect treasury stock—

I interpolate to say it apparently means stock of one's own company—

buy it low, watch it rise, perhaps split it now and then, sell it.

You cannot be taxed on your profits.

That is the hot tip of the Journal of Commerce. Representative MILLS has brought this matter to the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Journal of Commerce be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TAX REPORT: HOW FIRMS CAN EARN TAX-FREE INCOME IS EXPLAINED

WASHINGTON.—Here's a hot tax tip for profit-minded corporation treasurers and comptrollers, one that appears to have been entirely overlooked by students of the new tax code:

Collect treasury stock, buy it low, watch it rise, perhaps split it now and then; sell it.

You cannot be taxed on your profits.

Unlike the old law, which said nothing, the new code contains statutory provisions on the subject.

BASIS OF LITIGATION

Under the old law, regulations dating back to 1934 held that "whether the acquisition or disposition by a corporation of shares of its own capital stock gives rise to taxable gain or deductible loss depends upon the real nature of the transaction, which is to be ascertained from all its facts and circumstances."

Then follows the language that has given rise to two decades of litigation: "But if a corporation deals in its own shares as it might in the shares of another corporation, the resulting gain or loss is to be computed in the same manner as though the corporation were dealing in the shares of another."

As may be recalled, this space last week considered the problem the courts have had in interpreting that somewhat cloudy language. The various circuits of the United States Court of Appeals have been unanimous in holding that profits on the resale of treasury stock (when the transaction does not affect the corporation's capital structure) are, indeed, taxable.

The tax court, after long holding the contrary view, also came around to this position, and the Court of Claims' contrary holding is to be tested in the Supreme Court this fall in the Anderson, Clayton & Co. case.

TREND REVERSED

But the new law sharply reverses the trend court-made law has been taking in the absence of statutory provisions in the old code. The new law has a section 1032, a short section, which states in its entirety:

"No gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation."

In other words, a company holding a block of treasury stock that has appreciated in value and that has perhaps also multiplied through stock splits may now realize statutorily guaranteed untaxable profit in its resale—where prior to 1954 most courts, if not all, would have taxed those profits.

When the new code was being written, the administration calculated no revenue loss attributable to this section.

POSSIBLE LOOPHOLE

The Treasury position was that since it was legally possible for a corporation to cancel its cheaply reacquired treasury stock and float a new issue at the new, higher market value—both capital structure transactions and hence untaxable—the same effect could be achieved by this more round-about route, and that therefore all section 1032 did—so the Treasury assumed, rightly or wrongly—was to remove a technicality become meaningless.

Whether this is in fact true, or whether the new section will spur a movement to deal in treasury stocks, is one of those imponderables that makes miserable the life of a Treasury revenue-effect estimator. No one even knows or can reckon how much treasury stock is being held by the country's 425,000 corporations.

But some of the Government people charged with gathering the revenue privately express fear that section 1032 may turn out to be a revenue loser dwarfing the more highly touted loophole in section 462.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, true to form, the Treasury now denies that there will be any appreciable loss from this windfall, although some have stated it might run as high as another billion dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the reply of the Treasury Department published in the Wall Street Journal of May 23, 1955, under the heading "Lawmaker, Treasury Dispute Size of Loss From New Tax Loophole" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LAWMAKER, TREASURY DISPUTE SIZE OF LOSS FROM NEW TAX LOOPHOLE

WASHINGTON.—Treasury and congressional tax experts are at odds over the seriousness of a new tax loophole uncovered by Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS, a key member of the House Ways and Means Committee, says the situation, which exempts from tax any profit a corporation makes reselling its own stock, is very serious. He declares the provision probably will cost the Treasury far more than the expense reserve fund provision, which Congress now is in the process of repealing at the Treasury's request.

Treasury officials admit they are taking another look at the provision, but say they doubt it involves any great revenue loss. "We're not very excited about it," says one informed Treasury man.

At issue is a provision in last year's tax revision law declaring that "no gain or loss shall be recognized to a corporation on the receipt of money or other property in exchange for the stock (including treasury stock) of such corporation." In other words, the law says that when a corporation has bought back some of its stock and then resells that stock, profit on the resale will be free from tax and any loss on resale will not be tax deductible.

The provision reverses a long series of decisions by Federal circuit courts declaring that profit on the sale of treasury stock is taxable unless there is a legitimate business purpose to the transaction and unless the company actually cancels or retires the stock it buys back and then issues and sells new stock in its place.

The United States Tax Court early last year brought its rulings into conformity with this long-standing view of the various circuit courts. The Court of Claims, however, has taken the stand that any profit is tax free so long as there is a legitimate business purpose to the transaction. It said the company did not have to retire or cancel the reacquired stock and issue new stock instead, in order to have tax-free profit. This case, involving Anderson, Clayton & Co., has been appealed by the Government to the Supreme Court, which already has agreed to hear and decide the appeal.

All these court rulings, however, are now almost academic. They apply only to transactions made before January 1, 1954. For later transactions, the new law applies, with its provision that all profits made by a corporation reselling its own stock will be tax-free.

REPEAL URGED IMMEDIATELY

Mr. MILLS believes that this provision should be repealed retroactively at once. In a letter to Treasury Secretary Humphrey, urging the Treasury to look into the matter immediately, Mr. MILLS said, "a situation may arise under this language that will result in losses to the Treasury in the future in excess of any contemplated by anyone" under the prepaid income and expense reserve fund provision now being repealed by Congress.

Mr. MILLS sent a copy of this letter to House Ways and Means Committee Chairman COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and Senate Finance Committee Chairman BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia. He said he would ask Mr. COOPER for early committee consideration of the matter.

He pointed out that the loss to the Treasury under the reserve fund and prepaid income provisions would be a "one-shot" loss, taking place only in one year and then would be ended. The possible loss under the treasury stock provision, Mr. MILLS said, would be a recurrent loss. "It could cost the United States Treasury in each of several years as much as the reserve fund provision will cost in one year," he asserted. The cost of the reserve fund loophole has been estimated from $500 million up.

Not only will the treasury stock provision cost the Federal Government great loss of revenue, Mr. MILLS said, but it is also "highly conducive to speculation by a corporation in its own stock." He said it would be a tempting source of profit for corporations whose officers know in advance of some corporate situation that will send up the price of its stock.

Arguing that the doctrine laid down by the circuit courts and the Tax Court should be the law of the land, Mr. MILLS said that the provision in last year's law "is clearly a loophole that has to be plugged, and the sooner the better."

TREASURY MEN DOUBT GREAT LOSS

Treasury officials were inclined to doubt any great loss to the Government from the provision cited by Mr. MILLS. "There might be some small change in revenues," said one, "but whether it will be plus or minus we don't know."

They admitted that under the old law profits on the resale of treasury stock were taxable in many cases but pointed out that corporations could avoid taxable gains by canceling the stock and issuing new stock. What's more, they noted, under the old law losses on such sales were tax deductible. They said many corporations were able to arrange sales to create losses to hold down a corporation's tax liability, and thus the

United States Treasury lost considerable amount of revenue under the old system.

Now, the Treasury officials said, losses on the sale of such stock will not be deductible and the Treasury may pick up enough revenue from this fact to offset any loss arising from the fact that the profits on such stock sales are no longer taxable.

The new law treats company dealings in its own stock the way they were before the law was changed in 1934, Treasury men said. The Securities and Exchange Commission has taken this viewpoint "many times," they added.

Mr. MILLS, however, replied that this was "just talk." He declared that under the old law a corporation, in order to claim a tax deductible loss, had to prove a legitimate business purpose in reselling its own stock at a loss, and that this was extremely difficult to do.

"If the Treasury doesn't think it will lose a lot of money from this provision, taking into account all the corporations that already have treasury stock, it will shortly have reason to think otherwise, after it has studied the matter further," Mr. MILLS said. "After all, the Treasury's first opinion on the reserve-fund provision was also that it would not cost the Government much revenue loss."

THE 34TH CONGRESS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a message I am sending to the 34th Congress of the Slovak League of America.

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

A MESSAGE TO THE 34TH CONGRESS OF THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

It gives me great pleasure to send a message of greeting to the Slovak League of America. And, I am particularly delighted to learn that the 34th congress of the league is convening here in our Nation's Capital.

America and the Free World needs organizations which energetically, enthusiastically, and tirelessly fight communism. Democracies are devoted to peace, as indeed they must and should be. But although devoted to peace, democracies must be alert and constantly ready to repel any treacherous advances by those who would destroy their liberty. The record of the Communists as enemies of freedom and as destroyers of the independence of nations is an appalling one. Millions of people have fallen victim to their treacherous tactics of subversion and aggression. Unfortunately among them have been some of the Slovaks whose cause you represent today.

No man is an island, a great writer once said, and no man can be truly free as long as any of his fellowmen are in the chains of servitude. This is the reason why the democratic peoples must do everything they practicably can to bring hope and eventual freedom to those now enslaved by communism. It gives me considerable assurance to know that there are such groups as the Slovak League standing vigilantly on guard, combating tyranny and giving warning that the enemy of our day, world communism, is an uncompromising force of destruction. May the deliberations of the delegates of the Slovak League meeting in their 34th congress bear wholesome and satisfactory results; may there be harmony in Central and Eastern Europe when the Communist forces are rolled back and may nationalistic hostilities abate. And to all of you thus assembled I send my heartiest congratulations and warmest best wishes.

NEWS REPORT OF SENATOR DOUGLAS' ILLNESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for a moment. I know that I bespeak the feelings of all of his colleagues in the Senate in observing this morning that newspaper reports, as so frequently is the case, are again mistaken as to a question of fact. We are delighted to see the Senator appear on the Senate floor in such vigor and health. We are aware of the fact that he, like the rest of us, from time to time, must take special care of himself when a virus bug attacks. However, he has no idea, I am sure, of the consternation that went through this body when the first rumors were circulated that the Senator was seriously ill. We are delighted to see him here today in his usual fighting form, serving the people of Illinois as always in such a statesmanlike manner. We trust that his minor illness will leave him quickly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks.

MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK A UNIQUE PROFESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of my constituents in Portland, Miss Mildred Iverson, has written me:

The pioneer tradition of readiness to help neighbors or strangers who are sick or injured is still very much alive with us, although it has taken new forms.

But, she goes on to say:

The hard facts of personnel shortages are handicapping Oregon's health and medical care authorities in their efforts to improve and expand our health services and medical care programs in order to serve our citizens as they should be served.

In Oregon, it matters a great deal to us that our young people prepare themselves—in new ways—to keep alive the pioneer tradition of helping neighbors or strangers in trouble. Doctors and nurses are, we all know, absolutely essential. I have been interested to learn recently that out of every 100 workers in our civilian health services, only 11 are physicians but that all of the 89 others are considered "essential links in the circle of health protection."

Mr. Ray D. Murphy, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, has called attention to the real threat to all of us unless many more of our undergraduates begin now to prepare themselves for useful and interesting careers in the health field. Mr. Murphy warns:

The tremendous advances which medical and related sciences have made in recent years may not benefit us as quickly as they should if there is a continuing shortage of trained people in the health field. This would be intolerable—and it need not be. * * * The truth is that the health field is short of people. The jobs are there, the need is there.

Mr. Murphy is a practical man who persuaded his board of directors to contribute $1 million, as a public service, to help the National Health Council launch a nationwide campaign of information about health careers, known as Health Career Horizons.

I am very glad, therefore, to have received a letter from Miss Mildred Iverson of the Community Council in Portland, Oreg., calling attention to the opportunities in her own profession of medical social work, one of the many "essential links in the circle of health protection."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the communication which I have received from Miss Iverson.

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

COMMUNITY COUNCIL,
Portland, Oreg., May 19, 1955.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As Oregon's population and industry continue to grow, many persons in this great State are doing their utmost to improve and expand our health services and medical-care programs in order to serve our citizens as they should be served. The pioneer tradition of readiness to help neighbors or strangers who are sick or injured is still very much alive with us although it has taken new forms. We find ourselves handicapped, however, by the hard facts of personnel shortages.

Within the next 2 to 5 years, we must add to our ranks more young men and women who possess the high professional qualifications we demand of those who man our health and medical-care programs. I am writing to ask your help in making known to Oregon college students, their parents and counselors, the career opportunities open to professionally qualified persons in this field in our State.

In my own profession of medical social work we have at least three times as many jobs available as there are qualified applicants. This is true in Oregon and true in the whole country.

Not enough young men and women know that modern medicine's emphasis on the patient as a person gives the medical social worker an increasingly important place on the medical team—a team which includes the doctor, nurse, therapists, and allied professionals. Medical social work is a unique profession, combining as it does knowledge of medical care for the sick and disabled with the skills of social work.

Any young person who likes the medical atmosphere, who wants to help sick people and their families, who likes to work on a team, and who wants to grow with an expanding profession will be proud to wear the white coat of a medical social worker. I have never regretted my choice of this profession nor have any of my colleagues.

Physicians and health authorities in Oregon want and need more medical social workers to help them work with patients and their families when social, psychological, or economic upsets related to illness interfere with recovery and return to normal life. They want people with special professional training to work with crippled children and their parents, with men and women needing vocational rehabilitation, with sick and disabled veterans, with others who have tuberculosis, polio, or the illnesses of old age, to mention but a few examples. Our State and county health departments, as well as private hospitals, also want the services of medical social workers. But they want only persons who meet the educational requirements of a demanding profession.

Medical social work salaries are neither high nor low. A trained but inexperienced beginner in Oregon will probably receive about $3,500 the first year. Experienced

medical social workers with administrative responsibilities will receive about $6,000. Many of the positions are under civil-service systems.

Like all professions, the educational requirements for medical social work are high: a Bachelor's degree from an accredited 4-year college followed by 2 years of postgraduate study at one of the 26 schools of social work offering the medical social work curriculum. This postgraduate study leads to the Master's degree and includes classroom and supervised field work in hospital, clinic, or health agency. Undergraduate preparation should emphasize the social sciences or the biological sciences.

We have at least 16 colleges in Oregon which offer the kind of sound liberal arts undergraduate background future needed by medical social workers before entering a school of social work to prepare themselves for practice as medical social workers. These colleges and universities are Cascade, Eastern Oregon, George Fox, Lewis and Clark, Linfield, Marylhurst, Mount Angel, Northwest Christian, Oregon College of Education, Oregon State, Pacific, Reed, Southern Oregon, University of Oregon, Portland, and Willamette.

Undergraduates in our Oregon colleges and universities, especially those majoring in the social or biological sciences, would do well to investigate the career opportunities of medical social work. Until recent years, Oregon hospitals and health services have had to depend on persons from other States to fill medical social work positions. Now, more medical social workers employed in Oregon are native Oregonians who received their professional education outside the State, but have returned to Oregon to live and work.

Medical social workers in Oregon will be glad to interview any interested students if it is at all possible. Some of us travel within the State on business and might be able to arrange our time to meet with campus groups to answer questions about medical social work and scholarship opportunities. In any event, students, counselors, and parents may secure printed information about professional requirements and schools of social work by writing to the American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1700 I Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Yours very truly,

MILDRED C. IVERSON,
Secretary, Health Division.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], because I now wish to offer an amendment to the road bill. The amendment is along the lines of the colloquy in which the Senator from Tennessee and I engaged on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon. I want him to understand the purpose of the offering of the amendment and of the explanatory remarks I now wish to make concerning it.

Last night, following my colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee, I had another conference with the persons who, as I said yesterday afternoon, had been conferring with me about section 2 (d) of the bill. They seemed to be still somewhat dissatisfied, although they felt that the legislative record which was made yesterday was very helpful.

It is quite possible that with the offering of the amendment as a part of the legislative record, and further discussion of the matter during the course of the debate later today and again tomorrow, the entire matter may be clarified, and the amendment can be withdrawn. Or it may be that further debate will show that the amendment, in some form, at least, ought to be taken to conference.

Be that as it may, with the permission of the Senator, I should like to place my explanation of the amendment in the RECORD. I think I can do this in 2 or 3 minutes. If I should run beyond the 2-minute mark, I assure the Senate that I have only three and one-half pages of manuscript. I wish to have the explanation in the RECORD, where it will be available for the consideration of the Senator from Tennessee and other members of the Committee on Public Works.

At the close of the brief explanation of the amendment, I shall offer it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may make this brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, section 2 (d) of the bill would work grave injustices to the trucking industry and to all operators of large trucks and combinations in several States of the Union, including Nevada, Oregon, Vermont, and New Mexico. I am offering an amendment which would clarify the present section 2 (d) of the bill and make it possible for the laws and practices now in force in the various States to be continued, as the chairman of the subcommittee told the Senate in the debate yesterday it was the intention of his committee so to do.

In the case of the State of Nevada, there are no dimension regulations written into the law, with the result that under section 2 (d) the AASHO—American Association of State Highway Officials—code of 50 feet would automatically impose length dimensions in that State. At the present time tractor-trailer combinations operated from California to the East and from Oregon, Washington and Idaho to the South are 54–55 feet in overall length to conform with size and weights standards in the States I have just mentioned. As a result, if section 2 (d) were enacted, this equipment, of which there are several thousand pieces, would become obsolete overnight—a penalty which the over-the-road trucking industry cannot stand.

Also in the case of Nevada, there is no height limit and automobile transporters are now permitted to travel across that State and other Western States carrying cars the height of which overall is 13 feet 6 inches. In view of the fact that Nevada has no height limitation, the AASHO limit of 12 feet 6 inches would apply, thus obsoleting all automobile transporter equipment operating through that State from California and making it impossible to transport automobiles in the fashion in which they are now transported.

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

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete the statement. Then later in the day, when the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement, has concluded action on the postal pay bill, we can discuss the amendment I propose to offer. But I thought it would be better to place the statement in the RECORD now.

In the State of Oregon, the legal limit for tractor-trailer combinations is 50 feet by law, but the State Highway Commission is authorized to designate specific highways which, in their opinion, are capable of handling longer vehicles and they have so designated several interstate routes which would be on the interstate system, permitting 60 feet instead of 50 feet. Section 2 (d) of the bill specifically refers to laws of the State and there is grave question as to whether regulations issued by an administrative body can be classified as laws and have the effect of law. If they are not, Oregon would find itself with a 50-foot overall limitation for tractor-trailer combinations, thus making obsolete much of the equipment which is in use in that State and which operates through it from California to Washington.

In the State of Vermont, there is no limitation on axle weights, but the weight is computed by the size of the tires. If section 2 (d) becomes effective, the AASHO code of 18,000 pounds per axle would go into effect for Vermont, thus drastically reducing the permissive axle weights now in effect in that State.

The State of New Mexico has already enacted legislation which has been signed by the Governor, considerably increasing gross weights for combinations of vehicles. If section 2 (d) as now written, with the cutoff date of May 1, becomes effective, the legislation passed by the Legislature of New Mexico will be invalidated. Similar legislation has already been enacted by the State of Idaho, and legislation is pending in the State of Pennsylvania to increase both the axle weights and the weights permitted on tractor-trailer combinations.

It should be pointed out that the so-called scientific data on which the AASHO Code is based derives almost entirely from the so-called Bates road test which was conducted in Illinois around 1922. The Maryland test, which has been referred to on the floor, and which was conducted several years ago, showed conclusively that, in the case of rigid pavements, axle weights above 18,000 pounds did not cause any appreciable damage when the pavement rested on a good granular soil, which permitted rain water and drainage water to run off freely. The western State highway officials have recently conducted, in cooperation with the automobile, oil, and trailer industries, a road test of flexible pavement, on which the report has not

yet been published. However, indications are that roads can be built economically which will carry axle loads up to 22,400 pounds under continuous use by heavy trucks. Another comprehensive road test is now about to get underway in Illinois, in cooperation with the automobile industry and the Bureau of Public Roads and the 48 States, to determine the effects of much higher loads than those now in use in the United States on various types of flexible and rigid pavement. It is expected that these tests will show that axle loads considerably higher than 18,000 pounds can be carried on roads built with the proper subbase.

In light of these facts, I believe it would be only fair for the Senate to adopt my amendment which will simply clarify the unclear language in section 2 (d) and carry out exactly what the chairman has said his committee intended, namely, to make it lawful for all vehicles to operate in all States the same as they are now operating. I have set up the cutoff date to July 1, 1956, which is the date on which the funds, as authorized by the bill, would become effective.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee and also to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that all I have sought to do is to tell them very frankly the source of the information. This was all presented to me again in a briefing last night. My mind is perfectly open on the question. I think, however, that so long as there is great concern in the trucking industry over section 2 (d) we have a duty to make perfectly clear just what the effect of section 2 (d) will be.

The representatives of the trucking industry seemed to think that the amendment I have offered—and they wrote it; I did not write it—will, in their judgment, make the clarification which they feel is needed because there is no doubt about their sincerity and very great concern that section 2 (d) in its present form will result in making obsolete tens of thousands of dollars' worth of equipment, so they have said to me.

I have presented the amendment, as I always do, with all my cards on top of the table, and I ask the committtee, during the debate, to consider the contention of the trucking industry, in the hope that if there is merit in their contention my amendment either can be adopted or a modification of it, at least, can go to conference for further clarification; or, on the other hand, we can write into the record of the debate a legislative intent which will define section 2 (d) beyond question of doubt.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will understand my motivation in presenting this material.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The presentation of the amendment by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon is welcome. It will be printed and all of us will have an opportunity to read and study it. So far as I am concerned—and I think, also, I can speak for the committee—the amendment will be given careful consideration. We wish, without question, to implement the policy which was stated in the debate yesterday. If the amendment is needed, we will be prepared to consider and accept it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SYMINGTON in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 19th instant, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 1, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, returned by the President of the United States to the Senate without his approval.

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary 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.

The question is: Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the agreement, there is a limitation of debate of 3 hours, to be controlled by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

Under section 7 of article I of the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is required to be taken on the question now before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, out of the time I control, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I shall not require 5 minutes.

I voted in favor of the postal pay raise bill when it was first passed by the Senate, and I voted for the postal pay raise conference report. I also voted for the postal pay raise bill of last year. I so voted because I believe that those in the postal service sorely need and richly deserve an increase in pay.

This year I voted for this legislation in the hope that the President could be persuaded to approve it. I did so realizing that many in the postal service were opposed to the bill in its final form. I have felt that, most of all, they are in great need of higher pay.

The President has now acted. For the reasons he has stated in his veto message, he has declined to approve the bill. I cannot argue against some of the reasons he has stated for vetoing it.

At the same time, he has expressed a strong desire to approve a bill within the specifications he named. More than this, he has indicated a desire to compromise if those sponsoring the legislation are willing to do so.

There still remains ample time in this session of the Congress for drafting and passing a bill upon which there can be common agreement. The only obstacle to such action may be partisan politics.

If the Democratic leadership, now in control of the Congress, so decrees, postal pay increase legislation can be enacted in the present session. Moreover, the effective date of the increase itself can be made retroactive.

For these reasons I am voting to sustain this veto by the President. I urge that, if the veto is sustained, the Congress proceed at once to pass a postal-pay-raise bill which the President will approve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is at another crossroad. We must decide whether we are going to travel the road which leads to complete domination by the executive branch, or whether we are going to stand up and fight for our rights.

I propose to follow the latter course. Furthermore, I extend an invitation to each and every one of my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to join me in this fight to preserve the prerogatives of Congress. We can win the fight by voting today to sustain the twice-expressed will of Congress on the postal pay bill.

Immediately following delivery of the President's veto message to the Senate, last Thursday, I referred to it as "shameful."

Mr. President, since making that statement, I have had a week to consider the position taken by the President. After studying the veto message I am convinced that the President did not give full and proper study to the compromise agreement. For that reason, the facts set forth in that statement should be discussed in some detail, so there can be no possible misunderstanding of the situation. I propose to direct a few remarks to a review of the history of the pay issue, then to the action taken by the President, and, finally, to the problem which confronts us.

The following is the history of the postal pay raise issue: The last adjustment in the pay of postal employees took place on July 1, 1951. However, the increase granted at that time did not completely close the gap between the cost-of-living and the rate of pay of the

postal employees. Since the cost-of-living has continued to go up, the gap has grown wider and wider with each passing month. This plain fact has never been recognized by the present administration.

The President and his administration have made no sincere effort to give postal employees a pay raise. The record is completely clear in that respect.

Last year the administration wanted two things with respect to the postal service: First, it wanted an increase in the price of the 3-cent stamp—just another form of taxation—which would have cost the American public millions of dollars a year; and, second, it wanted unbridled authority to operate the postal service, with no advice or direction from Congress. The administration boldly offered to purchase these two items for a price. The price was a postage-tax increase and dictatorial powers to Czar Summerfield. It offered to buy both for an increase of less than 5 percent in the pay of postal workers. Just think of it, Mr. President: Bartering a pay raise for additional taxes and dictatorial authority, and doing so in the same cold and callous manner that shares of stock in General Motors have been bought and sold for years by the present Postmaster General.

Congress had a somewhat opposite opinion of the matter. It neither wanted an additional postage tax imposed on the American public, nor did it wish to turn over to the Postmaster General the unbridled authority he so badly wanted. However, Congress did favor a pay raise for the postal employees.

Acting without support of any kind from the administration—or, to state the matter more accurately, in spite of all-out opposition of the administration, Congress enacted a straight pay increase bill in the closing moments of the last session.

The bill enacted by Congress was modest. It was justified. It should have become law. However, it died on the desk of the President, after Congress had adjourned and gone home.

Why did this happen? It happened because the administration was not at all interested in a pay raise. That was only the price it would pay for additional revenue and authority. When these were not forthcoming, the pay increase enacted by Congress was not approved by the President. Let there be no misunderstanding about it, Mr. President; the administration was willing to go along with a modest pay increase only if by that process it could obtain additional revenue and power. When that effort failed, the well-justified increase to our postal employees and other Federal workers was doomed.

That brings us to the present session of Congress. On the Senate side, Senate bill 1 was introduced on the opening day of the session by 21 Members of the Senate. That bill provided for a 10 percent or $400 minimum increase to every postal employee. On January 11, the President sent to the Congress a proposal for a 5 percent increase in basic salaries, with the stipulation that it be coupled with the position classification plan purchased for $50,000 by the Postmaster General from an outside management consulting firm.

Following extensive hearings and weeks of deliberation, Senate bill 1, with minor amendments, was passed by an overwhelming vote in the Senate, and was sent to the House, for its consideration. The House, just as had been done by the Senate, held extensive hearings and devoted weeks of study to the problem, and then by an overwhelming vote passed the bill with amendments calling for a 6-percent increase in the basic salaries and the administration's classification plan, with only minor changes and certain technical corrections.

Accordingly, the Senate and the House conferees had, on the one hand, the Senate version of the bill, providing a 10-percent increase without position classification: and, on the other hand, the House version of the bill, providing a 6-percent increase and the position classification plan of the administration, with minor modifications.

In spite of our skepticism, notwithstanding our doubts, and casting aside our reservations, we finally agreed to accept the position classification features of the House version of the bill. In the true spirit of honest compromise and in the sincere hope and belief that our action would result in an immediate pay increase, we accepted the position classification features of the House version. In return, we were able to obtain an additional increase of 1 percent in the amount of immediate raises. It is this compromise—which then was approved by a vote of 328 to 66 in the House, and by a vote of 66 to 11 in the Senate—that the President returned without his approval. There we have the ugly history.

Mr. President, I turn now to the message from the President of the United States returning without approval the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

The first paragraph of the President's message sets forth three reasons for his not approving the bill. The first reason is that—

> The bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees—

Coupled with this is his statement in paragraph 6 of his message that H. R. 4644, as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—

> could have been, and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal service.

Let us begin our probe and bring out for all to see the exact difference between H. R. 4644, as reported by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—hereinafter referred to as the administration's bill because of its acceptability to the President—and S. 1, as sent to the President and hereinafter referred to as the compromise bill, because it was not acceptable to the President.

First, the administration's bill provided an immediate increase of 6 percent, as against 7 percent provided in the compromise bill. I do not believe any reasonable person would argue long that a difference of only 1 percent is sufficient to make one bill completely good and the other bill completely bad.

Secondly, both the administration's bill and the compromise bill contain a salary schedule made up of 21 different pay levels. These 21 levels represent and recognize the different degrees of job responsibility in the postal service. They establish the basis for giving equal pay for equal work. There are no differences between the administration's bill and the compromise bill in regard to the 21 levels or the jobs that fit into each such level. For example, under both bills, all janitorial jobs are in level 1; all mail handler jobs are in level 3; all special-delivery messengers are in level 4; all letter-carrier jobs are in level 5; and so on up the ladder to level 21 where we find the job of regional director, the top position in the postal field service. Therefore, the position classification features of both bills are the same.

Both the administration's bill and the compromise bill establish an entrance salary rate in each of the 21 levels. Both proposals provide, in addition to the entrance salary rate, 6 annual increases within each of the 21 levels. Therefore, there are no differences in the salary structure of the administration's proposal and the compromise agreement.

What are the differences that make one bill good and make the other bill bad? The differences are few indeed. Senators will be amazed at how small they are and what little it takes to bring the wrath of the administration down upon the Congress.

First. Level 1 under H. R. 4644 has an entrance salary of $2,870 and six annual increases of $100 each. Level 1 under the conference agreement has an entrance salary of $2,890 and six annual increases of $100 each. Thus, there is a difference of $20 a year.

Second. The entrance salary in level 2 is $3,080 under both bills. However, under H. R. 4644, there are six annual increases of $105 each, whereas under the vetoed proposal, the annual increases are $110 each. Think of it—an increase of $5 a year more under S. 1 than under H. R. 4644. And this additional $5 a year increase is not effective now, but occurs only after a full year has elapsed. It is only a potential increase.

Third. Level 5 under the administration's bill has an entrance salary of $3,640 and six annual increases of $120 each. Level 5 under the compromise has an entrance salary of $40 a year more and the six annual increases are $5 a year larger. The $40 a year more for the employees in level 5 amounts to 76 cents a week before tax and retirement deductions. It amounts to less than the price of a loaf of bread a day.

Mr. President, unbelievable as it may seem, these are the only increases made by the conference agreement over what the President now says he will accept.

In summary, the conference agreement raised the amount of immediate increases above the administration's proposal from 6 to 7 percent; added $20 a year to all pay steps in level 1; raised the annual increments in level 2 by $5; and, raised the entrance salary in level 5 by $40 and the annual increments by $5 a year.

Having established that the increases contained in S. 1 are modest in the extreme—so modest that they are hardly worthy of discussion—one must look elsewhere in an effort to justify the President's second veto action. There is only one other difference between H. R. 4644, the administration's bill, and S. 1, the conference agreement, and that occurs in 6 of the top 7 grades of the pay schedule. In these six grades the administration's bill provides annual increases of up to $400 to top officials in the postal service, whereas the conference bill limits the annual increases to these top officials to $250.

One must assume that under the "trickle down" theory of the Eisenhower administration this is the feature of S. 1 that makes it unacceptable to the President.

Mr. President, the President's second reason for not signing the bill is that "the bill creates grave administrative problems, such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates."

The person who misinformed the President on this point should be discharged either for complete incompetency or deliberate misrepresentation. The plain facts are that under our Federal payroll system each employee has an individual pay rate. This is occasioned by the fact that, irrespective of the base rate of pay for any given group of employees after deductions are made for taxes, retirement, and bonds, they have an individual rate of net take-home pay. The charge that grave administrative problems would be created should be dismissed as completely unjustified.

The President's third reason for not signing the bill relates to its cost. The President says he will accept a bill that costs $160 million a year. The actual cost of the pay increase under the compromise agreement is $13 million higher.

The President might, if he wished, reduce his pending request for additional billions for foreign aid by more than enough to cover the cost of the bill he vetoed, and the bill he is quoted as saying he would approve. In fact, this Congress has already reduced a number of the President's requests for money by more than enough to cover the full cost of the bill he has rejected.

Now that we have probed the President's three reasons for not approving the conference agreement and found them wanting, let us give some thought to the problem that confronts us today.

At the request of the President, the present Congress increased its own pay by 50 percent. Democrats and Republicans alike voted for the increase.

The newspapers carried a picture of the President signing the bill. He had a broad smile on his face and was quoted as saying that he did not believe the increase was enough.

At the request of the President, the present Congress increased the pay of our military personnel by 11½ percent on the average. Here again, the President signed the bill into law and was quoted in the press as stating that the increase was long over-due.

Our 800,000 blue-collar workers whose pay is based on local prevailing rates have had upward adjustments in keeping with the increased cost of living.

The present Congress has also increased the pay of the judiciary and that of the district attorneys, and others in the Department of Justice.

How can we—in the face of these facts—vote to longer deny postal employees the raise to which they are entitled?

How can we return home and face our friendly mailman—as he makes his daily call to our doorsteps—if we turn him down here today?

Mr. President, the issue is very clear. In spite of the efforts of the press to becloud the picture and charge the Congress with playing politics with this proposal the President of the United States must assume the responsibility for denying a pay increase to Federal employees. He has, by his lone action, delayed and delayed this deserved increase.

He has placed himself in the ridiculous position of vetoing a 5-percent proposal in August and proposing a 5-percent increase in January, and by vetoing an 8.5-percent proposal while advocating a 7.6-percent bill. I would not be at all surprised to see some stalwart supporter of the President now offer an 8-percent bill and say the administration will accept it.

Yet, even with such flagrant abuse of the basic principles of American Government the Republican-controlled press would have the American people believe the present Congress is interested only in the political aspects of this problem and not in gaining a much needed and deserved increase in pay for the Nation's public servants.

Why do we not place the blame where the blame belongs—squarely on the shoulders of that poor, misguided, and confused man in the White House?

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate should understand that their vote to sustain the President's regrettable action is a vote for the arrogant pride of the present Postmaster General. A vote to override the President's veto is a vote on the side of justice, fair play, and in keeping with the promise that the Nation's postal workers would gain an equitable adjustment in salary without delay.

Let us make no mistake. This vote will show who is in favor of the man who labors hard for his bread.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram, an editorial, and some letters dealing with this subject.

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

DETROIT, MICH., *May 22, 1955.*

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The more than 100 special-delivery messengers in the Detroit post office unanimously endorse S. 1 and urge you to override the veto. We have faith that Congress will correct any inequities in future legislation.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of May 21, 1955]

POSTAL PAY VETO

As had been predicted President Eisenhower has vetoed the pay increase for postal employees. It is reported the President said he would not approve an increase of more than 7.6 percent, whereas the new bill providing for a pay increase of 7 percent and reclassification of jobs and so on would actually amount to a raise of 8.8 percent.

The President may be justified in this alleged attitude, but in view of the colossal expenditures he has approved for giveaway programs, this seems a bit like quibbling. It appears to us from information presented over the last several years that the postal workers have made a clear case to prove that they have been overlooked.

As in other matters it appears that the President's staff of advisers cannot be compared to his staff officers who served under him as a military commander. Possibly he would have done well to bring them along with him.

Anyway, we think the Congress would be justified in overriding the veto.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF., *May 21, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: Enclosed you will find a newspaper article. This article and a number of other things has changed my political views. As a Government employee, I am not allowed to expressed my political views, but in this case I will take my chances.

I am a post office employee and feel a great injustice has been done us in the recent veto of the Postal Pay bill. Many others undoubtedly feel the same.

I know that you and your colleagues (Democratic) are on our side. If your opposition thinks a man with two children can live on $3,270 a year, they should try it.

I hope the Senate and House override the veto.

You may quote me as saying, President Eisenhower did something that Harry Truman could not do—that is, he made a Democrat out of me and my family.

By the enclosed article, it seems that Mr. Summerfield and his assistants are the policy-makers in Washington.

I now have proof that I was mistaken about the Democratic Party. It is the workingman's party. All Democrats have my loyal and devoted support.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *May 19, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: As you know, I was one of the very few employees of the Columbia Post Office who was a Democrat in 1952. However, since the veto of the pay bill today by Eisenhower, I believe that our boys have returned to the fold. I have almost "popped at the seams" laughing at the change in most of the employees from Republican back to Democrat since their pocketbook was touched. Many who were for Eisenhower have told me today I could place my foot in that part of their anatomy

which is close to the "sacroiliac." I just laughed and didn't "kick."

Good luck.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senate is confronted with the necessity this afternoon of determining the action it will take on Senate bill 1, which the President has returned without his approval. We will be given an opportunity to vote and to decide whether we shall override or sustain the President's veto.

Time is running out in this session of Congress for securing pay increases for Federal employees, both postal and classified.

We have marched up the hill, and we have marched down the hill. If the President's veto is sustained, I urge that we take immediate action on a postal pay measure and also on a classified pay measure which can and will be enacted into law. Let us stop shadow boxing and, as Members of the Senate, consider proposed legislation on this subject which can be enacted into law and to which the employees are justly entitled.

For the record it would be well to devote some time to the history of this proposed legislation.

On January 11, 1955, the President recommended to the Congress an adjustment of the salaries of postal employees by 5 percent, along with a salary plan to eliminate inequities which would cost an additional 1½ of payroll, or a total of $129 million a year for both the increase and adjustment of inequities. These recommendations were designed to place the salaries of postal employees in proper relationship to each other and to the salaries paid for similar work in nearly all of the thousands of communities where postal workers are employed.

After extended hearings, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a bipartisan majority of 17 to 6 reported H. R. 4644, which reclassified Postal Field Service salaries and corrected most of the inequities, but at the same time created a special salary level for clerks and letter carriers substantially higher than was recommended. This action and other amendments to the original bill by the committee increased the cost to approximately $160 million a year. As finally reported to the House, H. R. 4644 incorporated some 20 substantial changes in the bill originally proposed by the administration, but with certain exceptions would have accomplished the objective of establishing proper relationships between the salaries for various positions in the postal service based on the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and higher pay for more difficult and responsible work.

However, further amendments to this bill on the House floor destroyed the carefully worked out salary relationships between positions by making 60 changes in the rates provided in the salary schedule, thus creating new inequities.

These changes had the effect of decreasing the salaries proposed for many thousands of employees and increasing the pay proposed for thousands of others, placing the salaries of these employees at a substantially higher level than is paid for similar work in their individual cities and communities. The net further increase in the total cost of the bill resulting from these amendments was $10,700,000 annually.

In attempting to reconcile the difference between the bills passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate, the conference committee, restricted by applicable parliamentary rules, was not able to correct the extreme salary schedule distortions and administrative problems inherent in the bills, but did make changes adding further to the total cost. Thus, the bill now includes inequitable salary schedules and creates monstrous and expensive administrative problems as well as adding $180 million a year to the cost of operating the postal establishment.

The President has stated that in the consideration of such legislation as this there can be reasonable differences of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. However, in any final decision reached, consideration must be given to the Nation's taxpayers who will pay the cost, and the increases must be distributed on a basis that is fair for all employees in relation to the average salaries paid for similar work throughout the Nation.

Among the specific distortions, inequities, and administrative problems which make this proposed legislation unacceptable and unworkable are:

First. More than 20,000 of the 32,546 rural letter carriers now employed would receive pay in excess of the salary schedule in the bill. This absurdity would occur because of the combined effect of the 7 percent general increase and the savings clause, and would have the effect of creating more than 20,000 individual protected salary rates with consequent enormous administrative problems. Remaining rural carriers and all new rural carriers could progress in salary only to the limits provided in the schedule. Thus, employees with idenical routes would have different maximum salary rates.

Second. The bill destroys the historical and correct relationship between salaries of rural and city carriers by providing substantially greater increases and a relatively higher salary schedule for the city carriers. The schedule provides a maximum salary of $4,280 for a rural carrier on a 42-mile route, working 6 days a week, as compared to $4,430 for a city carrier working 5 days a week.

Third. The bill provides two separate salary levels, Nos. 4 and 5, for work of essentially the same level of duties and responsibilities. This provision would make it impossible administratively for the Postmaster General to carry out on a fair basis other sections of the bill which require him to determine which of the two levels should be used for remaining employees whose positions are not assigned specifically to either level.

Fourth. Up to salary level 13 the bill provides step rate pay raises, within a salary range, which increase as the salary levels increase. Above that level the step rates are reduced and made uniform, which has the effect of substantially decreasing the pay raise proposed for positions at these levels, thereby discriminating against key management and supervisory personnel. In fact, new postmasters assigned to these positions would be required to serve for years before receiving even the inadequate salaries provided by the present law enacted in 1951.

Fifth. The salaries provided for the senior clerks and letter carriers, $4,430 to $4,730 per annum, or $2.13 to $2.27 an hour, are substantially higher than the salaries paid by private employers for work of a similar level in most communities of the Nation. Acceptance of these rates would be unfair to the taxpayers who must foot the bill for an unconscionable postal deficit.

Sixth. This bill provides that the further changes in salaries provided by reclassification shall become effective on enactment, though it is agreed that 180 days will be required for the Post Office Department to complete the allocation of all positions to the proper levels. Thus, it would require the reconstruction of a work and placement situation in effect on date of enactment in a department where thousands of assignment changes occur each month. The administrative problem created would appear impossible of a just solution for all employees.

Seventh. The bill directs the Postmaster General to preserve the anniversary dates of employees who were in the automatic grades prior to reclassification, provided that in no case shall a junior employee be advanced ahead of a senior employee in any individual post office or organization unit. Retention of anniversary dates for junior employees would then depend entirely on the circumstances of placement on the separate rosters which would have to be compiled in each post office station or organization unit, rather than the individual's own record of service. Thus, treatment of employees in identical positions with the same service record would vary greatly from office to office throughout the postal establishment, and dates of salary increases would be controlled by administrative accident or a caprice of fate.

For 2 years with the aid of the Congress, the President has been making a sincere and determined effort to improve the personnel system of the Federal service. The Congress has approved much progressive personnel legislation for the benefit of the Government and its employees. Especially notable were the authorization of group life insurance, unemployment compensation, incentive awards, uniform allowances, and removal of restrictive controls on appointments to the career service. During this period, the President consistently urged the enactment of salary legislation for postal employees providing for salary increases to place salaries for the various positions in proper relationship to one another and to the salaries paid by private employers for work of the same level so that the principle of equal pay for equal work

and more pay for more difficult and responsible work would be followed, inequities eliminated, and incentives offered for advancement to positions of greater responsibility.

As was explained in the President's message to the Congress last January 11, a flat percentage increase would not eliminate the serious inequities which presently exist, nor would it correct the antiquated and unfair practice of paying most employees on the basis of job title alone without regard to duties, others on the basis of the number of cubic feet supervised, or solely in relation to number of employees directed.

Mr. President, for nearly 2 years it has been the desire of the great majority of the Members of the Senate to give postal employees a deserved and reasonable salary increase. In order to place money in the pockets of the postal employees, it is essential that Congress enact a salary increase measure which will correct inequities in the present salary structure as well as give all employees an increase which is within the limits the President has indicated he will approve.

Some of us have expressed the belief that the increase should be somewhat larger than it now appears possible to enact into law. But we have delayed long enough, and certainly an increase that can actually becomes a reality is far preferable to postal employees than continued discussion of a larger increase. It is time to quit talking and to act.

Therefore, if today the President's veto is sustained, I propose to introduce a bill, which is virtually identical in offering the same protection to employees with respect to reclassification as the bill which has been rejected by the President but which is less costly in that it restores the salary schedule contained in S. 1489, which I have previously offered as a substitute for S. 1. Further improvements have been made for the benefit and protection of employees and to eliminate certain major inequities and serious administrative problems which the President found objectionable. These changes may be summarized as follows:

First. The effective date of the minimum 6 percent increase which all postal employees will receive under this bill has been made retroactive to March 1, 1955, and the further salary increases resulting from reclassification adjustments will become effective 180 days after enactment.

I do not believe postal employees should be penalized for the delay in the enactment of this legislation, and it is only fair to make the general increase effective March 1. In order that due care may be used in the reclassification and also to permit an opportunity for senior employees to be transferred into the more responsible positions which will result in higher pay, it is essential that the Post Office Department be given a reasonable time to accomplish reclassification.

Second. S. 1 left only special delivery messengers in salary level 4. These employees take exactly the same civil-service examination as city carriers and it has been agreed by the employee organizations as well as the Department that they should be at the same salary level as city carriers. Therefore, this bill, in effect, eliminates salary level 4 by raising the special delivery messengers to the same salary level as city carriers.

Third. The provision agreed upon by the Senate and House conferees to require the Postmaster General to transmit to the Congress a comprehensive report as to the actions taken under the reclassification section of the bill has been included. This provision will enable the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to evaluate the reclassification actions and to take any necessary steps to correct inequities if they appear.

Fourth. Provision is made to retain existing anniversary dates for increases in the automatic grades except in cases where a junior employee would receive so large an increase, in addition to the 6 percent provided, on adjustment to the new schedule that he would pass a senior employee.

The only other changes are technical corrections designed to make clear the intent of the proposed legislation. I am sure that this bill meets the objections which were raised to S. 1. I particularly invite attention to the fact that the salary schedule for rural carriers is such that the proper and traditional relationship is maintained between the pay of these employees and that of the city carriers. This corrects one of the major defects in S. 1 which would have resulted in a serious injustice to the 33,000 rural letter carriers.

As was explained in the President's message to the Congress last January 11, a flat percentage increase would not be acceptable because it would not eliminate the serious inequities which presently exist; nor would it correct the present unfair practice of paying most employees on the basis of job title alone without regard to duties, of paying others on the basis of the number of cubic feet supervised, and paying still others in relation to the number of employees they direct.

In correcting these inequities, every possible protection for employees has been incorporated and each employee is guaranteed that his salary plus the 6-percent increase provided is properly protected.

During the debate on the conference report on S. 1, it was stated that the salary raises provided for clerks and letter carriers in S. 1 amounted to only 90 cents a week per employee more than the increases in the administration bill. Surely, we should not allow such a small amount of difference to stand in the way of immediate enactment of this bill which includes correction of the inequities as recommended by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short analysis of the bill I propose to introduce may follow my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The analysis is as follows:

This bill would—

1. Give all postal employees an increase of 6 percent retroactive to March 1, 1955.

2. Provide the reclassification recommended by the President, which brings total cost to 8 percent of payroll, and guarantee that no employee's pay will be less than his present salary plus 6 percent. Increases for city carriers would total over $41 millions or 8.2 percent of the present payroll for these employees.

3. Correct the injustice to 40,000 rural letter carriers and special delivery carriers by giving them a salary schedule comparable to that of city carriers.

4. Protect anniversary dates for automatic increases based on length of service, except in cases of junior employees who would get additional salary adjustments equivalent to their automatic increases.

5. Correct administrative problems by eliminating individual rates through a proper salary schedule for rural carriers.

6. Restore proper increases for key supervisors, assistant postmasters, and postmasters.

7. Require the Postmaster General to make a complete report to Congress on any classification actions taken in any cases where the specific salary for the job is not stipulated by title and description in the bill.

8. Restore the original larger increases proposed for lower paid clerks and letter carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is very good and most cheering to learn that the United States Senate, particularly the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], has been in touch with those of such great influence in high posts in the Post Office Department, and that the Senate will soon be let in on the kind of pay bill we may pass.

I think it is very peculiar that at this time the great United States Senate and House of Representatives are being made the captives of an arrogant Postmaster General, who has said, in effect, "If the bill does not follow, to the very last page, chapter, and verse, the form that I demand, then there will be no pay increase for the 500,000 loyal, patriotic Federal workers in the postal service."

The Senate this afternoon has a chance to determine whether it will still legislate the pay increases for Federal employees or whether we will surrender our prerogative to the heads of Government bureaus.

The issue, it seems to me, is far more important than the principal monetary difference in the bill—the famous 76 cents a week difference between the Postmaster General's bill and the bill so overwhelmingly passed by both Houses of Congress.

The bill vetoed by the President, at the insistence of the Postmaster General, squarely poses this question. If the Senate supinely abdicates its right to pass upon Federal employment matters, when the difference between two bills is so slight, then we may as well disband the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

We are asked to sustain not a broad principle of government in this veto, but a question of weekly compensation of 62 percent of the 500,000 postal employees—the great body of postal employees—amounting to only 76 cents a

week. We are, in fact, asked to vote to sustain the vanity of Postmaster General Summerfield.

If this were the first veto along these lines, it might not be so surprising. But this is the second of a 1-2 punch at the morale of the large body of postal workers. But Postmaster General Summerfield, the man who guided the Eisenhower crusade, must have his way, no matter what happens to the morale or efficiency of the Government service.

Admittedly the Government workers are entitled to a pay raise. Even the administration admits that. The Government employees have not had a pay increase in 4 years. Yet because of Postmaster General Summerfield and his will to dictate to Congress and to all Government employees, they have waited some 18 months for their Government to do them justice on the increase all parties admit they are entitled to have.

At the outset of the session last year, Congress took up the pay bills. Both Houses worked on the bills, and just before adjournment passed the 5 percent pay increase bill for Government employees. But because Congress failed—or, may I dare to say, refused—to rubberstamp Mr. Summerfield's demands, that pay bill was vetoed. Congress could not override it because of adjournment.

The first bill on which Mr. Summerfield won his veto did not affect merely the 500,000 postal workers under his jurisdiction. It was an omnibus bill affecting the salaries of more than a million other Federal workers with whom Mr. Summerfield is supposed to have no connection. It also carried increases for our congressional employees. But the bill did not suit Mr. Summerfield, so all Government employees—his own, and those in other Government departments, as well—had another year's delay added to their waiting time for an admittedly deserved pay increase.

The reasons then—as now—were strained to the limit. The bill, we were told then, was vetoed because the Congress did not increase the letter mail rate from 3 cents to 4 cents and make other revenue adjustments upward in mail rates. Although the administration had forced through a tax cut, largely for big corporations, it did not seem inconsistent to them to lodge a veto simply because the letter mail rate was not increased to take care of postal salaries. If the same logic is to be followed, a tax bill should accompany every pay increase ever made.

The other reason given for vetoing not only the postal increases, but the pay increases of all other classified workers, as well, was that the bill did not include the reclassification which the Postmaster General had insisted upon.

In some way or other, as we near the election, the Postmaster General and the administration seem to have forgotten or have allowed to become obscure their demand for the 4-cent letter rate. But the demand for Mr. Summerfield's own personal private reclassification ideas is still important enough to win a veto from the President.

So, 18 months after the hearings started, some two million Federal employees have their pay problem tied up with Mr. Summerfield's insistence on dictating in its entirety the act that Congress writes. We were told in the beginning on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that if we did not pass a bill substantially as submitted that a veto was likely.

In the second veto, it is stated by the President that the bill would create new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees.

Let us look at that one. The "bad bill," which the Senate passed on the conference report—66 to 11—and the House passed 328 to 66—stands on all fours with the Postmaster General's "good bill" excepting in very few particulars. The administration bill provides a 6-percent immediate pay increase for all. The congressional bill provides an immediate 7-percent increase for all. Congress, after hearings, consideration of the matter, and knowledge of the inflationary impact, voted to give an increase of 1 percent above the amount dictated by Mr. Summerfield.

Generally the difference is that a slight amount of added pay increases will go to the 62 percent of the postal workers who are the backbone and the legs of the postal service—the post-office clerks and the letter carriers. They will get, as I have said, the sum of 76 cents a week more under reclassification than the Postmaster General wants them to have. Others, such as janitors, the lowest paid in the postal service, will get $1.92 a week more. All others in the great body of the postal working service will get virtually the same under the "bad bill" which was vetoed, or under the "good bill" which Mr. Summerfield insists on pushing through. All of these computations are based upon the starting salaries under the new reclassification schedule.

The higher paid brackets of the postal service, including supervisors, postmasters, and others in positions of an executive or managerial nature, will get the same new higher reclassification pay as recommended by the Postmaster General. Their increases will be of a nature ranging from $500 to $1,400 per year. None of the pay brackets above, at the starting rates, were changed a thin dime in the conference report. Yet because Congress, in its wisdom and determination, saw fit to add 76 cents a week to the pay of 62 percent of all the postal workers, including the clerks and letter carriers, we now find a veto lodged against the bill.

Congress dared to change the annual step increases in the Postmaster General's bill. Perhaps that is one reason why the Postmaster General is so anxious to see the veto sustained. Since such generous increases had been made to compensate for responsibility of the higher posts, the annual step increases were trimmed down. While the Postmaster General had urged step increases for the better paying jobs, amounting to from $260 to $400 a year, Congress had the timerity to reduce this to a standard step increase every year, to $250.

This served two purposes. It saved some money on the total cost of the bill. Another reason was to keep the postal workers in comparable brackets in line with those occupying similar posts in the overall classified civil-service system. The classified service employee receives an increase of $200 after each 18 months of service. This "bad bill" reduces the postal steps in the higher brackets from $260 to $400 ranges to a flat $250 every 12 months for 7 step-ups in pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask to have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have tried to detail the points of difference between the administration bill and a bill the President said was so bad it had to be vetoed to prevent new discriminations or inequities.

If the postal service is to function properly, morale of the principal groups who handle and deliver the mail must be considered, as well as the morale of those in higher paying positions.

Morale, after long, long delay, is at a new low throughout the postal service. It is impossible to estimate the lasting damage this one-two punch given by the Postmaster General has created. Testimony for page after page in the Senate hearings details how thousands of wives and children of our main body of postal employees have to have outside work in order to hold their homes together.

If there is any department in Government that needs high morale and devotion to duty, it is the Department which must preserve the sanctity and integrity of our mail deliveries. Throughout our long history, the postal service has turned in the finest example of true character in devotion to honor and duty.

No employee, however, can continually see his family faced with hardships, his debts ever increasing, and his wife or children finding outside jobs, and be the kind of an employee we must have in Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask to have 1 additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the addition of a mere 76 cents a week, a vindictive Postmaster General insists on his own way, and his alone, in forcing through 2 vetoes to enforce his will on the employees and on the Congress.

Could it be that Mr. Summerfield wants to show he is boss, not only of the postal service, but of the Congress, and the White House as well?

Could it be that the purpose of these 2 vetoes is to drive fear into the hearts of postal employees, and show them that

unless they become Summerfield sycophants their wage proposals will be continually vetoed? Could it be that the Postmaster General is adopting an old and discredited technique of breaking up employees' organizations?

Bear in mind that the Government employees cannot strike. They cannot employ the accepted techniques of wage negotiations which the Congress has provided for all other employees. They rest their case for justice in wage matters with the Congress, where, under the Constitution, it rightfully belongs.

If we abdicate this right to the whims of the Postmaster General—even though the congressional bill parallels that of the Administration in most particulars—we are depriving their loyal workers of their proper day in court.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have long urged, supported, and endeavored to bring about a salary increase for the postal employees. On this my record is very clear.

I urged, more than a year ago, that a postal employees' salary increase bill be acted on.

It is imperative that any Federal job pay should be commensurate with that of private employment.

When Federal wages, retirements, and other related compensation, such as group insurance, lag behind those of private employment, the Federal service is endangered because it does not attract the best of the younger applicants.

If there is a failure to attract the best of our young people, the situation becomes more grave and serious with each passing year, for the reason that the Federal service then does not have the most apt young people qualifying themselves for positions as foremen, supervisors, superintendents, inspectors, and numerous other positions of responsibility.

This I have always recognized, and it was this question, and also the justice of a proper wage for Federal employees, that compelled me to insist to our leadership a year ago that a salary increase bill be approved.

The question now before the Senate is: Shall the veto of S. 1 by President Eisenhower be sustained?

I believe that the President acted in the best interest of all the Federal employees and the service of the postal department when he vetoed S. 1.

S. 1 contained several inequities. If permitted to become law, these would discriminate against large groups of postal employees, such as the rural carriers and special delivery messengers, and would destroy the incentive for men to qualify themselves and strive to obtain promotions to certain supervisory positions.

If there is no incentive to improve one's services, there results a stifling of a great heritage which it should be the privilege of every American citizen to claim—the encouragement of individual initiative and the will to go forward, or to progress.

I have named a few of the shortcomings of S. 1. There are many specific questions that could be amplified and discussed further; however, most of my colleagues are familiar with the various inequities other than those mentioned.

This is only the date of May 24, in this legislative session. We have ample time to approve a salary bill which will be just and fair to all, proper in all of its provisions, and make the pay increase retroactive to March 1 of this calendar year. I shall endeavor to have such a bill enacted at an early date.

The Republican leadership will strive to accomplish such a legislative enactment.

If the Democratic leadership will cooperate with us, we can enact such legislation within the next few weeks, assuring every postal employee of the opportunity of receiving a salary increase, leaving none to lament, "Why did the Congress discriminate against me?"

Therefore, Mr. President, I find these many compelling reasons why S. 1 should not be enacted into law, and I, therefore, support the President and shall vote to sustain his veto.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the veto by the President of Senate bill 1, and I urge all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to take similar action.

I believe the President sent to us a very honest and forthright message which makes clear his reasons for the veto. It fairly outlines the type of legislation which is needed for the Post Office Department, and which will result in a wage increase.

All of us recall the President's special message of January 11, 1955, in which he recommended a general increase in postal salaries and a reclassification of postal jobs which would put that great organization on a businesslike basis. That recommendation, by the President, would, if followed by the Congress, have given a 6½ percent total pay increase, at an aggregate annual cost of $129 million.

The President now advises us that the bill which finally reached his desk was discriminatory, excessive in cost, and filled with inequities.

In these days of streamlined business management and modern, efficient operation, it seems illogical that administrative modernization cannot be accomplished in the Post Office Department.

For years, I have been deeply concerned with our postal service and its fine employees. I firmly believe they are entitled to all the benefits modern management can give them.

I am convinced the President has given dedicated study to this subject. He deserves our wholehearted support, for the benefit of the postal employees, their management, and the customers of the postal service—the taxpayers.

Every Member of the Senate knows it is our firm desire to give the postal employees a real and proper salary increase. Each of us likewise realizes that in order to put additional money in the pockets of postal workers, we must enact a salary-increase measure which will correct the inequities in the present salary structure, and will be within the limits the President can and will approve. Such legislation can and should be considered and enacted during this session.

If we sustain the action of the President in vetoing Senate bill 1, which we should do, I am informed that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], will introduce a bill which will meet all of the several objections to Senate bill 1 and will give all postal employees an increase of 6 percent, retroactive to March 1, 1955.

I, for one, believe it is the responsibility of the President to see to it that the Post Office Department is operated properly and economically and that he should be held accountable for proper stewardship in the executive branch of the Government.

The President has made it abundantly clear that he, too, favors a real and proper salary increase for postal employees, but without discrimination in favor of one group and against another. Assuredly, both the President and Congress wish to be fair to all the half million employees of the postal service.

If we are going to provide adequate pay increases—and I think we should—there should be no discrimination whatsoever.

I believe the lower paid clerks are entitled to equal consideration with the better paid clerks; and that the supervisory personnel, which have had an average increase of only 15 percent since 1939, are also entitled to equitable consideration.

I urge the Senate promptly to sustain the action of the President, and with equal promptness consider and pass the bill which I understand will be introduced by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas. His bill is intended to give the postal workers the desired pay increase and to correct injustices and inequities now existing.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall vote to uphold the hand of the President and to sustain his veto; and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in my strong desire for the enactment of legislation granting an increase in compensation to postal employees, I have, during this year alone, on three occasions voted for such an increase. On one occasion, I voted for a 10 percent raise. The last time proposed legislation for this purpose was before us, I voted for an increase of approximately 8.8 percent. However, when those bills were passed by the Senate, I doubted that they would become law; and in all my correspondence on this subject with my constituents, I cautioned against overoptimism. The President had made it clear he would not approve a bill providing for an increase in excess of 7.6 percent, or one which did not provide for reclassification of postal positions, so as to bring about

proper wage relationships and to eliminate inequities.

Interested as I am in a raise for the postal employees, I have great confidence in the President, and I shall vote to sustain his position. I know his veto is no whim or caprice on his part. He has made his position clear throughout, and I am convinced that the position he has taken is based on a very careful and thorough study. I, for one, am willing to accept his judgment regarding the technicalities of the measure we pass, for I know that both of us are striving for the same objective, namely, a pay increase for the postal employees. The President's veto message makes it clear that it is his hope and it is his recommendation that the Congress will act quickly on a postal pay bill which will be in the public interest and will be fair to all employees of the postal service.

I share that hope. So, Mr. President, with all respect I urge the members of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee to make this problem the first order of business, and to report a bill which will be in line with the President's recommendations, so there will be no further delay in enacting such legislation and in getting an increase into the workers' paychecks. My own investigations and conferences with the workers convince me that this money is badly needed by them, in order to enable them to pay their grocery bills, their doctors' bills, their rent—in short, to enable these workers to pay for all the necessities of life, not the luxuries.

This is a question which should have been settled long ago. When the congressional pay raise bill was before us, I strongly objected to consideration of that bill until we had settled the question of pay raises for both the postal employees and the classified employees. In my opinion, our own pay raise was inappropriate and untimely, and I voted against it.

We shall be remiss in the performance of our duty if we do not act quickly on a bill which will meet the President's recommendations. I urge that such a bill contain a retroactive provision as of March 1, 1955, so the postal workers will not, in the long run, be the losers because of the delay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now 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. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe that the veto message of the President is contradictory in itself, and in my opinion his reasoning is completely fallacious. He points out in his veto message certain alleged defects in the bill which is now before us, on reconsideration, and which was passed by the Senate 2 months ago.

That bill provides for a gross increase in salaries of 8.6 percent. While the President points out certain alleged defects in some of the provisions of the bill, he has said that he is willing to sign a bill providing a pay increase of 7.6 percent. I was interested to hear my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] emphasize the fact that a bill would be introduced which would be substantially identical, in many of its provisions, with the one which was vetoed.

In my opinion it is impossible to correct defects in a bill merely by lowering by 1 percent the increase in the compensation paid to workers, or, as pointed out by the Senator from Oklahoma, by 76 cents a week.

The second fallacy in the President's veto message, it seems to me, is the fact that the President seeks to tie an increase in the salaries of the postal workers to an increase in postal rates.

That, in my opinion, is not only a fallacious point of view, but it is also a dangerous point of view. I do not recall many if any agencies of government except the Post Office Department in which the salaries of the workers are dependent upon the income of the department or agency, and dependent upon whether the department involved sustains a loss or makes a profit. We do not demand that of the armed services. We do not demand it of the public road agency. We do not demand it of the Internal Revenue Service. We do not demand it of Congress itself. We do not demand it in the conduct and operation of our courts.

I repeat, so far as I know—there is no other agency of government of which it is demanded that its income shall balance its outlays.

Mr. President, I voted for the postal pay bill when it was passed by the Senate 2 months ago. I shall vote to override the President's veto. I believe the postal workers are fully entitled to the pay raise provided in the bill which the President has vetoed. In its present form the bill is eminently fair, and the increase in pay for postal workers is long overdue. I very much hope that the veto will be overridden and that there will be no further delay in raising the salaries of the postal workers, who for a long time have been grossly underpaid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am going to vote to override the veto of S. 1 because I believe a 10-percent pay increase for our postal employees is fully justified.

In 1951 classified and postal workers received their last basic pay increase. In the interval, the general cost of living has gone up 3 or 4 percent; this means these Government employees have suffered the equivalent of a 3 or 4 percent cut in wages.

While the pay of postal workers has been remaining stationary since 1951, the weekly pay of office clerical workers in six large representative key cities of the United States rose during the same period by 13 percent. The weekly pay of factory workers went up by approximately 15 percent.

Can anyone claim that justice and equity has been done our postal workers when their pay stayed the same during a time when the wages of men and women in comparable income brackets rose by 13 percent or 15 percent?

Alvin Shuster wrote in the New York Times for Sunday, May 22, 1955, that "in the low as well as the high grades of Federal employment, salary increases in recent years have lagged behind pay increases in private industry."

Furthermore, Mr. President, I dispute the thesis of this administration that postal employees should not receive higher wages until there have been increases in postage rates to pay for these wage boosts.

If a pay increase is proposed for employees of the State Department, does someone advocate raising the fees for passports and visas?

If a pay increase is advocated for employees of the National Park Service, does someone propose a boost in the entrance fees to Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks?

If a pay increase is proposed for employees of the Bonneville Power Administration, does someone propose an increase in Columbia River hydroelectric-power rates?

Only in the Post Office does it seem necessary to balance expenditures with new income before we can properly safeguard the living standards of the employees of that Department.

A Government agency exists for service, not for profit. If it can return a profit to the Treasury, fine and good. But service must come first. Why must the Post Office pay for itself when no such measurement is applied to the Public Health Service, to the Fish and Wildlife Service, to the FBI?

For example, the Hoover Commission would boost parcel-post rates sky high to make that agency profitable. Think what this would do to the thousands of rural people in America, whose only delivery service is parcel post. And this parcel-post increase would surely be followed by huge increases in postal rates for first-class mail, airmail, special delivery, newspapers, books and magazines.

I admit that the Hoover thesis of "those who receive governmental services should pay for them" is persuasive and convincing—that is, until the thesis is closely examined.

What if this theory were put into effect? Would it not mean that only the people with children would pay school taxes—the more children, the more taxes?

Would it not mean that a man whose house burned down would receive a bill from the city for turning out the hook-and-ladder truck? Would it not mean that a family needing police assistance would be billed for the patrolman's time and wages?

I renounce this tooth-and-fang theory. I believe we are indeed our brother's keeper.

I am voting to override the veto of S. 1, of which I am a cosponsor, because I believe the facts justify a 10-percent pay increase for postal employees on the merits.

Even with a 10-percent increase, postal workers still will lag behind the pay increases won since 1951 by office help and factory employees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of the disparity in compensation between city carriers and rural carriers. What would actually happen if Senate bill 1 should be passed over the President's veto would be that each long-service clerk and carrier in level 5 would receive an increase in his base salary amounting to 8.8 percent, whereas a long-service rural carrier, traditionally receiving a comparable salary, would receive only a 5-percent increase under the bill before us.

There are presently 32,546 rural carriers. They serve more than 9 million families, embracing 33 million or more individuals throughout the country. They, too, are concerned in this matter.

Each Member of the Senate has received a copy of a telegram sent by Mr. Warren B. Bledsoe, president of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association. It is dated May 24—today—and is very important.

I read the telegram, as follows:

This is to clarify and reaffirm the position of this Association on Postal Pay Legislation. We supported a 10-percent salary increase both in the House and Senate hearings. It soon became apparent, however, that this goal had to be compromised if postal employees were to receive a needed pay raise. Thus, on April 4, we directed a letter to all Members of the House supporting a compromise agreement within the framework of S. 1489 and H. R. 4644, which would have provided an average increase approximating 8 percent. It has been stated that representatives of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association informed Members of the House that they were entirely satisfied with H. R. 4644 as reported. This is in error. We were not satisfied with the inequitable salary treatment in H. R. 4644 and strongly supported the salary schedule of S. 1489 which would have corrected the inequity. The amendments adopted by the House and conference committee further distorted the inequitable relationship already existing in the bill between the rural schedule and the clerk-carrier schedules.

We have not in the past nor will we in the future support legislation which accords rural carriers inequitable salary treatment when compared with the treatment accorded other postal employees with whom we have historically and with full justification received comparable salaries. We will continue to support legislation which accords fair and honorable salary treatment to rural carriers and all postal employees. In view of the unjustified and unwarranted salary discriminations in the pending legislation and in consideration of the practically unworkable hodgepodge of salary levels it would automatically create for almost 20,000 rural carriers by pushing them through the salary schedule set forth in S. 1, the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association cannot support its enactment into law.

WARREN B. BLEDSOE.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that the very bill that House Members were told the President would approve contained the provisions which the Senator from Kansas now criticizes?

Mr. CARLSON. I am not familiar with that situation. However, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that, as no doubt he will remember, in conference we would have corrected certain inequities had the language of the House and Senate versions of the bill been sufficiently diverse as to permit correction. There was no question between us in conference as to the desirability of such correction, but, because of the circumstances, the conferees could not make it.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator feel that the President should have vetoed the bill merely because of an inequity which could have been corrected by a subsequent bill?

Mr. CARLSON. The President had no other bill before him, and he had to base his judgment on the bill which had been passed and sent to him.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The inequities which have been mentioned were in the bill when we voted on it 2 or 3 weeks ago. The president of the Rural Carriers' Association must have known about it. Why did he wait to express his views until today, when we are about to vote on a veto?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I was advised personally that they were not satisfied with the bill. I do not know whether the Senator from Kentucky was so advised.

Mr. BARKLEY. Personal advice to the Senator from Kansas is not official advice to the Senate, which comes to us today.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state very emphatically that my bill—Senate bill 1489—did correct the inequities, and I so stated to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks editorials regarding postal pay legislation, and some information regarding the operations of the Rural Carriers' Association.

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

[From the New York Times of May 21, 1955]

A POSTAL PAY COMPROMISE

President Eisenhower has rightly based his veto of the S. 1 postal pay bill primarily on the deep disturbance it would cause in the complicated relationships between salaries and job requirements.

It would, he said, create new discriminations or inequities, which would affect many thousands of postal employees. It would add administrative difficulties beyond measure. This would be particularly obnoxious in view of the Department's thoroughgoing proposed reclassification of positions and salaries, designed to do away with present inequities, which was embodied in the original administration bill. S. 1 would throw that whole structure, as well as the present one, badly out of line.

The President has wisely suggested a compromise measure which would do no such violence to sound administration and yet would give postal employees a larger increase than the original bill allowed. This is H. R. 4644, which combines the essential elements of the proposed reclassification with a 7.6 percent average increase. For example, it would raise the basic salary of clerks and city letter carriers to a range of $3,590 to $4,280 a year—a 104- to 100-percent increase over 1939, compared with an 88-percent increase in the cost of living.

The Senate should promptly sustain the President's veto and both Houses should then pass the compromise measure which the President has in effect pledged himself to sign. That the House committee has already approved H. R. 4644 by a substantial bipartisan majority is evidence that its provisions can command influential support on both sides of the aisle.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1955]

A COURAGEOUS VETO

President Eisenhower is right in vetoing the postal pay raise bill. As might be expected, he has aroused a lot of furious protest from civil-service groups, organized labor, and anti-Eisenhower Democrats. But the President refused to sign the same type of bill last year, and he still disapproves for exactly the same reasons. The legislation is unfair and overly expensive.

Since the Senate Democrats, or at least some of them, are going to try next week to override the veto, Mr. Eisenhower has painstakingly explained his grounds for opposition. He is all in favor of a general pay increase, but not one that discriminates against large groups of postal employees (from rural letter carriers to supervisors and postmasters) and fails to heed the necessity for a reclassification system.

The President admits that there can be honest differences of opinion as to what constitutes a suitable raise in pay. He himself proposed 5 percent last January. Together with reclassification to assure equal pay for equal work and extra compensation for the upper rungs, the total increase came to 6½ percent. But, as the veto message emphasizes, "any pay legislation must be fair to all to whom it applies," and it must be administratively sound, and, of course, not an affront to the taxpayer.

The bill which the President vetoed is none of these things. It is inequitable, unworkable from the point of job-classification reform, and horribly costly. Instead of the Eisenhower 6½ percent, Congress voted 8.8-percent increases that contained blessed little to make any management expert happy. This was more than Mr. Eisenhower could endure.

The Presidential veto was an act of courage. There are close to 500,000 postal workers, and they and their kinfolk can exert plenty of pressure. But President Eisenhower, as the delegate of 165,000,000 Americans, saw his duty and did it. The Senate should sustain the veto.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 20, 1955]

FOR A POSTAL PAY RAISE

President Eisenhower's reluctant veto of the postal pay bill throws back on Congress the responsibility for writing a bill he can conscientiously approve. His arguments against the bill are unassailable—yet the fact remains that the postal employees ought to have a raise and have it soon. The administration rightly wants to couple the raise with an increase in the postal rates. But the President, knowing that a postal-rate increase this year is unlikely, would not insist on the rate feature if Congress would pass a pay bill without the discriminatory provisions of the vetoed measure.

Congress is overwhelmingly in sympathy with the request of postal employees for a pay raise. But it allowed partisanship to get the upper hand in the measure it recently approved. As the President said, the measure would create new discriminations and inequities, create grave administrative problems, and impose a heavier burden than necessary on the taxpayer. The vetoed bill would have provided an 8.8-percent overall increase while the administration recommended a somewhat smaller amount. But the size of the increase was not the critical factor in the President's decision. It ought not to be in the next measure, either, for the administration proposal of a 6½-percent raise may not be adequate.

Surely Congress ought to be able to write a bill without the objectionable features. It should begin work on this at once in the interest (to borrow the President's words) of a more speedy, certain, economical, and efficient handling of the mail. This purpose can be achieved only with dedicated and satisfied employees.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 20, 1955]

IKE'S COURAGEOUS VETO

The President has shown political courage in vetoing the bill to raise the pay of postal workers. Nobody, least of all the President, denies that a raise is needed. But this bill was certainly not the answer.

Perhaps its worst feature was that it retained and in fact widened the inequities in pay for different kinds of postal work. Clerks made out much better, relatively, than supervisors and technical people. City letter carriers got more of a raise than rural ones. In all, it went against what the President has described as "the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work."

The bill would have raised pay an average of 8.8 percent. The President—who has to keep in mind that what postal workers get other Government workers will want—has said he will go for a raise of up to 7.6 percent.

Congress ought now to write a bill that will both match the President's figure and give the kind of job incentive that is basic to running any business, and especially the big business that is the Postal Department.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 20, 1955]

EQUAL PAY, EQUAL WORK

Hardly anyone would deny that our postal employees deserve a pay raise. The squabble is over two points: How much the raise should be, and whether postal job classifications should be changed at the same time in order to distribute pay boosts fairly.

President Eisenhower has vetoed the postal pay bill. Within the next few days the Senate, and perhaps the House as well, will vote on whether to override.

The President had no choice but to say "No," in our opinion, and has clearly explained why.

He recommended a postal pay raise months ago. He still stands willing to O. K. a reasonable one which does not discriminate against certain categories of postal workers.

As he said when he vetoed it, "equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work."

That policy is common in private enterprise. It should be common in Government, too. It is ridiculous to expect men of administrative ability to carry supervisory responsibility—or even to seek it—if boss pay is little more than that of the men supervised.

Yet that narrow differential seems to be the goal of the postal employee unions which represent the rank and file and seem to have influence on Capitol Hill far out of proportion to their numbers.

Their attitude is understandable, for union leaders hold power only by "taking care" of their members.

But the Post Office Department belongs to all the people, who pay for it, directly by postage and indirectly by taxes.

Congress should cooperate with the President by passing the kind of pay and reclassification bill he has requested.

And it should also raise postage rates to pay for it.

[From the Evening Star of May 21, 1955]

POLITICS AND PAY

The sooner Congress stops playing politics with postal pay legislation, the sooner postal and other Federal employees will get the salary increases they should have had long ago. Similar political shenanigans last session killed the pay raise. Then, as now, warnings of a presidential veto were ignored. There was no time to try overriding a veto last year. An effort to override the latest veto will be made, of course, but indications point to failure. In the end, Congress undoubtedly will have to pass pay legislation that will be acceptable to the administration.

Chairman JOHNSTON, of the Senate Civil Service Committee, in a statement accusing the President of shameful treatment of postal workers, has attempted to lay the blame for denial of a postal pay raise on the President. But President Eisenhower has not denied postal workers a fair and equitable raise. Senator JOHNSTON himself said that the individual increase voted by Congress would amount only to the cost of "a bottle of milk or so" above the sum approved by the administration. The real hardship comes from the long denial, because of politicking, of any pay increase. And those who have been trying to make political capital out of the pay-raise issue are the ones who should be blamed for doing a disservice to postal and classified employees.

THE RURAL FREE DELIVERY

There are 32,546 rural letter carriers who serve 9,372,621 families (as of June 30, 1953 (latest data available)) and 33,878,226 individuals (as of June 30, 1953).

The average daily time required to serve routes is 37 hours, 48 minutes per week, or almost 38 hours per week.

They work a 6-day week.

Principal base pay for a rural carrier is based on fixed compensation plus an annual rate per mile for each mile up to 30. Thus, a 30-mile route carrier in top pay grade earns an annual salary as follows: Fixed compensation, $1,610; 30 times rate per mile up to 30 of $74 in top pay grade, $2,220; or total annual salary of $3,830.

For each mile over 30 rural carriers are paid an additional $20 per mile per annum. (This pay of $20 per annum for miles over 30 has been standard for many years.)

Analysis of what this means in time required to render service is computed as follows: For that $20 per year for each mile of rural route over 30, the rural carrier travels an aggregate of roughly 280 miles per year (making deductions for Sundays, holidays, and annual leave). This means that for $20 compensation the carrier drives at least 280 miles. Official standards substantiate the fact that it requires approximately 1 hour to drive each 25 miles of rural route. This average time takes into consideration road and weather conditions. Thus, if you break the $20 per mile per annum rate down into hours, you find that for providing service on this mile, the carrier is being compensated at approximately $1.85 to $1.90 per hour. This would be the approximate hourly rate merely for the travel involved and does not take into consideration the factors of providing the service of a complete postal facility to whatever number of patrons reside or conduct business along that mile.

The rural carrier is a post office on wheels—delivers mail, sells stamps and money orders, accepts registered and c. o. d. mail—and, in fact, performs almost every service to the rural patron which can be secured at any post office.

All of this service, the responsibilities involved, the tremendous problems with roads and weather, plus his 6-day workweek, certainly highlights that he is not being overpaid and rightly deserves equitable salary treatment for work performed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kansas signed the conference report, knowing about the inequities; did he not?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. I did sign the conference report. I did not know how else we could complete legislative action, although I knew the inequities were in the bill, and I so stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear that when the Senate voted upon the conference report on S. 1, it is presumed that every Member of the body knew what he was doing. I respectfully suggest that it would be well if the Members of the Senate would try to adhere to that presumption. Having known what we were doing, having had all the facts before us, after a careful consideration of the bill in committee, on the floor of the Senate, then in the conference committee, and, finally in connection with the final vote, it is difficult to understand why any Senator should now admit that they were unaware of any so-called difficulties or limitations in the legislative proposal upon which the Senate acted.

I voted upon the conference report in good faith. I voted on S. 1, as it passed the Senate, in good faith. I think the point has been well made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that

the House bill which the Post Office Department was willing to accept, and which, apparently the President of the United States was willing to sign, included all the so-called difficult administrative problems which now seem to be so bad and so obvious in the President's veto message. The difference between the House bill, in the main, and the conference report which was adopted and which the President has vetoed is a difference of 13 cents for each postal worker, if I am not mistaken. A difference of one pint of milk a day for a member of a postal worker's family.

I must say, Mr. President, that this administration is literally stretching a point and making a mountain out of a molehill when it says that on the basis of administrative principle it must veto this very important and long-overdue measure.

I am somewhat impressed by the President's message. I wish he had spent as much time on the tax bill, which he signed, as he did on the postal pay bill. He has found grave administrative difficulties in this measure, but he did not find a billion-dollar loophole in the tax bill when he signed it. He could not get the pen out fast enough to sign that special interest tax bill, but we now find the Secretary of the Treasury coming to the Congress and admitting that his Department could not see a billion-dollar loophole in the tax bill. Oh, my. But the administration can see a $179 million pay bill. Apparently they have gotten new glasses and a new insight into fiscal responsibility. Practically every competent tax attorney and accountant in America pointed out that the tax bill would offer grave administrative problems to the Treasury, but that did not impede the President in signing the tax bill. Oh, no. He signed a bill which provided millions of dollars of relief for those who needed it the least.

Not long ago the Democrats were accused of being financially irresponsible because they wanted to offer a modicum of tax relief to the average citizen. Because we wanted to help balance the budget we were accused of being financially irresponsible, but when the administration wanted stock dividend credits for a handful of people, that, in Republican parlance, was economic responsibility.

Let us see how much irresponsibility is in the President's veto message.

First, the postal workers have waited 4 long years for an increase in pay.

Second, we passed a bill half a year ago providing for a 5-percent pay increase, and the President vetoed it.

How does it happen that the President could veto a 5-percent bill in the summer of 1954, and now indicate that he is willing to sign a 7.6-percent pay bill in the summer of 1955? I am not impressed by this phony argument of principle and administrative responsibility.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Does not the Senator realize that we are nearer the time when Mr. Eisenhower is going to run to succeed himself than we were when he vetoed the 5-percent pay increase?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do realize that; and I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that his political insight is exceeded only by the logic of his argument.

I watched the administration play percentage points in connection with commodity prices. From a figure of 75 percent they finally got around to 82½ percent.

If the Members of Congress really believe the postal workers are entitled to an increase of pay, let them stand up like men and give it to them.

Where was the protest coming from, for example, in connection with the extra interest rates on the 30-year bond issue which went to large-scale investors? Let the President of the United States explain that situation, when he wants fiscal responsibility and when he says the burden upon the taxpayer is too heavy.

The great President of the United States, through his Secretary of the Treasury, authorized 1-year certificates the interest on which cost the Treasury of the United States an additional $42 million.

On another issue of short-term certificates the additional interest amounted to $30 million. On short-term 10-month certificates, the additional interest amounted to $1,250,000.

This grand, humanitarian, dynamic, progressive administration increased the interest rate on GI loans by 13 percent, costing veterans $269,939.

On commodity-credit price-support loans, there is an annual increase of interest amounting to $14 million which the farmers, who are already hard pressed, must pay.

How about farm disaster loans? Talk about fiscal responsibility and concern for the taxpayers. On emergency disaster loans, the administration tried to sneak through—and I repeat the words "sneak through"—an increase in interest rates from 3 to 5 percent, which would cost the farmers of the United States $1,440,000.

I would be more impressed by the argument about the burden upon the people, Mr. President, if this administration were really concerned about the burden upon the people. Where was their concern for the people when the Dixon-Yates contract was negotiated?

Of all the colossal, massive giveaways of public funds and public interest, the Dixon-Yates contract was the greatest.

Mr. President, I will tell you what is wrong with the bill. What is wrong with the bill is that it was sponsored by and was reported from a committee which was under the general management and chairmanship of a distinguished Member of the Senate who for many years has served the interests of the civil service and postal workers.

The administration is going to have its own bill, not as a matter of principle, because it is going to cut the rates just a little bit. It has a bargain-counter sale coming on for the postal workers. It is going to cut the amount of the increase from 8.8 percent to 7.6 percent. This is not a matter of principle; it is simply a matter of cutting a little closer to the bone, a little deeper; that is all. I wish the administration were half as much concerned about other aspects of the Treasury as it seems to be about this bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator from Minnesota mind a slight correction? It is not a reduction from 8.8 percent to 7.6 percent; it is a reduction from 8.8 percent to 8 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the modification. I have difficulty in keeping up with the administration's manipulations of percentage points.

I suggest that the administration take one good look at the measure and see what is so wrong with it, except for the fact that the administration does not want to pay people on the job what they are worth. I read in the press and I heard in messages that money was worth its hire. That is why interest rates went up, I may say to my distinguished colleagues.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the President's chief official, the pride and joy of the administration—not HUBERT HUMPHREY, but George Humphrey, "Trickle-Down" Humphrey, the pride and joy of the administration—said that money was worth its hire. I agree. So are the postal workers.

It is about time we set a good standard in the Senate for all good men to rally around. There is not one thing wrong with the bill that could not have been corrected long ago. We do not need to get the "death bed" political religion which some people are now getting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have said enough, Mr. President. I am certain that what I have said will at least vindicate the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

THE POSTAL WORKERS PAY A MEASURING STICK FOR MONEY—BILLIONS FOR FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, my remarks which appear on page 3657 of the RECORD of March 24, 1955, and also an excerpt from the Union Postal Clerk magazine, appearing on page 29 of the May 1955 issue.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1955]

POSTAL PAY RAISE LONG OVERDUE—EQUAL INFLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed pay raise for the carriers, clerks, postal transport, and motor vehicle employees is long overdue. The ultimate effect of the deliberate inflation over two decades has finally caught up with the Congress. The chickens have come home to roost, as a result of unbalanced budgets and cheapening money.

TWO WAYS TO REDUCE WAGES

There are two ways to reduce wages. One long recognized way was simply to reduce the pay. The more subtle method, which

has become customary over two decades, is to cheapen the value of money, resulting in higher prices.

The subtle method of inflation has cast less immediate blame on Congress and has always put the postal workers behind, and they never catch up. The increase proposed by the pending legislation is long overdue.

ANALYSIS OF HOUSE BILL 4644

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing an analysis of House bill 4644.

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

Analysis of H. R. 4644

Classification	Proposed level	Number of employees	Present salary	Proposed salary	Ultimate dollar increase	Ultimate percentage increase	Immediate dollar increase	Immediate percentage increase	Years to reach top grade	Amount of yearly step increases
1. Janitor	1	3,202	$2,870- $3,270	$2,870- $3,470	$200	6.1	$200	6.1		
2. Elevator operator	2	1,166	2,970- 3,370	3,080- 3,710	340	10.0	235	6.9	1	$105
3. Order filler	2	212	2,950- 3,430	3,080- 3,710	280	8.1	280	8.1		
4. Clerks, 3d-class post office	2	19,651	2,770- 3,070	3,080- 3,710	640	20.8	220	6.4	4	105
5. Guard	3	650	3,170- 3,570	3,330- 3,990	420	11.7	310	8.6	1	110
6. File clerk	3	1,250	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 3,990	−80	−10.9				
7. Typist	3	125	3,270- 4,070	3,330- 3,990	−80	−10.9				
8. Mail handler	3	25,712	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 3,990	520	15.0	300	8.6	2	110
9. Garageman	3	624	3,170- 3,470	3,330- 3,990	520	15.0	300	8.6	2	110
10. Special-delivery messengers	4	4,533	3,170- 3,770	3,590- 4,280	510	13.5	280	7.3	2	115
11. Motor-vehicle operator	5	4,160	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
12. City carriers	5	121,731	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
13. Distribution clerk	5	113,890	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
14. Window clerks	5	64,750	3,270- 4,070	3,640- 4,360	290	7.1	290	7.1		
15. Automotive mechanics	6	1,192	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	310	7.8	2	125
16. Transfer clerk	6	1,459	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360	8.4		
17. Distribution clerk, railway post office	6	17,107	3,470- 4,270	3,880- 4,630	360	8.4	360	8.4		
18. Claims clerk, post office	6	54	3,270- 4,070	3,880- 4,630	560	13.7	260	6.3	5	125
19. Postmaster, small 3d-class office	6	162	2,883- 3,645	3,880- 4,630	985	27.7	235	6.3	6	125
20. Claims clerk	7	105	3,470- 4,070	4,190- 5,030	960	23.5	260	6.3	5	140
21. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	7	8,005	2,883- 4,298	4,190- 5,030	732	16.9	452	10.5	2	140
22. Foreman, mails	8	564	4,787- 4,896	4,530- 5,460	564	11.5	409	8.3	1	155
23. Postmaster, 3d-class post office	8	1,162	3,781- 4,298	4,530- 5,460	1,162	27.0	387	9.0	5	155
24. General foreman, railway post office	9	640	5,114- 5,270	4,890- 5,910	640	12.1	470	8.9	1	170
25. Assistant postmaster, 1st class	9	940	4,896- 4,970	4,890- 5,910	940	18.1	430	8.4	3	170
26. Postmaster, 2d-class post office	9	840	4,770- 5,070	4,890- 5,910	840	16.5	330	6.5	3	170
27. General foreman, mails	10	1,020	5,005- 5,370	5,280- 6,390	1,020	18.9	465	8.6	3	185
28. Postmaster, small 1st-class post office	10	2,639	5,370- 5,570	5,280- 6,390	820	14.7	450	8.0	2	185
29. Building superintendent	11	7	5,970- 6,270	5,800- 7,000	730	11.6	530	8.4	1	200
30. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	11	1,663	5,670- 6,170	5,800- 7,000	830	13.4	430	6.9	2	200
31. Tour superintendent	12	175	5,270- 5,670	6,380- 7,700	2,030	35.8	710	12.5	6	220
32. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	12	865	6,370- 7,070	6,380- 7,700	630	8.9	630	8.9		
33. Postal inspector	13	385	5,970- 6,770	7,020- 8,460	1,690	24.9	490	7.2	6	240
34. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	13	122	6,570- 7,370	7,020- 8,460	1,090	14.7	610	8.2	2	240
35. Station superintendent	14	15	6,470	7,730- 9,290	2,820	43.5	1,260	19.4	6	260
36. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	54	6,070	7,730- 9,290	3,220	53.0	1,660	27.3	6	260
37. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	14	120	7,370- 7,770	7,730- 9,290	1,520	19.5	480	6.18	4	260
38. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	44	6,270- 6,870	8,500- 10,180	3,310	48.1	1,630	26.0	6	280
39. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	15	54	7,770- 8,770	8,500- 10,180	1,410	16.0	570	6.5	3	280
40. Assistant postmaster, 1st-class post office	16	15	7,070	9,350- 11,150	4,080	57.7	2,280	32.2	6	300
41. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	16	34	8,770- 9,770	9,350- 11,150	1,380	14.1	780	7.9	2	300
42. General superintendent, PTS Division	17	9	8,470	10,300- 12,220	3,750	44.3	1,830	21.6	6	320
43. Assistant postmaster	17	10	7,970- 8,470	10,300- 12,220	3,750	44.3	1,830	21.6	6	320
44. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	17	10	10,770	10,300- 12,220	1,450	13.5	810	7.5	2	320
45. General superintendent, PTS Division	18	3	8,470	11,400- 13,440	4,970	58.7	2,930	34.6	6	340
46. Assistant postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	18	2	8,470	11,400- 13,440	4,970	58.7	2,930	34.6	6	340
47. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	18	15	11,770	11,400- 13,440	1,670	14.2	990	8.5	2	340
48. Postmaster, 1st-class post office	19	10	12,770- 13,770	12,500- 14,660	890	6.5	890	6.03		
49. Postmaster, largest 1st-class post office	20	2	13,770	13,600- 14,800	1,030	7.5	1,030	7.5		
50. Regional director	21	15	12,000- 12,800	14,800	2,000	15.6	2,000	15.6		

BREAKDOWN ON POSTAL PAY

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table which breaks down the 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and the motor vehicle employees.

Of 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and motor vehicle employees in level 5, 213,121 would receive increases of less than $300 under House bill 4644; 180,086 employees would receive increases of less than 7 percent.

The table shows the number of employees in each of the present pay grades in the classifications enumerated in this paragraph, the actual dollar amount they would receive, and the percentage pay increase they would receive under House bill 4644.

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

Present grade	Number of employees	Dollar increase	Percent increase
1	1,492	$370	11.3
2	2,684	270	8.0
3	12,683	290	8.3
4	7,121	310	8.68
5	12,828	330	8.9
6	23,906	230	6.1
7	20,583	250	6.4
8	13,715	270	6.8
9	17,668	290	7.1
9A	39,517	290	6.9
9B	30,723	290	6.7
9C	51,642	290	6.6

RAISE OVERDUE AND SHOULD PASS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the proposed 10 percent increase for postal workers at this time is little enough. The bill should pass.

[From the Postal Union Clerk for May 1955]

TEN PERCENT LITTLE ENOUGH, SAYS SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, OF NEVADA

Vigorous support of the bills increasing pay of postal and Federal employees by 10 percent was given by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE prior to the Senate's passage of both bills on March 25.

The pay increase, Senator MALONE said, is long overdue. For two decades, he declared, wages of the employees have been reduced due to inflation, which has resulted in higher prices, and they have never been able to catch up.

In a statement on the Senate floor on Thursday, March 24, after the postal pay measure was called up by the majority leader, Senator MALONE vigorously endorsed the bill S. 1 and said:

"Mr. President, the proposed pay raise for the carriers, clerks, postal transport, and motor vehicle employees is long overdue. The ultimate effect of the deliberate inflation over two decades has finally caught up with the Congress. The chickens have come home to roost, as a result of unbalanced budgets and cheapening money."

TWO WAYS TO REDUCE WAGES

"There are two ways to reduce wages. One long recognized way was simply to reduce the pay. The more subtle method, which has become customary over two decades, is to cheapen the value of money resulting in higher prices.

"The subtle method of inflation has cast less immediate blame on Congress and has always put the postal workers behind, and they never catch up. The increase proposed by the pending legislation is long overdue."

BREAKDOWN ON POSTAL PAY

"Of 234,562 regular carriers, clerks, and postal transport employees in level 5, and motor vehicle employees in level 5, 213,121 would receive increases of less than $300 under House bill 4644; 180,086 employees would receive increases of less than 7 percent."

RAISE OVERDUE AND SHOULD PASS

"Mr. President, the proposed 10 percent increase for postal workers at this time is little enough. The bill should pass."

In a further statement to the legislative director of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks after the bill passed the Senate, Senator MALONE amplified his views by calling attention to the fact that even the increase provided in the bill S. 1 would not restore the 1939 purchasing power of postal wages. He again placed the blame for present conditions on the cheapening of the American dollar due to inflation, and said that without such inflation postal employees would neither need nor seek an increase.

WILL VOTE TO OVERRIDE VETO

Senator MALONE further stated that he was prepared to vote to override a veto and had already given notice of that intention.

CONGRESS LOWERED WAGES FOR 22 YEARS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 22 years Congress has deliberately lowered wages through inflation, on the theory, I suppose that the money supply can be doubled without affecting its purchasing power.

The real purchasing power of the dollar, on the 1934 basis, is about one-third. Reducing the purchasing power of the dollar after the wages are fixed is dishonest. How long would a merchant last with his shelves loaded with goods paid for on a basis of 3 feet to the yard if Congress passed a bill providing that he must sell the goods on the basis of 4 feet to the yard. It is time that Congress woke up and reestablished as a measuring stick for money the gold standard.

BILLIONS TO FOREIGN NATIONS

It is time we stopped distributing billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money throughout the world without a quid pro quo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to announce that the time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for another 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

PROTECT WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. It is time that we protected the higher living standard of our workingmen and investors in accordance with article I, second 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

COMMON HORSESENSE

We need to use some of the common horsesense we used to be taught in grade school. But ordinary common horsesense is probably the scarcest commodity in the Capital City of the Nation today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] if he is ready to proceed at this time?

Mr. NEELY. I shall speak a little later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, when the conference report on Senate bill 1 was before the Senate, I ventured to say that I thought it was the kind of bill which the President of the United States could approve. I said that as sincerely and as honestly as I could have made any statement.

As I look back today and read again all the utterances which were made by representatives of the administration in the Senate and the House of Representatives, and also in the administrative departments of the Government, I am not at all surprised by the veto of the bill. More than anything else, in connection with the bill and the veto, we have become involved in false pride. Too many prophesied that the bill would be vetoed by the President. The minority leader on the floor of the House, the minority leader on the floor of the Senate—and I say this with all due deference to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—and the Postmaster General of the United States—all of them—said that the President would not sign the bill; that he would veto it.

It has been said that the President gave a thorough study to S. 1. I do not wish to say anything unkind about the President of the United States; I have too much respect for the dignity and the prestige of his high office. But I doubt that any serious study, consideration, and attention were given to the bill at the White House, because if it had so happened, I am afraid that the President would not have used the reasons which he assigned in his veto message in justifying his action.

The distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]—and I wish to say that there is no finer or fairer Member of the Senate than the distinguished Senator from Kansas—has made quite a distinction with reference to the question of rural letter carriers.

Let us consider exactly what has happened. What had been proposed in the administration bill, so far as rural letter carriers were concerned, was that in the first step the increase would be $281. Under S. 1, the first step, the increase is $281.

In the second step the difference would be nothing, for the reason that the increase under the administration bill was $297, and the increase under S. 1 is $297.

We come to the third step. The increase under the administration bill was $313. The increase under S. 1 is $313.

In steps 4, 5, 6, and 7 under Senate bill 1 the rural carriers would receive $100 a year more than they would under the administration bill.

But the important point is that the provisions contained in S. 1 pertaining to rural letter carriers are precisely the same provisions which were in the bill the President had said he could approve.

We come next to the special delivery messengers. We did not touch them at all in conference. As a matter of fact, with respect to special delivery messengers we adopted the very conditions which were contained in the administration bill. That is the second big point made in the veto message.

The administration talks about the burden upon the taxpayers. With complete deference, I may say that I would not be surprised if we witnessed today the biggest flipflop of this session. There is no question at all in my mind that the veto will be sustained because we have already heard from 2 or 3 Members on the other side of the aisle who voted not only for S. 1, which was passed by a vote of 72 to 21 in the Senate, but also voted for the adoption of the conference report which was agreed to by a vote of 66 to 11, but who today have said in the Senate, "I am compelled to vote to sustain the veto because there are inequities in the bill."

If they should be asked what the inequities were, they would politely say that they were speaking on limited time and could not answer the question.

I know we are not going to change the mind of any Senator at this late hour. We will not save any souls on the floor of the Senate. But this is really significant: We are told today that the President will approve a bill which will amount to an 8 percent increase. This is how picayune we are getting: The difference between the bill which he would sign and the bill which he has vetoed amounts to approximately $8 million.

I will admit that the President did not let BILL KNOWLAND down; he did not let JOE MARTIN down; he did not let Mr. Summerfield down. He made their prophecies stand good. They said on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that the President would never sign the bill, and he did not let them down. They took note of the fact that what they said was true, and they carried out their charge. There was no question about that. But who was let down, Mr. President? The 500,000 small postal workers of the United States of America. And who are they? Are they traveling around in Cadillacs? Do they have unlimited money to spend and funds to send their children to the best colleges? Oh, no.

What is the difference we are talking about? Only 76 cents a week. When one considers that this is the biggest giveaway administration in the history of the United States, how careful we are becoming in the month of May.

It will make no difference how long I talk on this question, Mr. President. I think the result is already pretty well foregone. It might well be, and the chances are, that representatives of the administration wanted a Republican bill. I do not say that is the fact; I do not know; but for the life of me I cannot understand what justification there was for the vetoing of a bill which provided for an 8.6-percent increase and, at the same time, saying, "If you send me a bill that will provide for only an 8-percent increase, I will approve it." How ridiculous can we get?

Mr. President, I do not know the real background of everything that led up to the veto, but the bill which came from the administration provided for a flat 5-percent increase, plus 1.5 by reason of its position classification features, and it would have cost $129 million.

The House passed a bill providing for a 6-percent increase, plus classification amounting to another 2.2 percent which would have cost $164 million.

No conferees from the Senate could ever be fairer and more understanding than were the conferees who were appointed to carry out the mandate of the Senate on S. 1.

We went as far as we could go and still protect and defend the prestige of this august body. We came from the conference committee with a bill which would have cost the people of the United States $173 million. The difference between the cost of a bill which the President said he would accept and the one which the Congress passed is so small that it shocks me to think that it could have been vetoed.

Mr. President, perhaps Congress will pass another postal pay bill. Maybe it will be a bill which the President of the United States will approve. The picture now is so confused that I really do not know what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. We still have to take the

administration's word for it. But, come what may, one thing I do know, Mr. President, is that while the statements and the utterances and the admonitions of many persons representing the administration may be upheld we did let down the 500,000 postal workers.

I hope that, regardless of what happens, the Senate will finally pass a bill which will give some relief to these faithful workers of the United States of America.

I know the Senate will not override the veto today, Mr. President. I say that as sincerely and as honestly as I can, but honestly and sincerely as I say that I also say I do not think any man can rise and in good conscience gloat over that fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not so egotistical as to think that anything I may say will change or will affect a single vote. Nevertheless, I wish to submit my views on the pending questions; and I hope my presentation will be quite brief.

Mr. President, the bill does not now contain a single sentence or a single paragraph which was not in it when the Senate passed it before. The bill does not now contain a single defect or a single inequity which was not in it when it was passed. The bill was first passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 in favor of its passage to a very small number of votes in opposition. On the second occasion, when the question was on agreeing to the conference report, the vote in the Senate was 66 to 11 in favor of agreeing to the report. Every shortcoming now in the bill was in it on both those occasions, and we are bound to assume that Senators knew they were in it when they voted for it. Otherwise, that would be a serious reflection on the intelligence of the Senators who voted for the bill. I am not willing to make such a reflection on the intellectual capacity of Senators of the United States.

I am told that the difference between the overall cost of this bill and one the President would sign is approximately $8 million a year, and that in some individual cases it amounts to 90 cents a week. Yet the President has vetoed the bill because of inequities which we knew were in it—if any were in it, which I deny—and any Senator who voted for the bill in the first instance, and who later voted in favor of agreeing to the conference report, when it was before this body, and who now will vote to sustain the President's veto, was either wrong then or he will be wrong now; he cannot be right both times.

So, Mr. President, approximately $8 million is involved, as I understand, as the difference between the bill we have passed and a bill which we are told the President would approve. I ask the chairman of the committee whether my understanding of that matter is correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this situation reminds me of an occasion when I was in the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee reported a bill appropriating $14,927,868.92. One Member of the House rose and said, "Mr. Speaker, I can understand the big figures, but I should like to have the chairman of the committee explain the 92 cents in the bill." [Laughter.] It took an hour to explain the reason for the inclusion of the 92 cents.

I am also reminded very much of an old saying which I once heard from an orator who was a great expert in playing on words. In order to reduce something from the sublime to the ridiculous, he said, "The lightnings flashed, the thunders roared—and killed a chigger." [Laughter.] Mr. President, that seems to be what has happened here.

A few weeks ago we voted overwhelmingly to increase our own salaries, not by 8.8 percent, but by 50 percent. The President recommended that that be done, and he signed the bill. I realize that the overall amount of the increase involved in that bill was not so great as the overall amount of the increase involved in this one. In that case, only 96 Senators and 435 Members of the House of Representatives were involved, whereas the bill before us involves 535,000 postal employees. However, individually, as Members of the Senate or Members of the House of Representatives, the Members of Congress have no more claim to a 50-percent increase in pay than the postal employees have to an 8.8-percent pay increase.

At about the same time we voted for a 10-percent increase in the pay of all other Government employees, including our own office staffs. The House of Representatives has not yet acted on that bill, and I do not know what the House will do regarding it. But there has been no great protest against the bill, either on the part of the President or on the part of anyone else in the administration.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me especially peculiar that so great an assault is made against a bill providing so modest a pay increase for the postal employees of the Nation, who on the darkest nights and in the roughest weather must go forth and deliver to us the mail—the messages which come to us, either for business or for pleasure, from our friends and our kinfolk. These are the employees whose proposed pay increase is now inveighed against.

Mr. President, I shall vote that the bill be passed, notwithstanding the President's veto of it. I am sorry that it seems that the Senate will not be able to pass the bill over the veto. But if we cannot, we cannot.

However, Mr. President, those of us who voted for the bill in the beginning because we thought we were right then, stand by our guns now, because we still think we were right then; and we can only do our duty, no matter what it is.

Mr. President, I shall take great pleasure in voting to override the President's veto, because I think it is unjust, unfair, and based on petty considerations which should not enter into the consideration of a great bill of this sort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains to this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 22 minutes remaining under his control, and the other side has 49 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me an additional one-half minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, merely to emphasize what I said a moment ago about the pay increases which have been provided for other groups, I now wish to call attention to the fact that Congress has voted to increase by 12½ percent the pay of the military, and the President has signed that measure. It seems that only the postal employees are the forgotten men and women of this Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the minority leader will be able to yield some time at this point. Only 22 minutes remain to this side.

While I am waiting for the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that I may now suggest the absence of a quorum, without having the time required for the quorum call charged to either side.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I now 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. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course there is no question about the fact that

under Article I, section 7, of the Constitution, the President of the United States has the constitutional power and right to veto the pending piece of legislation. Yet I respectfully suggest today that what we ought to do is to review the constitutional origin of Article I, section 7, of the Constitution. If we do, we shall find that it was not the intention of the constitutional fathers that the President of the United States should set himself up as a superlegislature. The veto check was placed in the Constitution in order to provide an executive check in protecting the interests of the American people against violations of our constitutional system by the legislative branch of the Government. It was not intended that the President's legislative will should be imposed upon the legislative branch of the Government except when a clear violation of our constitutional system was involved or a clear infringement of sound public policy was involved.

Although throughout the history of our country Presidents have expressed their subjective legislative views by throwing vetoes at the Congress, nevertheless, I respectfully submit today that the primary purpose of the veto check in the Constitution of the United States is to see to it, through the executive, that we, as legislators, do not do violence to our representative system of government.

What have we in this case? We certainly do not have a bill which does violence to our representative system or to sound legislative policy. On the contrary, we have a bill which was worked out very carefully by committees in both Houses of the legislative branch, a bill which represents reasonable compromises in the legislative processes to the end that we brought forth in the House and in the Senate a bill which could be properly described as a nonpartisan piece of legislation.

To prove that statement we have only to look at the votes by which the bill passed in both Houses of Congress. Republicans and Democrats alike, by a large majority, voted for the bill. It is a fair bill. It is an equitable bill. In my judgment it is a good bill. But let us be frank. Republicans and Democrats alike thought it was a fair and good bill. It was passed by a vote which, if Members held to the same opinion still, would clearly make it possible for us to override the veto by a substantial margin.

But the Republican partisan whip has been cracked on the Republicans. A subject which should be nonpartisan has now become highly partisan in the thinking of many Members of Congress. I think that is to be regretted.

Who suffers? In this instance a group of postal workers. But let me say to Government workers in general, "You may be next. It is the postal workers this time, but you may be next."

In my judgment we should not sit idly by in the Congress of the United States and allow the President to function as a super legislature. In this instance the Congress has not infringed or impinged in the slightest degree whatsoever upon our system of representative government. We have passed a good bill.

What has happened is that the President has been sold a bill of goods by Summerfield; and it is a rotten bill of goods. It is a bill of goods which does not augur well for the future of Government employees. We ought to stand firm here today, as Republicans and Democrats alike, in support of the legislative judgment we rendered not so long ago, when, by substantial majorities in both Houses of Congress, we placed our stamp of legislative approval on this bill.

In closing I invite attention to what I think, even from the standpoint of the exercise of legislative judgment by the President of the United States, is excedingly poor judgment.

The President speaks of the financial aspects of the bill. I say to him, "Mr. President, why did you not talk that way when you were trying to obtain support for such a huge increase in salary for the lawmakers and judges of the country?" In my judgment, those salary increases were all out of proportion to good, sound public policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President we have before us a bill which calls for a small increase in salary, an increase, on the average of 8.6 percent, for some of the most public spirited public servants we have, the postal workers of the country.

We have a President who vetoes the bill in terms of economy with regard to that increase, and who talks also in terms of classification and the relationship of postal pay to postal rates. We ought to separate the classification issue and the postal rate issue from the question of how much money the postal workers deserve in order to have a fair and decent wage from the taxpayers of the country.

I close by saying that a reading of the bill shows that it is a fair and equitable bill. The Congress of the United States should give its answer to the President today for what I consider, in the light of the history of the veto power under the Constitution of the United States, to be an abuse of such power. The President should be overruled in the Senate by a substantial vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, so long as I remain a Member of the Senate I do not propose to be a stooge for any member of the Cabinet. When I was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 80th Congress, not once did the Postmaster General come before our committee and tell us what to do. If he had tried to do so, we would have thrown him out of the committee.

However, when S. 1 came before the committee, we had the spectacle of Mr. Summerfield coming before the committee and telling us that unless we did so and so the President would veto the bill.

I should like to know how any Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle would feel, if he were chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and a member of the Cabinet walked into his committee and told him that unless his committee did so and so the President would veto the bill being considered by the committee.

That is the spectacle we had in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As every member of the committee knows, so far as I am concerned, I will not let any member of the Cabinet do that.

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

Mr. LANGER. I have only 3 minutes, but I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When the Langer-Chavez bill passed, increasing benefits to the Federal employees, did we have one word from any Government department or agency?

Mr. LANGER. Indeed, we did not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not one word. We carried on the work, and we did pretty well, I believe.

Mr. LANGER. The action of Mr. Summerfield is probably due to the fact that he was formerly chairman of the National Republican Party. In the last election he could not even reelect his own Representative, and he lost even his own Senator from Michigan. Maybe it is due to the fact that he is always sticking his nose into someone else's business.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I shall vote to override the veto, and I shall vote the way the people of the United States expect us to vote under the Constitution, as Senators of the United States, not by dictation from any member of the Cabinet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I was a little amazed by the remark of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon wherein he purported to question the presidential veto. I do not know whether he was questioning the constitutionality of the veto, or its propriety. Certainly, under the Constitution, the President was exercising his constitutional responsibility. He is charged with that responsibility under the Constitution.

The President gave consideration to the pending legislation. He is a man of sincere convictions. He is interested in having fairly and equitably paid postal employees, as well as fairly and equitably paid employees of the other departments of Government. I do not believe he lightly undertook to veto the bill. In accordance with his views on the subject, his veto is entitled to respectful attention on the part of the Senate.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD.

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

Year	Average base salaries of postal employees	Percentage increase of salaries over 1945	Average monthly consumers' price index (1947–49 as base)	Percentage increase in consumers' price index over 1945
1945	$1,769		76.9	
1946	2,390	35.1	83.4	8.5
1947	2,649	49.7	95.5	24.2
1948	2,666	50.7	102.8	33.7
1949	3,106	75.6	101.8	32.4
1950	3,273	85.0	102.8	33.7
1951	3,344	89.0	111.0	44.3
1952	3,828	116.4	113.5	47.6
1953	3,817	115.8	114.4	48.8
1954	3,855	117.9	114.8	49.3
April 1955			114.3	48.6

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President it will be observed that the base salaries of postal employees have increased from $1,769 in 1945, to $2,390 in 1946, to $2,649 in 1947, to $2,666 in 1948, to $3,106 in 1949, to $3,273 in 1950 to $3,344 in 1951, to $3,828 in 1952, to $3,817 in 1953, to $3,855 in 1954.

The percentage increase in the average base salary of postal employees is 117.9 percent.

During the period 1945 to 1955 the percentage increase in the consumers' price index was 48.6 percent.

The President of the United States desires an equitable increase in postal salaries. It is my belief that the postal service is one of the finest services in the Federal Government. I believe that with some statesmanship on the part of some of their leaders, the postal workers could have benefited from the passage of a bill which would have given them an increase in salary, not, to be sure, to the full extent they might have desired, but an increase which would have been in keeping with the increased cost of living, and perhaps considerably above that.

Congress has been fair and equitable in its treatment of the postal workers. I believe it will continue to be so over the years.

For the reasons stated in the President's veto message, the veto should be sustained. After it is sustained I hope a bill, which has been discussed by the able Senator from Kansas, will be promptly introduced and passed by Congress.

It is certainly well within reason and equity that the classification recommended by the Postmaster General should reflect compensation for comparable work in the business world. There has been some criticism of the Postmaster General. I believe the Postmaster General would have been derelict in his duty if he had not come before the proper committees of Congress to give his judgment concerning classification features, particularly with respect to what is necessary to be done in order to keep in proper balance the responsibilities of the supervisory employees and the responsibilities and duties of the other postal employees.

The Post Office Department is a very important branch of the Federal Government, and it is essential that it be properly administered. I believe the Postmaster General has been trying to install in the Post Office Department modern methods of administration. In that effort he has had the support of the rank and file of the postal workers. They recognize that it is important to them that the postal service operate efficiently. In discussing the subject with postal workers in my own State and in other States, I have found that they are the first to make suggestions for the betterment of the service.

The Postmaster General should not be criticized or made the whipping boy in this matter. I do not believe he was trying to pre-empt the responsibilities of the Senate or of Congress as a whole.

We made our decision. In the regular constitutional way, the bill went to the President. He, for valid reasons, vetoed the bill. I hope the veto will be sustained.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are about to determine by a yea-and-nay vote whether we shall sustain or override the President's veto of S. 1, dealing with pay for the postal workers of this Nation.

When I offered S. 1489 as a substitute for S. 1, I stated on the floor of the Senate that I was fearful we would pass a postal-pay increase bill which would not meet with the approval of the President. I wish to say that with other Members of the Senate, I have been consistently trying in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on the floor of the Senate, to secure the enactment of postal-pay increase legislation.

In the event the President's veto is sustained, I am hopeful that the bill I shall introduce immediately thereafter will receive immediate consideration. It is a bill on which we have already heard testimony in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Some modifications have been made in it, of course. For instance, the date has been made retroactive to March 1. That was not a provision in S. 1489.

We have corrected the inequities between rural carriers and city carriers. We have taken care of the special messengers. We have clarified the anniversary date. It is a good piece of proposed legislation. It increases fairly and equitably the pay of the various postal employees.

More than that, it is a bill about which there would be no question of Executive approval.

I certainly hope that if the President's veto is sustained we will take early action on that bill, which applies to the postal workers, but also on a bill for the classified workers. At the present time we should not act for the benefit of one group of Government employees without also acting in behalf of the other group. I shall do everything in my power to see to it that such proposed legislation is presented to the Senate for decision at an early date.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know of no man who is fairer to the Government worker than is the Senator from Kansas. But for quite a few days I have been mulling over this matter and considering the position I should take not only as to the pending bill but as to future legislative proposals. This is what confuses me: How can I, under my oath, vote to sustain the veto, and then justify myself in approving an appropriation of two or three billion dollars as a giveaway to countries in Asia?

Mr. CARLSON. I would say to the Senator that I am unable to help him with that problem. It is a personal one which he will have to work out for himself. But the President of the United States has returned to the Senate, Senate bill 1 without his signature. The President had very good reasons, in my opinion, for vetoing the bill. But that does not mean that we are not obligated to do everything in our power to correct the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, with the fervor with which I would feed a starving Lazarus who had been denied the crumbs from a rich man's table, I shall vote to override the President's indefensible and intolerable veto of the bill to provide a long overdue increase in the compensation of postal employees.

My text consists of the following 9th and 10th verses of the 7th chapter of Matthew:

> What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?
> Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?

For nineteen hundred years these questions remained unanswered. But now every postal employee in the United States can instantly identify the man. He is the confused, and floundering mythical one who momentarily occupies the Presidential chair. Last year the postal workers asked for bread. The Senate and the House voted to give it to them. But the President, with his veto, gave them a stone. This year the postal workers asked for a fish. Again the Congress favorably responded. But the President, with his veto, gave them a serpent.

According to Ripley, the well-known author of Believe It or Not, Turkey in the year 503 froze the wages of laboring men and women in Constantinople at 2 cents a day, and the freeze continued for 1,400 years. If General Eisenhower had been in authority in Turkey at the proper time, he doubtless would have vetoed the repeal of this tyrannical Turkish law. Certainly he would not have approved it if any considerable number of the Turks had been letter carriers or postal clerks.

In my opinion, there are two grounds for hope that the Eisenhower veto will not be sustained. The first of these is sufficiently indicated by the following quotation from a speech which the wishful candidate Eisenhower in 1952 made to the letter carriers and postal clerks:

> Every man who has ever carried me a letter is a friend of mine. I was in the Army too long not to place mail call above every other call that the bugles could blow. * * * Your

compensation, retirement, and so on have been close to the hearts of the Republican leaders for a long time. They will continue to be close.

Mr. President Eisenhower, if you were sincere when you made that statement, please tell us why you and your fellow Republican leaders now pour out all your vials of disservice and wrath upon the postal workers' defenseless heads.

The second ground is a little more complicated than the first but it should be much more impressive to 17 Republican Senators who will be running for reelection next year. If they ignore the warning implicit in this second ground, as they go about campaigning in 1956, their constituents will ask them the searching question: "Did you in 1955, at the expense of the taxpayers, vote to increase your salary 50 percent or $7,500 a year?" And the distinguished Senators, whom I will soon name, will be compelled to answer that question in the affirmative.

The next question will be: "Did you vote to sustain the Eisenhower veto, and thereby help to deprive every postal worker in the land of sufficient increase in his daily compensation to buy a pint of milk or a loaf of bread?"

If, as a result of your action today, you are obliged to answer that question in the affirmative, the voters whom you are electioneering will say to you, in scriptural language, subject to slight modification,

Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.

And thereafter all you will hear as you wearily "tramp, tramp, tramp" over your State seeking votes will be the melancholy refrain:

Hark, from the tomb a doleful sound.
Mine ears attend the cry.
Ye sinful men, come view the ground
Where ye shall shortly lie.

And now for the exposition of ground No. 2, on which we base our hope for overriding the President's veto. The following are the names of the Republican Members who recently and successfully voted to increase their official salary 50 percent, or from $15,000 to $22,500 a year: Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUTLER, CASE of New Jersey, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DUFF, FLANDERS, GOLDWATER, IVES, JENNER, KNOWLAND, KUCHEL, MALONE, MARTIN of Iowa, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, MCCARTHY, MILLIKIN, PAYNE, POTTER, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPEL, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, and WATKINS.

Let us now call the roll of the Republican Senators who recently praiseworthily voted for the inadequate but substantial increase of compensation for postal workers as set forth in the bill before us: Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BEALL, BENDER, BENNETT, BUSH, BUTLER, CAPEHART, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, COTTON, DIRKSEN, DUFF, FLANDERS, GOLDWATER, HICKENLOOPER, IVES, JENNER, KUCHEL, MALONE, MARTIN of Iowa, MCCARTHY, MILLIKIN, MUNDT, PAYNE, PURTELL, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, THYE, WATKINS, WELKER, WILEY, and YOUNG.

Many of the Senators named, before they began to enliven this body with their wit, enlighten it with their wisdom and enchant it with their eloquence, had obtained the priceless benefit of highly qualifying experience as civilian officeholders. For example, the Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], had been a member of the Phoenix City Council before he became a Senator; the eminent Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] served for many years as a member of the New York Legislature and as Speaker of the Assembly of the State of New York before he became a Senator; the distinguished Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE] long served as Members of the House of Representatives before they became Senators. A number of the others named had been governors of States.

It is boldly asserted that it would be impossible to find in all the land a similar group of men more thoroughly qualified by experience for the proper performance of duty in the greatest legislative body in the world than are those Senators whom we have named.

But, according to current rumor, practically all these Senators purpose to vote to sustain the veto of the postal pay increase bill in response to the demand of the man at the other end of the avenue, who never held a civilian office or had a moment's civilian official experience in his life until he had been inaugurated President of the United States.

It is my hope that these honorable Republican Senators will not throw their practical experience to the wind, blind their eyes, deafen their ears, surrender their judgment, and at the former general's imperious command vote to sustain the veto of a bill for which they enthusiastically voted a few days ago.

Senators, if, in existing circumstances, you obey this Presidential command, you will not only repent in sackcloth and ashes on the "Ides" of November 1956 but you will also inflict upon yourselves a greater injury than was suffered by the base Indian who—

Threw a pearl away
Richer than all his tribe.

Let us trust that we are not unduly optimistic in believing that the factual matters now before us are sufficient justification for hope that the veto will not be sustained.

Supplementary to the foregoing is an economic and humanitarian factor which we should consider in determining how we shall vote on the approaching roll call, which will be of unlimited importance to a half a million postal workers and their families. Let us remember that the salary of the President, whose veto message is before us, is a hundred thousand dollars a year. He has a yearly travel allowance of $40,000 and an expense allowance of $50,000, making the President's total official compensation $190,000 a year. The salary of a letter carrier or postal clerk is $3,270 a year. The President's monthly official income is $8,333.33. A postal clerk's monthly salary is $272.50. The President's official income is $2,083.33 a week. The salary of letter carriers and postal clerks is $68.12 for the same length of time. The President's compensation is $297.61 a day. The compensation of letter carriers and clerks is $9.73 a day. The President's salary—whether sleeping or waking, or golfing or fishing—is $12.40 an hour, or 20⅔ cents a minute. Yet he heartlessly vetoes a bill largely because, in his opinion, it extravagantly grants an underpaid postal worker a little less than enough increase in his daily compensation to buy a loaf of bread or a bottle of milk for his hungry children.

Mr. President of the United States, let me entreat you to try the noble experiment of refraining for a period of 7 days from using any part of your weekly salary of $2,083.33, and endeavor to support yourself and your family—whether in your home in Gettysburg or in the White House where you will have no rent to pay—on the letter carrier or postal clerk's weekly salary of $68.12. If you will do this, it is my confident prediction that at the end of your trial period, you will not only regret your veto, but if you are as good a man as I hope you are, you will bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and thereafter help the Congress in a spirit of generosity and Christian charity to do unto the Nation's toiling men and women as you and we of the Congress would have them do unto us.

Mr. President of the United States, let us abandon all phony crusades and embark upon a real one to promote the welfare of the poor and the needy as faithfully and vigorously as we promote that of the wealthy and the well-to-do. Officially, let us henceforth be as just and as generous to the man with one talent as we are to the man with a million or more, and thus speed the day when—

All crime shall cease
And ancient fraud shall fail,
Descending justice lift aloft her scale,
Peace o'er the world her olive wand extend,
And white-robed Innocence from heaven descend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. NEELY. My dear Republican friends, please cast your vote on the Eisenhower veto in the spirit of Whittier's memorable lines:

While there's a grief to need redress,
A balance to adjust;
Where weighs our living manhood less
Than Mammon's vilest dust,
While there's a right to need my vote,
A wrong to sweep away.
Up! clouted knee and ragged coat,
A man's a man today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It will be a sad day for the Republic, in my judgment, if threats of political annihilation made on the floor of the Senate prevent any body of men and women from voting their convictions on proposed legislation. Many times men and women are called upon to vote their convictions, not on the popularity of a measure, but on whether they believe it to be in the best interest of the country and the entire 165 million Americans.

There are always special groups, but—and I say this with no disparagement of

the group of postal workers, who, of course, have a point of view—we sit in the Senate representing not only 500,000 postal employees, representing not only 1 million or 2 million, or more, Federal workers, representing not only a single segment of the national life; but representing 165 million Americans.

Sitting in that capacity, Senators certainly should vote their convictions, even if it meant the defeat of all 96 Members of the Senate. They should be willing to vote their convictions, even though they know that to do so would put them out of office in the following November.

If the time ever comes when Members of the legislative body, acting under threats of duress of any type or character, are constrained not to vote their convictions, it will be a sad day in the history of the Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield when I have finished.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] that I have differed on occasions with the President of the United States; but I know him to be a man of deep, sincere convictions. I know he has a vital interest in all Federal employees, including those in the postal service.

The President and the Postmaster General have indicated that they want equitable legislation. They want those who have given years of service and have advanced to supervisory positions also to be treated fairly in any legislation which may be enacted. It is my judgment that if Congress will cooperate in enacting that type of equitable legislation, it will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California does not take the position, does he, that when 72 Members of the Senate voted a few days ago for this very bill, they did not vote their convictions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; but I say to the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On that basis, would they be voting their convictions today if they voted to sustain the veto?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Senators may vote on the assumption that additional facts have not been presented. But facts have been presented. I believe the President's veto message and the additional information furnished by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] justify support of the veto and the passage of other legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know of no fact which has been presented, either in the message or in the discussion on the floor, of which every Senator was not aware, including the fact that the President would veto the bill, because, as I recall, the able minority leader assured the Members of the Senate that the President would veto the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The minority leader also suggested that we should be interested in passing a bill which would put a pay increase in the hands of postal carriers, and not merely the passage of a bill which would be an empty gesture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is correct. Will the Senator answer this question? After the Senator from California had given the assurance that the President would veto the bill, and thereafter 72 Members had voted their convictions, does the Senator think that having gone up the hill last week, we should come down the hill this week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I say to the Senator the only way this matter could be brought to a head—and I believe this was the judgment of a number of Senators—was to send the bill to conference, then to the White House, and then, when action was taken by the President, be prepared to enact legislation which would put an increase in the hands of the Federal employees.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. As one of the 72 Senators referred to by the Senator from Texas, I want to say that voting to send the bill to the White House was the only way we had of indicating we approved of a substantial and reasonable increase for the postal workers. It did not mean that we approved word for word or amount for amount what was included in the bill, but it did mean we were in favor of a substantial pay increase.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from California referred to the great man in the White House. In view of what is before the Senate, namely—the President's action in vetoing the bill, let me remind the Senator that the Apostle James said: "Faith without works is dead." That is applicable today. What counts is not what the President has said about a pay increase, but what he has done about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a short while ago I was a little confused as to what my vote should be, but I have overcome that confusion, and I am going to vote to override the veto without any confusion whatsoever.

When the Senate acted in passing Senate bill 1, it acted on conviction. It acted after being advised that a veto would be forthcoming. I voted for the proposed legislation at the time, in spite of the threat of a veto.

It is true that the President has the responsibility for that veto. That is his business. But that has nothing to do with a Senator's performing his duty and meeting the obligation, which he assumed when he took his oath of office, to vote his conscience on the merits of proposed legislation.

I agree entirely with my good friend from West Virginia. Do we have to enact legislation which is in the interest only of the wealthy, the great industrialists, and completely ignore the postal workers who, in the service of the Government, toil for the American people?

Oh, the Treasury Department and the other departments might think they are close to the American people, but the ones who are actually close to the American people are the postal workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the Senator from California will yield me further time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who is it that the housewife meets daily to receive a note of sadness or a note of gladness? Who is it that brings a message to her from a son who may never come back from a foreign battlefield? It is the postal worker.

Mr. President, I have been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have seen the anguished faces of wives of postal workers—the sidewalk pounders. I have heard such a wife tell what she and her family had to eat. In a city like Washington, unless one has the cash, he cannot buy a loaf of bread or a quart of milk for his family. Some of them have used a soupbone for 4 days before payday, keeping it in water for 3 or 4 days. Butter? Some postal employees were lucky if they could have a quarter pound of butter for Christmas.

Mr. President, let us be human. Let us have a conscience. Let us override the veto.

SENATOR KENNEDY'S RETURN TO THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

(At this point the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] entered the Chamber, Senators rising and applauding.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I know I speak for every Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, and I think for every Member on the other side, when I welcome back to this Chamber one of our most beloved colleagues.

It is a great pleasure to all of us to see JACK KENNEDY return to the Senate. During the months of his indisposition, he had our sympathy. We are delighted he is back with us again. We welcome him here today. Although he tells me he spent several months in sunny Florida as a next-door neighbor of the Republican State chairman, I know that fact has not changed his views.

We are glad to see you, Jack.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose

of joining with the majority leader in extending a very warm and cordial greeting, on his return to the Senate floor, to our good friend JACK KENNEDY. He has not been a Member of the Senate as long as have some of us, but those of us who have gotten to know him have for him a very warm and high place in our affections. I assure him that the feeling of admiration and regard is no less on this side of the aisle than it is on the side on which he sits.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader is ready to yield back the time remaining to him——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall be ready to do so when I fulfill my commitments to the Members of the party on the other side of the aisle.

I yield a minute and a half to the senior Senator from South Carolina, who I understand desires to have certain documents printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram which was sent to me, and I think to all other Members of the Senate. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Representing more than 60 percent of all employees in the postal field service, we urge you to vote to override the veto of S. 1, Tuesday.

The criticisms made against the bill possess little validity. Many of the supervisors who are alleged to be discriminated against will receive an ultimate increase of $4,310 or 49 percent. We believe that the bill has been disapproved chiefly because employees in levels 1 and 5, who were discriminated against in the original departmental proposal were granted additional increases by Congress. Seventy percent of all field employees are in these two levels.

Do not be misled by the statement that the Carlson substitute will take care of the postal pay problems. It will not. Further the Carlson proposal stands little chance of favorable approval by Congress. Bills similar to the Carlson proposal have been rejected by substantial votes in both Houses. The Carlson bill proposes to reinstate many provisions vigorously opposed by postal employees and corrected by the House, Senate or conferees.

During the past 2 years there have been 15 separate votes on postal pay legislation in both Houses—despite that fact there still is no pay bill.

A vote to override the veto will give postal employees a long overdue raise without further prolonged debate and without further cruel delay. Failure to override will have an extremely bad effect on morale already at a low ebb.

The decision is yours to make. S. 1 is a fair compromise worked out by both Houses of Congress. The Senate approved it by a vote of 66 to 11, the House by a vote of 328 to 66.

On behalf of the thousands of employees that we represent, we urge you to cast your vote in favor of overriding the veto of S. 1.

ROSS MESSER,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Post Office and General Service Maintenance Employees.
SAMUEL KLEIN,
President, United National Association of Post Office Clerks.
WILLIAM C. DOHERTY,
President, National Association of Letter Carriers.
WILLIAM THOMAS,
President, National Postal Transport Association.
PAUL CASTIGLIONI,
Legislative Representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees.
HAROLD MCAVOY,
President, National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service, Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation on increased incomes from 1935 to 1955, showing that the national income has increased 500 percent, and the income of the postal workers about 95 percent.

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

Increase incomes, 1935–55

	Percent
National income	500
Personal incomes	475
Incomes of postal workers	95

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing the productivity of the postal worker as it has increased from 1946 to 1953.

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

Productivity of postal workers increased 37.2 percent from 1946 to 1953

	Percent
Total pieces handled:	
1946	−100
1947	101
1948	109
1949	118
1950	123
1951	128
1952	135
1953	144
Total revenues:	
1946	100
1947	106
1948	116
1949	+128
1950	137
1951	145
1952	159
1953	163
Total employees, Postal Field Service:	
1946	+100
1947	−100
1948	103
1949	106
1950	103
1951	102
1952	107
1953	104

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control if the other side will do likewise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to express my personal gratitude for the generosity the distinguished minority leader has demonstrated not only to me but also to the other Senators on this side of the aisle.

In accordance with the customary practice of the distinguished Senator from California, he has been very considerate of all of us, and has yielded to us from the time under his control in order to make it possible for Senators on this side of the aisle to submit their arguments. I certainly appreciate very much the courtesy and consideration of the senior Senator from California.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kennedy	Smathers
Cotton	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the vote which is about to be taken, a vote "nay" will be in favor of sustaining the President's veto, and a vote "yea" will be in favor of overriding the veto of the President; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Article 1, section 5, of the Constitution requires a yea-and-nay vote on the pending quesion, which is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]

is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that if the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I annuonce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—54

Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barkley	Hill	McNamara
Bible	Holland	Monroney
Capehart	Humphrey	Morse
Chavez	Jackson	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kefauver	Pastore
Duff	Kennedy	Russell
Eastland	Kerr	Scott
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Ervin	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Frear	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Stennis
George	Long	Symington
Gore	Magnuson	Thurmond
Green	Malone	Welker
Hayden	Mansfield	Young

NAYS—39

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Cotton	Millikin
Barrett	Curtis	Mundt
Beall	Dirksen	Payne
Bender	Dworshak	Potter
Bennett	Flanders	Purtell
Bricker	Goldwater	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Butler	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Martin, Iowa	Williams

NOT VOTING—3

McCarthy	Murray	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, on reconsideration the bill fails of passage.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Federal employees of America cannot fail to know now which political party is the party of the workingman.

In the vote just taken, 46 Democrats have voted to override the regrettable action taken by the President while only 2 Democrats saw fit to approve that action.

Thirty-five Republicans have just voted to sustain the action taken by the President and to deny to the Nation's postal workers once again the pay increase they so justly have deserved for so long.

I know not how the members of the opposite party justify their action. I rather suspect that it is their terrible fear that if they did not vote to sustain the veto, the confused man in the White House would not agree to be their standard bearer in 1956.

However, be that as it may, the issue is clear and will be settled in 1956.

In order to gain for the postal workers of America their much sought and deserved pay increase, I now send to the desk another Democratic compromise plan. While this is more of a compromise than I am in favor of, I, along with the other Democratic Members of the Senate, desire to exert even the very last effort to gain this increase, and I propose to call the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee into executive session tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to consider this new proposal.

I shall make every effort to report this bill to the Senate tomorrow afternoon, with the earnest hope that it will be immediately considered and favorably approved by this body, by the House of Representatives, and by the President of the United States.

I introduce the bill on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senatore from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2061) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, during the debate on the veto message, I said I would introduce a bill dealing with postal pay increases. I was pleased to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service say that he is calling a meeting of the committee tomorrow morning to consider proposed pay increase legislation. Personally I am pleased that he plans to do so, and I expect fully to cooperate with him. I am introducing a bill which I know could be approved and become law within a matter of days.

I sincerely hope the committee will have an opportunity to consider my bill. Although I am not familier with the terms of the bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the committee, I sincerely and earnestly assure him that I will cooperate with him in the consideration of his bill so long as it meets requirements which I believe are necessary to be met in the enactment of such legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not know what is contained in the bill being introduced by the Senator from Kansas. I assure him also that I shall be very glad to cooperate in the consideration of any pay-raise measure which comes before the Senate.

Mr. CARLSON. I feel certain there will be no serious difference between us, and that we will be able to work out acceptable legislation. I hope for early action by the committee.

Mr. President, I now introduce the bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2062) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and the employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. BENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, it has always been my view that public employees should be well paid, and that adequate provision for their retirement should be made by progressive legislation.

The postal service is a most important part of our governmental machinery. The postal employees have been good workers. There is universal agreement that they merit a pay increase.

I voted in favor of the postal-pay-raise bill which President Eisenhower has vetoed. However, after the President vetoed the bill, I voted to sustain his veto. I maintain that there is nothing inconsistent between my vote on the question of passing the bill over the President's veto and my political philosophy and my point of view regarding the entire question of the payment of public employees and the treatment of pubilc employees. I am not alibing. I have no explanation to make. I am merely stating what my record has been during 25 years of public life as an elected legislator, and during my many other years of public service.

I have always believed in removing the excess baggage from public payrolls. I have always maintained that there are too many public employees, not only in the Federal Government, but also in the State and municipal governments. But I believe that for service rendered, a public employee should be paid well.

So, Mr. President, during my political life I have consistently taken the position that the best investment the taxpayers can make is in paying well the public employees.

Back in 1927, in the State of Ohio, we had a fee system, similar to that now in existence in the State of Virginia. That system was for the purpose of providing fees for certain public officials, so as to make public service attractive to them. In Ohio we abolished that system; and I led the fight to abolish it, in the case of State highway officials, and certain courts, including justice-of-the-peace courts with countywide jurisdiction.

My record has been consistent with my present stand with regard to public employees and the manner in which they should be treated.

President Eisenhower has vetoed this bill. However, he has said he is in favor of a bill which will provide adequately for the postal workers and the other civil-service employees.

After he made that statement at his press conference, I found on the front page of one of the Washington newspapers an article which is comparable with other articles which appeared in all the other Washington newspapers.

I shall now read from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, May 18. The headline reads as follows: "Dem Leaders

Warn: If 8.8 Is Vetoed and Sustained, No Pay Hike At All."

Mr. President, after all the huffing and puffing and blowing the house down, it is interesting to observe that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the committee, could scarcely wait to get on his feet and say that he was introducing another bill. So obviously that newspaper statement is wrong, and obviously the Democratic leaders will vote for a bill to increase the pay of Federal employees, including the civil-service employees, which the President will support.

I read now from the article:

The Government employee pay-raise fight appeared veering today toward a possible impasse which could kill both postal and classified (white collar) raises at this session of Congress.

President Eisenhower told his press conference today that he's still studying the 8.8 percent postal pay bill and still hasn't decided whether to sign or veto.

The threat of no pay raises all this session came from another source.

If there's a veto, the News learned, Democratic leaders are prepared to tell the Senate that, should the veto be sustained, there will be no further action on raises at this session of Congress.

Obviously the Democratic leaders did not consult with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], because he is calling a meeting of his committee at 10 o'clock in the morning. After the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] announced that he would introduce another bill, the Democratic leaders say they would call a meeting of the committee in the morning for the purpose of discussing this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know upon whose authority the Senator from Ohio speaks for the Democratic leaders, but I can personally assure him that, so far as the present majority leader is concerned, he concurred wholeheartedly in the action taken by the chairman of the committee, and has never taken any other position.

Mr. BENDER. I accept the statement of the distinguished majority leader. I have known him for many years.

However, I am reading from an article which was published in a Washington newspaper, and which was brought to my office by a postal worker. The article states, in effect, "If you do not do this, there will be no pay raise."

I appreciate the statement of the majority leader in sustaining the action of the chairman of the committee, who announced that he was calling his committee together for the purpose of considering another postal pay bill. I am satisfied, if that bill comes before us, that as the President has indicated, those of us who are interested in pay raises and in living conditions can be sure that the bill will pass the Senate, as a cat would pass through a dog show. I am sure that not only Republican Senators, but Democratic Senators, as a whole, will vote for a bill providing for an increase in pay, and providing for good working conditions for our postal and classified civil service employees.

Reading further from the article by Mr. John Cramer, who is a very responsible reporter for the Scripps-Howard Washington News, he says:

The leaders will take the position that the issue is much larger than the size of pay raises—or whether the 8.8 percent bill's postal job reclassification plan should be the one sought by the administration or the modified one approved by Congress.

They will argue, it's reported, that the prestige and prerogatives of Congress are at stake, that the administration has attempted to dictate to Congress, and that Congress must resist this dictation as a matter of principle.

Democratic Senators are described as eager for an all-out showdown.

Obviously, from the expressions made by the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the committee which has this legislation before it, there is no such purpose in their minds. Obviously we have been misinformed, to the effect that the Democratic leadership in both Houses proposes to call a halt so far as postal and civil service legislation is concerned. We are to have a bill. We are to have a good bill. We are to have a bill which the President will support. I am satisfied that the President will act in as good conscience as he has acted with respect to every other measure which has come before him for consideration.

I happen to be occupying the seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Ohio which was filled for many years by the late great Senator Robert A. Taft. I am proud to say that I was one of the first sponsors of Senator Taft when he ran for the Ohio Senate, when most of the Republican machines in Ohio were against him. I supported him in Cleveland, and in my own county, Cuyahoga County, because I believed in him. I served with him in the Ohio State senate.

I know that Bob Taft never did anything merely because he thought it would gain votes for him. Bob Taft acted upon orders which he received from within, and not from without. Bob Taft did the things which he believed to be right. So I admire Bob Taft very much.

After we fought to defeat General Eisenhower at the 1952 convention, after we had done everything in our power to make Robert A. Taft the nominee, Bob Taft was the best possible soldier following his defeat, because he was a good sport. He did not sulk. He did not make wise cracks about the then candidate, General Eisenhower, now President Eisenhower. Bob Taft became President Eisenhower's No. 1 man. Senators who served with him will recall that, during Bob Taft's lifetime, he was the outspoken champion of President Eisenhower on the floor of the Senate on every occasion.

I can understand why Senator Bob Taft supported President Eisenhower. Frankly, I have considered myself a liberal Republican or a progressive Republican. I am not a standpatter. I have never been for sale. Republicans in Ohio, as well as all the other people of my State, know that. I had less money with which to work in my campaign for the senatorship than did any other candidate for Senator in the history of Ohio, in either party.

I supported President Eisenhower from the very beginning in the other body, and have supported him in the Senate 100 percent. Why? Because I believe in him. I believe in President Eisenhower and in his philosophy. I believed in his philosophy long before I knew the name of Eisenhower and long before I knew there was such an individual as Eisenhower. I supported the things he stood for. He has said that his philosophy is to be a liberal in the matter of human rights and a conservative in the matter of our economy. I believe in that philosophy. I believe President Eisenhower, in the short space of 2 years, has done more for civil rights than had previously been accomplished in the history of our country. Certainly he has done more in 2 years than the previous administrations had done in 20 years. The previous administrations gave us conversation; President Eisenhower has given us action.

I know the hour is late. I have always been consistent in my feelings for public employees, and I certainly do not want to keep any of them here overtime by making a long speech.

But I feel this is an occasion on which I should say what I have in my heart regarding the action the Senate took today.

No one has been closer to the postal workers in my home State than I have. I have testified to that fact not only in voting for bills but in my whole interest in the postal workers of the State.

When they assembled in my office I told them very frankly that my batting average so far as President Eisenhower is concerned was 100 percent. I have not voted against him once, not because I am a rubber stamp, but because I believe wholeheartedly in what the President is doing.

As I say, I was for him long before I knew him. I supported his philosophy and his point of view long before I knew him. He is good for the Republican Party. He is good for America. He is good for the world.

I do not know of anyone who has done a better job and a more honest job than our great President.

When he sent his veto message to the Senate, I did not like it. I had hoped that he would sign the bill. But I read his veto message and, under the circumstances, I felt the urge to support him because he said the administration would sponsor another bill immediately. Obviously he is acting in good faith, because the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has presented an administration bill, subject to amendments that are in keeping with what the administration believes it is desirable to do.

I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for his zeal to get the floor immediately after the vote on the veto message and to denounce what the Democratic politicians not only in Washington but elsewhere have been saying, namely,

that the Republicans want to deny the common, ordinary worker a fair chance.

As a matter of fact, the dollar is worth more today without a war than it has been at any time in recent years. The dollar is worth more in every way. Conditions are better. We have peace on earth and more good will toward men because of the leadership provided by our great President. Under the circumstances, the new bill will receive immediate consideration not only by the committee but by Congress, and the President will sign a bill providing for approximately an 8 percent raise in pay, which will be suitable and desirable not only so far as the postal employees are concerned but also so far as the other employees of the Government are concerned.

I believe with all my heart in our President. I believe in him thoroughly. I have supported him with all the vigor I have at my command; but I have done so quietly. I have not made many speeches on this floor. Even though I was a Member of the House for 14 years, this is only the second or third time I have spoken on the floor since I became a Member of the Senate. Nevertheless, sometimes I feel the urge, even as a new Member of the Senate, to say the things I feel deeply. I say to my colleagues and I say to the postal workers and I say to other Government employees that the President has not been hounding the employees.

As a matter of fact, Republicans are complaining about too many hold-overs in Government employment. The President has not been trying to take advantage of any situation. He has the power to clean house altogether. He has not done anything that people can criticize as a purge. The President has been very considerate. Sometimes I think he has been more considerate than people have a right to expect him to be, particularly those who have entrenched themselves in the other political party and who in many cases are doing everything in their power to promote discord and disunity inside the administration.

Mr. President, I wish to close by saying that I am not at all apologetic about having supported the veto message. As a friend of the postal workers, as a friend of Federal employees, I believe in the bill which is to be reported, they will have a better bill, with more justice and more consideration. I further believe the new bill will come before the Senate with the unanimous vote, not only of the Republican members of the committee, but of the Democratic members as well.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 771), is amended by striking out "$14,500" and substituting therefor "$17,500" and by striking out "$14,000" and substituting therefor "$17,000."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 753), is amended by striking out "$13,500" and substituting therefor "$16,500" and by striking out "$13,000" and substituting therefor "$16,000."

SEC. 3. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended by the acts of May 16, 1938, and June 10, 1952, is amended as follows: By striking out in the second paragraph thereof "$13,000" and substituting therefor "$16,000."

SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (11 D. C. Code, sec. 920) is amended to read as follows: "The salary of the judge shall be $14,800 per annum."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses theron, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

DRAWING THE LINE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader, one of the leading daily newspapers in New England and the Northeast, recently contacted a number of our top military figures who commanded large forces and were otherwise identified with our tremendous successes during World War II. They were all asked the same question: Do you consider Quemoy and Matsu vital to the defense of Formosa, the key to the free world's Pacific defense? The answers were virtually unanimous that the abandonment of these two small but strategically located outposts would ultimately result in the loss of the Nationalist Chinese stronghold.

I think that their opinions are very significant for two reasons. In the first place these men, among them General Chennault, Admiral Sherman, and General Stratemeyer—to mention just a few—have come face to face with the Communist menace during their many years of military service. They played a large part in leading our country to victory in World War II, and we have only respect for their sound judgment and mature understanding of the need for containing and stemming the advances of Red China in southeastern Asia. Secondly, these men are no longer on active military duty. They are under no compulsion to restrain in any way their personal feelings. They are in a position to speak out strongly and effectively on a problem of vast significance to our country today—the need for a strong security chain in the Far Pacific.

I am impressed by their urgings that Quemoy and Matsu be defended to the utmost. I am firmly of the opinion that their counsel on a matter of this importance should command the attention of all thinking Americans. It is a course of action that I have felt imperative for some time. I think theirs is a contribution that this country and the other free nations of the world can ill afford to overlook. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WOULD DRAW LINE NOW ON COMMUNIST GRABS—FREE YANKS IN PRISON

In response to queries from the Manchester Union Leader, 10 of America's top military figures yesterday made their views positively clear that the United States should not abandon the islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

The military leaders asserted that the United States should draw the line on Communist aggression. Some favored active military action now to release Americans held prisoner by Red China.

The Union Leader's question was: "Do you think giving up of the liberty of Quemoy and Matsu would produce peace?"

TOO FAR ALREADY

All 10 were unanimous in their opinion that the free world has allowed the Communists to go too far already and that on the question of Quemoy and Matsu, the United States must defend the islands or surrender to even more Communist grabs.

One other military leader was less positive in his approach to the problem, and another advocated surrender of the islands.

The list of those replying to the Union Leader queries included Gen. Claire Chennault, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Rear Adm. Robert E. Theobald, Adm. William H. Standley, Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer; Adm. Frederick C. Sherman, Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, Col. L. E. Bunker, former staff officer of General MacArthur; Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, Frank L. Howley, and Adm. H. E. Yarnell.

Gen. Claire Chennault, former commander of the Flying Tigers in China and adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, believes the United States must draw the line beyond which communism may not pass by force. He wired this message:

"We should make it unmistakably clear that we will resist with adequate force, any Communist attempt to occupy territory now inhabited by free people, whether Quemoy, Matsu, or elsewhere. The line beyond which communism may not pass by force must be drawn sometime.

"We have shamefully permitted our own people to live in Communist prisons too long. We should issue an ultimatum with a definite time limit demanding their release and be prepared to use force if ignored. Communists will never respect us unless we demand it."

WOULD USE ATOM WEAPONS

Gen. James A. Van Fleet, United States Army (retired), referred this newspaper to an article by him in Life magazine for April 18. He wrote:

"It seems clear to me that as long as the Nationalists can hold Quemoy and the Matsus, the Communists have little chance, if any, of successfully invading Formosa. Red

China can almost gage American intentions from comment heard in the capitals of the world. If the reaction is weak, more pressure is applied. Should firmness be encountered, the Reds withdraw."

The former Eighth Army commander, who fought the Reds to a standstill in Korea, wrote further: "Suppose the Communists do launch a sizable invasion to capture any of the islands in the Matsus or Quemoy groups? It would present the United States with good reason to shoot back with atomic weapons and annihilate the Red effort.

"The use of such force would stop Communist military aggression here and elsewhere in the world. Such an act of warning would preserve the peace for years to come. This may be a God-given opportunity to avoid a general war."

APPEASEMENT NOT PEACE

Rear Adm. Robert E. Theobald, former northern Pacific fleet commander, put this message on the wire at his Marblehead, Mass., home:

"Appeasement and retreat before an aggressive dictatorship is never the road to peace. Red China should be told we will defend Quemoy and Matsu.

"The Nation must protect nationals abroad from persecution. We should take drastic action, to and including a Pacific blockade, to secure the release of servicemen and civilians illegally held by Red Chinese."

NEED DEFINITE STAND

Adm. William H. Standley, United States Navy (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations, wired from his Coronado, Calif., home that: "The surest way to avoid war is to take a definite and vigorous stand now.

"Our present policy in re Quemoy and Matsu is a continuation of the appeasement policy inaugurated with the withdrawal of our Army to enable the Russian Army to enter Berlin ahead of the American Army," he said, adding that it was similar to American policy in the shooting down of unarmed planes, of our pusillanimous Korean police action, our failure to meet aggressive action in Indochina, our policy in repeated violations in the Korean armistice agreement, and our failure to obtain the release of American prisoners from Red China.

COULD BE DISASTER

It is the opinion of Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, USAF, retired, former commander of the Air Forces in China, that "the old 'Spirit of '76' has nearly disappeared from our leaders and many of our people." He says: "I do not understand the strange times we are encountering. If the United States forces the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists, it will be a great disaster for our country. Remember, the Red Chinese have no effective north-south communications except shipping. Nationalist guns on Matsu and Quemoy force this shipping far out to sea where Chiang Kai-shek's naval vessels destroy or intercept it. With Matsu and Quemoy abandoned to the Red murderers, their shipping can hug the coast and the Communist domination of southeast Asia and the Communist seizure of supplies we propose to send to Indochina can be made certain.

"This abandonment of Quemoy and Matsu would surely immobilize Chiang permanently on Formosa and in a few years, as his army grows old, the Communists would take without opposition that great strategic island so essential to the security of the United States of America. That island is the key to the free world's Pacific defense."

ISLANDS IMPORTANT

From a background as combat commander of the famed aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Lexington*, retired Adm. Frederick C. Sherman wired: "I believe that Quemoy and Matsu are important to the military defense of Formosa and should be defended. As a military ally of Nationalist China, I think the United States should assist in their defense and announce this decision to the world."

This veteran of the battles of Bougainville, Salamau, and the Coral Sea added: "We cannot defeat communism at home and abroad by continually withdrawing and giving up additional territory."

MUST USE FORCE

Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, USAF, retired, believes this Nation should establish a military backfire on the Quemoy-Matsu firing line.

He wired: "It is my opinion, our national interest demands immediate revival and future preservation of the basic principles of international law and associated laws of war, as understood and practiced by the United States in the days when protection of American lives and property at home and abroad were of paramount interest. Such barbaric practices will never be checked except through the use of armed military force."

General Foulois concluded: "As we are directly and primarily concerned with the present diplomatic-political brushfire now burning around Quemoy and Matsu, it is my opinion that from a military point of view we should establish our military backfire on the Quemoy-Matsu firing line."

MAC ARTHUR AIDE COMMENTS

Although special attempts were made to reach Gen. Douglas MacArthur for comment, the message apparently failed to get to him, as his aide de camp, Col. S. L. Huff, reported him away from his office. However, Col. L. E. Bunker, of Wellesley, Mass., former MacArthur staff officer, wired:

"It is my personal feeling we should announce a firm intention to defend these islands and prevent the destruction of the morale of the Chinese Republican Army.

"If they disintegrate, who defends Formosa—officially declared an essential part of America's defense perimeter?"

FEAR IS LIVING DEATH

Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle wrote from his home in Elkridge, Md., commander of the 1st Marine Division in Okinawa's capture, that: "We should take a firm and uncompromising stand, either liberate the Americans held prisoner by Red China, or we shall back Chiang in an attack on the mainland and Rhee in an attack on North Korea."

He wrote: "To continue to live and act in fear is a living death. Americans would rather die fighting than live this kind of a life."

The morale, not only of the Armed Forces, but of the entire Nation would be bolstered immediately by such action (the backing of Chiang and Rhee attacks). The people today are confused and unable to understand why this great and powerful country has to keep appeasing the Reds when even the earliest shadow of firmness would be infinitely more effective as a peacemaker than the shameful surrenders we have made at each and every conference with the murderers of our sons."

SHOULD TRY TO FREE PRISONERS

A former chief of naval operations, Adm. Louis E. Denfield, United States Navy (retired) believes President Eisenhower—whom he calls "one of the greatest military leaders of our time"—and his staff will "take appropriate steps to defend Formosa as well as Quemoy and Matsu if conditions require it."

The former superior of the present Chief of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, said: "No military man discloses his intentions in advance, and I am sure that is the reason that no statement has been given out on the defense of Quemoy and Matsu."

He added: "With regard to our servicemen and civilians held prisoners by the Chinese, I think every possible step should be taken to obtain their release."

PRESTIGE IN ORIENT LOW

"Quemoy and Matsu are of tremendous importance," writes Frank L. Howley, retired Army officer, nationally known business leader, and now vice chancellor of New York University. In Berlin as United States commandant on Allied Kommandatura, he spent thousands of hours of negotiation with the Soviets and has since kept track of their activities in Guatemala, North Africa, and Germany. Only recently he visited Hong Kong and other spots of the Far East, including Formosa.

After declaring Quemoy and Matsu to be of great importance, General Howley asserts:

"We must regrettably admit that our prestige in the Orient is at a low point as a result of past activities. It is useless to go back and debate whether or not we should have made commitments or should have become involved with the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. We have to start where we are today and these two islands are part of the territory still held by the legitimate government of China, which we recognize. To the people of Asia we are allied, militarily as well as politically, with the Nationalist government of China. Therefore, if these islands are captured by the Communists it would be a most serious blow to us. It might, in fact, be the final act necessary to discourage our allies and encourage our enemies."

WOULD SURRENDER ISLANDS

Adm. H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy (retired), former commander of the United States Asiatic Fleet, a veteran of Spanish-American and First World War, was the only voice urging the islands of Quemoy and Matsu be turned over to the Communists.

"To paraphrase Bismarck," he wrote, "these islands are not worth the bones of a single American."

He continued: "Use the surrender of the islands to secure the release of the servicemen and civilians illegally held prisoners by the Chinese Communists."

Only two of those replying refused to take a stand on the issue. They were Adm. William F. "Bull" Halsey, and Gen. Mark W. Clark.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I expect to take only a few minutes of the Senate's time this afternoon to discuss a matter that is of vital importance to the American people.

The record of debate thus far indicates that there is overwhelming sentiment in the Senate that an accelerated highway construction program is essential for an expanding economy and for the national defense. The question for determination is the selection of the method of approach which will provide the roads we need and at the same time preserve sound principles of representative Government.

Mr. President, I wish to pay high tribute to my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for the tremendous amount of study and consideration he has given to the entire road program. Whenever he undertakes any assignment

he does it thoroughly and always keeps always in mind what is best for the welfare of the Nation. His committee held extensive hearings. Their point of view has been presented, and the conclusion which he and his committee have reached is well backed by sound principles of Government. I think the junior Senator from Tennessee is entitled to the thanks of the Senate and to the backing of the American people who are interested in good roads and a road program which is in keeping with our constitutional method of doing business.

We are faced with a most fundamental issue. The drafters of the Constitution were dedicated to the concept of representative Government. In other words, they were determined that the people should control the Government, rather than vice versa. So our Constitution contains a careful delineation of responsibility and authority as between the respective branches of Government.

The powers of the Congress are specified in article I. Section 8 of article I provides that, "The Congress shall have the power," among other things, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," and "to borrow money on the credit of the United States."

Mr. President, I do not know how the proponents of the so-called administration bill got the idea that it would be in keeping with constitutional government and would save money if the Congress delegated its responsibility for many, many years to come to a corporation, over which it would have little control, and granted to it the authority to borrow money with which to finance the highway program.

Certainly, no power of the Congress has been guarded more zealously than its control over the pursestrings.

It seems to me that we should think seriously about our responsibilities along this line in reaching our individual decisions on the question before us.

In the substitute which has been offered we are asked to support a proposal whereby Congress would delegate its responsibilities relative to the expenditure of funds and the creation of debt to a Federal Highway Corporation, which would operate entirely under the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government. We are asked to grant to this Corporation the authority to issue $21 billion in bonds, with the proceeds to be distributed among the various States as the Corporation may see fit. We are asked to make an indefinite appropriation of vast sums of money to be used by this Corporation to service its bonds over a period without limitation of time, but which would certainly extend beyond 30 years.

If the substitute is adopted, Mr. President, Congress will have lost control of our road-building program and the expenditure of the taxpayers' funds. If these bonds are issued, Congress will have no control whatsoever over the manner in which the proceeds are spent.

In my opinion, the dangerous procedures embodied in the substitute proposal are aptly summarized in a section of the committee report, which I should like to read to the Senate. I quote from page 8 of the report:

> The committee concluded that the special corporate system of financing as proposed by S. 1160 is not conducive to sound fiscal management. The creation of governmental obligations and the expenditure of the proceeds thereof outside the budget by a corporation, without apportionment to States, would be basically unsound. The dedication of general revenues as proposed by S. 1160 and the indefinite appropriation thereof to the corporation to service its bonds would place the Congress in a fiscal straitjacket, and, in practical effect, prohibit the Congress from exercising its constitutional responsibilities with respect to creation of debt and expenditure of funds.

I believe the committee was wise, Mr. President, in rejecting this highly unorthodox approach.

It is my further opinion that S. 1048, in its present form, embodies a sound program for highway construction. It builds upon a program which has been developed over the years and which has worked well. It insures an equitable distribution of Federal funds among the several States. It provides sufficient flexibility to permit a program to meet the varying needs of the individual States. It preserves the principle of cooperative partnership between the Federal and State governments in the field of highway construction and, most important of all, Mr. President, it preserves to the people through their representatives control over the expenditure of our funds.

Mr. President, I was, however, disappointed that the committee did not accept the amendment which was offered to the committee by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and me. The presentation to the committee was in connection with a special item for highways for civil defense. The statement by the Senator from Massachusetts appears on page 580 of the hearings, and my statement to the subcommittee begins on page 574. The statements were the result, not of our individual opinions, but of weeks and weeks of hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which had studied the problem of civil defense. The statements did not represent any formal action of the committee; but I am certain that every member of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense feels that some action should be taken in this field.

The statements are the result of opinions expressed by leaders in Government, including the governors of some of the States, mayors of cities, and civil defense officials, as to what would be required in order to save a maximum number of lives and the greatest possible amount of property in the event of an atomic or a hydrogen bomb attack upon our Nation.

If war, unfortunately, ever should come, the civilian population in our cities would be as much a part of the battleline as would be the men in the frontlines. If war should come, I think we must anticipate that the attacks would be made upon our cities, and, as matters now stand, our home front would have difficulty in surviving.

In spite of the valiant efforts on the part of the Federal Civil Defense Administrator; in spite of the activities of the Federal agencies, such as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in carrying out the delegations of authority made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator; in spite of the remarkable interest and activity on the part of many of the cities and States, the sad fact is that the United States is woefully unprepared to protect the people and the industries of the Nation in the event of a thermonuclear attack.

Sufficient attention simply has not been given to the matter at any level of the Government. In the executive departments, civil defense has been considered as a stepchild. In Congress, appropriations for civil defense have been almost nil, considering the work that must be done. There have been too many areas of indecision.

Everyone agrees that the only protection which can be afforded people living in the target areas is by the evacuation of our cities. In the beginning of the civil-defense program there was a concept of building shelters inside buildings. But we know, as a result of the explosion of hydrogen bombs and of the information which has been given about them, that even bombs of the size used in tests would craterize the ground and destroy buildings for a substantial distance.

The figures which have been given indicate that in a city having a population of 1 million if nothing were done in the way of civil defense, it could be anticipated that probably 900,000 persons would lose their lives.

It is known that the explosions in the Pacific a little more than a year ago left a crater large enough to place 14 Pentagon buildings inside, and much additional space. So no protection of a substantial nature can be secured by constructing bomb shelters inside a target area. Therefore, the only alternative is to evacuate the cities.

The first requirement for evacuation is adequate highways, streets, and roads to enable the movement of people out of the cities. After they have been moved away from the cities, the question arises as to what will be done with them and how to shelter, feed, and clothe them. In those phases of the civil-defense program, policy decisions have not been made as to whether the Federal Government or the State governments will assume responsibility.

The Civil Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, consisting of five Senators, last week issued a unanimous report dealing with this problem, and I now call it to the attention of Members of the Senate.

Unless sufficient highways and ingress and egress roads can be built to and from the cities, then what will happen to the people outside the cities becomes an academic question. Without adequate highways the people would never be able to leave the cities.

All the civil-defense tests which have been held, including the one in Milwaukee, which was the most complete, and in Philadelphia and other cities, showed

the great need of additional highways in order to move people away from the target areas. Such highways and roads would also be a valuable addition to the national highway system.

If the people are to have any protection at all, they simply must have more highways and roads leading out of the target areas. So I have prepared an amendment which makes a very modest start on the problem. It is amendment designated "5–23–55–c," which I expect to offer some time tomorrow.

My amendment would provide for $40 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Of that sum, $20 million would be available to be spent immediately. Already plans and programs have been submitted by the States and cities in critical target areas, calling for an expenditure of a much larger amount than I have proposed. The $20 million would be spent for highways and roads in the target areas, both in the cities and the counties, for evacuation purposes. The Federal Civil Defense Administrator would designate the target areas.

The program would be worked out between the Secretary of Commerce and the States in which the target areas are located. The apportionment of the payment for the special evacuation highways would be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State. That is a larger Federal amount than is provided in other sections of the bill. But, after all, this is a part of the cost of defense. It is as important for the defense of our country to have a civil-defense program as it is that we have a military-defense program.

So I think we are met with the plain fact that the Federal Government will have to bear a larger proportion of the cost of building special roads and of enlarging and widening streets for evacuation purposes. This, in my opinion, is largely a Federal responsibility.

I hope Senators will consider well this proposal, and will agree to the amendment when it is offered later.

Another part of the amendment, which pertains to the 2,700 miles which will be left over in the interstate highway system, provides as follows:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall, by not later than February 1, 1956, make a report to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and of the House of Representatives containing his recommendations as to the manner in which the undesignated mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways can best be utilized for the purpose of eliminating bottlenecks in the evacuation routes leading from target areas as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

We all talk much about civil defense. Everyone bemoans the fact that civil defense is not being given more attention. Here is a way—the most important way—in which Congress can make a small start toward taking some action to protect the people of the Nation in the event of an all-out attack.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for a number of years the highways of our Nation have been fast deteriorating and becoming obsolete. Highway construction has not been keeping pace with traffic demands, and the gap between highway usage and improvement needs has widened.

The time has come when positive steps are needed to correct our highway deficiencies in order to assure the continued growth of our economy. In meeting these needs, it should be noted that our civilian needs also coincide with our military needs.

The most serious highway deficiencies are in and around our cities and metropolitan areas. These areas have become extremely congested from the traffic overload, and now constitute bottlenecks on through highways, with consequent delays to through traffic. These sections also involve the most expensive construction of any of the highway systems.

Highways around municipalities involve higher standards of construction, and wider traffic lanes and more lanes are required. Access control is needed. Thus, service roads, grade separations, and cloverleafs must be provided. Rights-of-way through the urban areas are very expensive.

The problem of financing street and highway construction in cities is acute. Most cities now have extensive obligations for schools and other community facilities. Many of the municipalities are bonded heavily to meet their obligations. The greater part of the State road taxes collected in cities goes back to the counties. The cities have to rely largely on real-estate taxes for their financing.

S. 1048 is a realistic approach to our highway problem. This is particularly true as it affects the situation in urban areas.

The bill recognizes the importance of the national system of interstate highways, and places emphasis on its expeditious completion. At the same time, it does not neglect the other important highway systems—primary, secondary, and urban.

The interstate system connects the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers of the country. Four thousand three hundred and forty-six miles of the designated 37,600 miles are located in urban areas. Early planning routed most of these highways through the centers of the cities. The same is true of the primary system, of which 14,466 miles of the total 196,807 miles are in urban areas.

The committee bill authorizes an appropriation of $400 million annually for 5 years for projects on the Federal-aid primary system, and $200 million for projects on the primary system in urban areas. It averages $1,550 million a year for 5 years for projects on the interstate system to be matched on a 90–10 basis.

The study of the highway needs of the Nation, conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads, indicates that the total estimated cost of improving the interstate system is $23,253 million, of which $10,717 million is in urban areas. To render the interstate system fully effective will require provision for additional feeder and distribution routes in urban areas, and bypasses around metropolitan centers, the most heavily congested areas at the present time.

There remain undesignated about 2,400 miles of the authorized 40,000 miles on the interstate system, which are available for feeder routes and bypasses. The committee has recommended in the bill that the mileage limitation for the interstate system be raised to 42,500 to provide for additional route designation on that system.

While considering improvement of highways at the present time, the civil defense aspects must not be overlooked. In the event of an atomic attack, large-scale evacuation of the cities would be necessary. Completion of the Interstate System and the urban connections would be of value as a civil-defense measure, and additional improvement of the primary, secondary, and urban routes, for dispersal of the population over many routes out into the countryside, would be essential.

The committee has also provided in the bill for transfer between the various systems of not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to a State. This provision will permit a large degree of flexibility to the States in keeping their programs in balance, and using funds of the various systems where urgently needed.

The bill would also permit early acquisition of highway rights-of-way by the Secretary of Commerce, when requested by a State to do so, or where the State cannot acquire control of access. This provision, to be applicable for fiscal year 1956, will prevent the program from being slowed down in certain States.

Mr. President, I think S. 1048 is a good bill. It is a necessary bill. There are no questions about the need for a more adequate and safe highway system. The only questions appear to be as to the method of providing that system, the speed with which to accomplish the goal, and the way the program should be financed. The committee considered that a well-balanced program, carried forward within the framework of the existing law, and financed as other Federal authorizations are, would accomplish the desired results, and modernize the highway system of the Nation.

Approaching the whole problem from its economic importance to the people of the United States, I think it almost impossible to overstress the program's value. In 1940 there were 34 million vehicles operating on the Nation's roads. This year there are 58 million. It is estimated that by 1965 the total will be 81 million. What this can mean in terms of low-cost haulage, of added recreational facilities, of convenience of transport between homes and places of employment, cannot be computed in dollars and cents. But it will result in vast good, and it will redound to the benefit of the Nation, if the roads to carry the traffic are built.

Coming as I do from Wayne County, Mich., where the first mile of concrete highway in the world was laid—and this was within my adult years—and where the automotive industry of the Nation is centered, I have always had a keen sense of the importance of good roads to all the people of the United States.

I have not forgotten that history tells us that the might of the Roman Empire, which endured for centuries against the assaults of barbarians, was built upon

strategic roads of the highest quality. In that simple, but at that time new, approach, the Romans solved the problems of trade, of military effectiveness, and of communications, by a road program.

The importance of good roads is far greater today than it was then. Roads are expensive, but there is no substitute for them in these days of mass mobility of the population in automobiles.

I believe there will be further important dividends from the passage of the committee bill. Many of our cities are suffering from rot at the center for lack of adequate means of reaching the downtown areas from the suburban districts. Immense taxing powers are gradually being lost to the cities by this insidious dry rot. The committee bill will make it possible for the cities to meet the problem, and I hope solve it. These are days which call for grand strategy in building the America of the future. The committee's road program, which I support, is of key importance in that grand strategy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a fellow-member of the subcommittee on roads, which considered both Senate bill 1048 and the Clay report, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan for his very effective contribution to the discussion of this vital issue.

Mr. President, speaking further as a member of the subcommittee, I wish to point out that no Member made a greater contribution to the consideration of this issue than did the Senator from Michigan, not only because he represents the State where the vast preponderance of our motor vehicles are manufactured, but also because of his personal knowledge of the construction business and his long association with the men who will be called upon to build the great interstate road system, as well as the subsidiary roads.

I desire to take this opportunity to express to the Senator from Michigan my own personal appreciation of the work he contributed to the subcommittee. I am particularly grateful because my State is primarily rural, rather than manufacturing, except for the lumber business; and I felt that the Senator from Michigan, who brought to us much knowledge of the problems of a great metropolitan area and its transportation difficulties, and particularly of the metropolitan area where most of our automobiles are manufactured, was especially helpful to me, in connection with my work on the subcommittee. I know I speak for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the other members when I thank the Senator from Michigan for his splendid contributions to our work.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very flattering remarks. I assure him that it was a pleasure to serve with him on the subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to concur fully and wholeheartedly in the statements the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has just made.

Let me say that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] brought to the subcommittee not only the determination to render public service—a determination which has activated the excellent work he has done in the State of Michigan—but the ability to separate the wheat from the chaff, and also a personality so likable that his efforts were made very successful, very useful, and very helpful. I have appreciated his constant attendance at the subcommittee meetings, and his fine contribution to the work which has been done on this legislative proposal; and I have listened with pride to the fine address he has delivered today to the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I thank him very much for his most flattering remarks. I assure him that it was a pleasure for me to serve with him on the subcommittee, and I shall be very glad to work with him again at any time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be modified.

Before submitting the modification, I wish to say that I have checked it with the ranking minority member of the committee, and the majority leader has checked it with the minority leader.

I now ask unanimous consent that on page 7, in line 20, the word "May" be changed to the word "July."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I send forward several amendments which I request to have printed and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table and be made the pending question for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 17, through page 21, line 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the request of the Senator from New Mexico that his amendment be made the pending question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it was my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday offered an amendment which is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a perfecting amendment has precedence over an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from South Dakota is too good a parliamentarian to contend that no other amendment can be offered because an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been offered and is pending.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota would not contend that such an amendment could not be offered. In fact, it is my understanding that if this is a perfecting amendment, it or other perfecting amendments may be considered before the consideration of a complete substitute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If that is what the amendment is, I have no objection to making it the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Lest any Senator be disturbed, there is no intention to have any vote or action on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico today.

The Senator from New Mexico merely wished to offer the amendment and have it printed, in order that it might be available to Senators. It is a perfecting amendment. Other amendments were submitted earlier in the day, and yesterday, notwithstanding the fact that the substitute of the Senator from Pennsylvania was pending. I am sure other such amendments will be submitted tomorrow.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota has not been in the Chamber during the entire afternoon, and was not advised as to what the situation was with respect to other amendments which might have been offered, and did not know whether or not there was something else which might be the pending question. However, he was aware that the Senator from Pennsylvania had offered his substitute.

In order that we may be clear as to the parliamentary situation, has any other amendment been offered with respect to which a request was made that it be made the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, with the exception of the substitute amendment, nothing of that nature has been offered prior to this moment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The request of the Senator from New Mexico was that the amendment offered by him be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has offered it, and it is now the pending question.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 9:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that it is the plan of the leadership that the Senate convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning so that all Senators may have sufficient opportunity, if they so desire, to participate in the transaction of morning business.

Following the close of the morning hour, there will be a quorum call. Perhaps the debate on the pending bill will not be resumed until 10 o'clock. If all time for debate is consumed on the pending amendment, there will probably not be a vote on it until 12 o'clock.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, because of the circumstances under which we are meeting tomorrow, I wish to state for the RECORD it is my understanding that a statement was made by the distinguished majority leader yesterday—and the statement appears in the RECORD—that it would be his plan to have the Senate meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning. Therefore, Members of the Senate have had notice of that fact in advance of the order that has now been entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that all statements I make on the floor appear in the RECORD. I made such a statement on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota could have read it in the RECORD, but he wanted the RECORD to show that fact at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know that I called the matter to the attention of the minority leader and that we were in agreement on it. I want the RECORD again to show that we will have a morning hour tomorrow morning from 9:30 to 10 o'clock. Any Senator who wishes to introduce bills or submit memorials or petitions, or make statements at that time, may do so, without the time being taken out of the time allotted for debate on any amendment, substitute, or motion. It may be that not all the Senators will be in the Chamber at 9:30, but the majority leader will be here, and I am sure the distinguished Senator from South Dakota will also be here. Any Senator who desires to make a statement will be given that opportunity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The hour is late; it is after 5:30. Normally it would be a little unusual at this time of day to permit an order to be entered that the Senate meet at 9:30 the following morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be very glad, if the Senator should desire it, to move that the Senate meet at 9:30 tomorrow and to have a quorum call.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, the junior Senator from South Dakota merely wishes to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD that there was an earlier understanding reached on this matter and that we are not establishing the precedent of entering an order at 5:30 in the evening providing that the Senate meet at 9:30 the following morning without having more than 4 or 5 Senators on the floor to act on the request for such an order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas never functions in that fashion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know that the Senator from Texas does not do so. That is why I call attention to the fact that when the Senator from Texas made his statement yesterday there were other Senators on the floor, including the minority leader.

UNION PARTICIPATION IN POLITICS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, much has been said in the press in the past few weeks regarding union participation in politics. It will be recalled that the Wisconsin Legislature recently passed an act limiting union participation in politics, and I understand that the august legislative body of the State of the present Presiding Officer is presently considering proposed legislation along the same line.

Mr. President, because of this, and because of the interest of all the people of the country, both members of unions and nonmembers, and politicians, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks an interesting proposal in the form of a letter from the California Industrial Union Council, which is an affiliate of the CIO. I ask that the entire article, including the return card, be printed.

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

CALIFORNIA INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, CIO,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: We are inviting you, as a member of the articulate liberal community in your area, to take advantage of our Legislative Secretarial Service. Over 800 citizens holding pro-liberal-labor views in California have already signed up, and we are sure that other citizens like yourself will be similarly interested.

This is how it works:

You fill out the enclosed authorization card and drop it in the mail. From time to time, during legislative sessions, you will receive from our office an individually typed letter to your Congressman, Senators (United States or State), or assemblyman. Your return address will be on the letter; all you need to do is sign it and place it in the envelope which will be enclosed with it. The envelope will be already stamped and addressed, ready for you to mail. You will also receive a carbon copy of the letter to keep.

The letters will be concerned with issues which are important, timely, and controversial. The point of view expressed will be based on liberal-labor attitudes which most liberals generally hold. We are sure that you are in full agreement with liberal-labor policy on issues such as minimum-wage laws, unemployment insurance, housing, child-care centers, and the like.

This secretarial service will mean more letters on important issues to your legislators. It helps you to keep in touch with your legislators at the time the legislative fight is on in Congress or Sacramento. It can be your way of letting your legislator know that you, as an individual, are keeping abreast of the most important issues arising in Congress and in Sacramento. It also helps your legislator keep in touch with you, because he will answer your personal letter, letting you know his position.

Remember that the final action—the signing and mailing of the letter is taken by you. You approve, sign, and mail every letter which bears your signature. The authorization card which we have enclosed with this letter is merely to let us know that you want us to provide you with this service. There is no charge.

The only way your legislator can know how you, the voter, feel about a proposed law is through your telling him. We will be happy to help you tell him if you will sign and mail the enclosed card.

Legislatively yours,

JOHN A. DESPOL,
Legislative Representative.

P. S.—This proposal can be summed up as follows: We will provide you with what amounts to a private secretary who will do research, write and type your letters for your signature. Professional lobbyists have this kind of service. So do many business executives. We just thought it would be a good idea to provide the same kind of service to those of you who would like to be amateur lobbyists more often.

I hereby authorize the CIO State council to act as my legislative secretary on any State and National legislation endorsed or opposed by CIO. I understand I will receive an original and carbon copy of any correspondence typed for me by the council. I will mail my original copy to my legislator.

_____
Name

_____
Address

_____ _____
Phone number Local union

Congressional district_____

Assembly district_____

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to be recognized, I move that, in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate now stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1955, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, O12599, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sections 513 and 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, for remainder of term expiring June 5, 1957.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, in this moment of prayer we are coming unto Thee with glad and grateful hearts, for Thou art mindful of all our needs.

We rejoice that Thou hast given unto our generation the wisdom to discover the wonders and mysteries of Thy handiwork.

Grant that men and nations may never use its power for cruel and unworthy purposes but only for Thy glory and the good of all mankind.

Show us how we may strengthen the ties of brotherhood, bringing the members of the human family into a cooperative and invincible fellowship.

Inspire men everywhere to live together in peace and good will, united in their aspirations and endeavors to build a world which has in it a love that is as inclusive as the love of God.

In Christ's name we offer our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 244, Rept. No. 614), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission established by Public Law 37, 77th Congress, with a view to ascertaining when it may be expected that the bridge and approaches thereto operated by such Commission near New Harmony, Ind., will become free of tolls, and what money has been received, and what expenditures have been made, by such Commission since its establishment in 1941.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], be excused from meetings of the House today, tomorrow, and Thursday, because of official business.

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

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN ARMED FORCES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, within the last several days, despite my protests, the House passed the cuts in the Armed Forces appropriation bill. I was advised by this House that I had nothing to worry about because you were going to pass a Reserve bill. Now you have cut the armed services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines. We have failed to pass a Reserve bill.

France is moving one division from NATO to North Africa. You have lost that one from NATO. You are now going to beef up a Marine division and take it from Japan and send it to Okinawa, though you have cut the Marines 20,000. You are considering another division for Korea, although you will not have the men. We have cut the Army nearly 80,000.

I just bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, out of an abundance of caution. Do not say I did not tell you.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LET'S HOLD COFFEE PRICES IN CHECK

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the price of coffee has come down some more and that is good news to the American housewife. I am asking the membership of the House to join me later this afternoon in a step to hold coffee prices in check. I would like to announce now that I plan to offer an amendment this afternoon to the Commerce Department appropriations bill as soon as it is opened for amendment to add $25,000 to the funds of the Census Bureau for a continuing, monthly survey and report of coffee stocks on hand in this country. If we had had such information in 1953 and 1954, through the period of the fake coffee shortage, our housewives would have saved hundreds of millions of dollars. My amendment will come right at the start of the reading of the bill at page 2, line 12. The Commerce Department appropriation bill appropriates $1,121,000,000 and I ask that a mere $25,000 be put in the bill to protect the American housewife against the kind of fake shortage that we recently experienced in coffee.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. McCARTHY. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, according to the Evening Star of yesterday, Harold E. Stassen, President Eisenhower's new "Secretary of Peace," is restlessly awaiting his cue to move onto the international stage and fill his "peace" role.

The cue, according to the report, will be a decision by the President that the country is ready to take definite steps toward bringing about world disarmament. We are told further that Mr. Stassen seems to think his cue is coming sooner than many people believe.

Recently the President was quoted as saying that we cannot have peace without disarmament or disarmament without peace. He did not indicate which came first or whether there was a cause-and-effect relationship. Actually, the President was half right. One cannot safely have disarmament without peace. But one may have what passes for peace without disarmament. In my opinion, the administration should be careful to restrict Mr. Stassen to his office of Special Assistant to the President on Disarmament, as the President himself should take prime responsibility for peace and realize that, as a matter of fact, all governmental activities in the

domestic field should be directed toward justice and international relations sustained by domestic policy—directed toward securing peace among nations. This is a responsibility not to be delegated.

While getting his teeth into the peace job—this is rather a strange figure of speech to use in this application; I do not know whether it is Mr. Stassen's contribution or that of the Star reporter—Mr. Stassen is serving out his time as head of the Foreign Operations Administration, which is being dissolved. We are told that peace and disarmament now get just half of Mr. Stassen's time. In this half-time work he has been doing a lot of things, we are told, which he cannot talk about. He has received and has been studying approximately 1,000 suggestions which have been sent to him in response to a plea for suggestions made on television and he is waiting for responses to a more recent plea beamed out by the Voice of America.

In the first place—

Says Mr. Stassen—

you never know where a sound idea is going to come from.

How true. In addition, a hastily recruited staff has been studying, we are told, all disarmament efforts since the dawn of history. It will be interesting to see this digest of the history of mankind soon, I assume, to be completed.

Meanwhile, while Mr. Stassen has been waiting for his cue and beaming out pleas for sound ideas, the Russians are conducting a peace campaign with specific proposals which threatens to sweep much of Europe into neutrality.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

THE LATE MRS. MARY BETHUNE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, few people have so dramatically lived their belief in the divinity of the individual as did that woman who said, "I believe in God and so I believe in Mary Bethune." Few women have contributed more to raise the standard of living of other women and so of a whole group than has Mary Bethune. I question if any man or woman has overcome greater difficulties with as great serenity or with as constant faith as Mary Bethune. When she opened the Bethune-Cookman College in Daytona Beach, she did so with $1.50 and a prayer. On the day of the opening she read the 23d Psalm, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want"; and she believed every word of that beautiful song of praise, and lived every word of it through many, many long years. When she finished reading the psalm she sang with a very full heart and an unshakable faith the song that the students of her college sang at her burial service, Leaning on the Everlasting Arms.

That was Mary Bethune, a woman of great courage, a woman of great faith, a woman of absolutely indomitable will, and of a strength that overcame mountains.

I am happy to pay my respects to this woman who has done so much for all of us who are women and all of us who are Americans—Mary Bethune.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

IDENTIFICATION TAGS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are many persons throughout the United States who are interested in several bills that have been introduced in both branches of the Congress to have designated on identification tags of those in the armed services the fact that they are communicants or members of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The Department of the Army in a report to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has reported against it on the ground that they have 4 or 5 classifications now. One, "C" for the Roman Catholic; two, "J" for Jewry; three, "P" for Protestant, and one for any other group that would not be included by those three, "Y," a preference which the individual had indicated but does not necessarily follow.

They also provide administratively that a particular religion may, if desired, give some identification to a member of the Armed Forces if they are a member of that particular religious group, such as Protestant, and so forth.

I have in my hand an identification tag given me by a young man of Greek origin who served during World War II. He told me last night that this identification tag was received from the Army as his Army identification tag, and it clearly shows on the tag the letters "G. O.," showing that he was a communicant or member of the Greek Orthodox Church.

I call attention to this fact to show that during World War II the Army did issue such tags. This might be of interest to the Members who are receiving a number of letters from well-meaning people who would like to see such legislation put through, and it might also be of interest to the members of the Armed Services Committee.

Apparently what they are seeking now was already being used in World War II.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not know that the gentleman has introduced a bill which would follow out the wishes of the Greek Orthodox Church, but I have introduced one today for that purpose. I am delighted that the gentleman brought up the matter. I am receiving hundreds of letters. It seems only a just thing to do.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are several bills introduced. I am glad to note that the gentlewoman has introduced one; but I wanted to call attention to the fact that apparently the Army followed this procedure in World War II which these good people seek to have them do again. As this identification tag indicates, they did issue such tags bearing the designation of the Greek Orthodox Church through the letters "G. O." during World War II.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not see any reason why they should change now. I sometimes feel that the armed services' right hand does not know what its left hand does.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I introduced a bill to accomplish this. I wish to congratulate the majority leader for his fine contribution.

HURRICANE WARNINGS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of general debate on the Commerce Department appropriation bill and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, it is my intention to offer an amendment for an increase of funds for salaries and expenses of the Weather Bureau in order that we may be able to have faster advance warnings of hurricanes and tornadoes, such as those that caused so much damage in the last few years. Because it affects not only aviation and agriculture, but also all the citizens of the country, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6367, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee handling the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriations brings the bill for fiscal year 1956 to the floor today for your consideration. As chairman of the subcommittee, I want to thank the other Members who have worked with me so hard during the past 6 weeks to bring out a bill which adequately provides for the various programs provided for therein and at the same time effects every possible economy.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has been of immeasurable help during the hearings and markup of this bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has had an active hand in the handling of this appropriation bill for many years, has been of valuable assistance. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] have also been very helpful and cooperative.

The four Members on the minority side have also been very diligent in their work on this bill and have been 100 percent cooperative. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] had the major responsibility for most of the appropriations contained in this bill during the 83d Congress. His intimate knowledge of these appropriations has been of great assistance to the subcommittee this year. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] also have done everything possible to help me bring you a satisfactory bill today.

The bill before you appropriates a total of $1,121,435,000 for the coming fiscal year for the Department of Commerce, the Canal Zone, the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and the Tariff Commission. While funds for the Small Business Administration also come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, no budget estimates have been submitted as yet in connection with its operations for the 1956 fiscal year.

The amount provided in the accompanying bill is a decrease of $26,077,746 below the funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1955. Also it represents a reduction of $244,958,000—nearly $245 million—in the 1956 budget estimates. This is a reduction of 18 percent below the budget, a rather substantial decrease. In complete frankness, however, it should be pointed out that the major portion of these reductions are in items which may require supplemental funds at a later date, depending on obligations incurred under basic legislation for subsidies to air carriers and ship operators, and depending on payments of contracts on Federal highways and forest highways. While the decreases in these items do not necessarily represent savings to the taxpayers in the final analysis, and they are not claimed as such by the subcommittee, it is believed that tight control over these items by the Congress is necessary. The appropriation of a little less than needed, rather than a little more, should encourage the Department of Commerce to effect every possible economy and make every possible saving.

In order that the Members of the House may have a complete picture of the action on every major program included in the bill, I will comment briefly on each appropriation, following the table commencing on page 14 of the committee report.

TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The amount provided here will permit the Secretary's office, and the top administrative staff of the Department, to continue its operations in 1956 at the 1955 level. The increase of $122,000 over 1955 covers the transfer of the Defense Air Transport Administration from the Business and Defense Services Administration to the Secretary's office.

CENSUS BUREAU

The amount recommended for salaries and expenses will permit the Bureau to continue its program in 1956 on the same basis as was authorized for 1955. The committee did not feel that the additional statistics to be gathered with the increase of $1,200,000 proposed in the budget were of sufficient importance at this time to warrant the appropriation of the additional funds requested. Some of the additional information proposed to be gathered appeared to be a duplication of information in other bureaus of the Department. Furthermore, all of the additional surveys proposed were merely extensions of existing programs already in existence. The funds requested to complete the Census of Agriculture and the Censuses of Business, Manufacturers, and Mineral Industries are recommended in substantially the amounts proposed by the budget estimates. The funds proposed for next year will permit the completion of these censuses, which were initiated a year ago.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The amount approved provides for the operation and regulation activities of the administration at about the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955. It is believed that additional economies and increased efficiency in operation can be effected to permit the commissioning of additional airways facilities to be added next year from establishment funds authorized for this year.

A rather sizable increase is provided for the establishment of air navigation facilities. The committee believes that the additional $13,500,000 over 1955 is necessary to permit the continued improvement of our air navigation facilities throughout the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Pacific. The growing needs of the rapidly expanding aviation industry of this country must be recognized and adequately financed from year to year. This is important to assure adequate safety in flight, which is important to every citizen of the country, whether or not he uses air transportation. It is also important that we have an adequate airways system in the interest of protection in the event of a national military emergency. Therefore, the committee is recommending to you today a rather sizable appropriation for this purpose.

With respect to the airport program, the committee is recommending an appropriation of $20 million for next year, an increase of $9 million over the budget. This amount will permit the continuation of this program at approximately the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955. The committee was impressed with the testimony indicating the expanding need for larger and better airports throughout the country. It is also convinced that direct Federal participation is essential to assure a well-planned and closely integrated national network of airports of proper design and adequate capacity to be useful for military as well as civilian purposes. In the interest of economy in construction as well as cooperation with local communities, the committee feels that the appropriation recommended is the proper amount to be authorized for the coming fiscal year.

The amounts proposed for 1956 for the operation of the Washington National Airport and the airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, are the same as were provided for the fiscal year 1955. It is expected that improved efficiency will enable these airports to continue to operate at present levels and to absorb additional costs authorized last year under the so-called fringe benefits bill.

The committee has also provided an additional $525,000 for the improvements at the Washington National Airport. This amount includes funds for installation of additional safety devices such as additional gasoline storage facilities, additional apron paving, standardization and replacement of field markings and lights, installation of an emergency electrical generator, and improvement of fire protection facilities. In addition, this appropriation will provide $70,000 for the construction of additional baggage facilities essential to meet the constantly increasing traffic at the airport.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

An additional $123,000 has been provided for the operation of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the coming fiscal year. This amount is recommended in order that the Board may increase its field audit staff sufficiently to assure adequate audit and verification of air carrier subsidy claims in advance of payment. The committee is not at all satisfied with the present audit procedures of the Board. It is convinced that more thorough field audit will make it possible to reduce the subsidy payments to air carriers in the future.

The committee has reduced the funds in the bill for payments to air carriers from the budget estimate of $63 million to $40 million. While it may be necessary to provide some additional funds for this purpose at a later date, the committee recommendation is adequate for the Board to commence operations during the next fiscal year. The committee feels that this approach to the problem of financing air carrier subsidies is desirable, in that it encourages the Board to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the taxpayers in the handling of these claims.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The amount authorized for the salaries and expenses of this organization for 1956 will permit the continuation of its operations at exactly the same level as was provided for the fiscal year 1955.

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The appropriation of $6,198,000 recommended for 1956 will permit continuation of the operations of this agency at the 1955 level. The reduction of $122,000 below 1955, as reflected in the table, is the result of the transfer of the Defense Air Transport Administration from this organization to the Office of the Secretary.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Rather sizable reductions have been made in the appropriations for the coming year for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. This results from the reduction of some 45 percent during the past year in the number of items on the positive list used in the export-control program of the agency.

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

The $75,000 increase over 1955 recommended in the bill for this Bureau is to be used to make a special study of unemployment problems throughout the country. In view of the serious nature of this problem in some areas, the committee feels that more complete and accurate information is essential to guide both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government in developing future policies.

MARITIME ACTIVITIES

A rather large appropriation is recommended for the coming year for ship construction. The bill includes a total of $64,700,000 for 5 major construction programs of the Maritime Administration, as follows: Title V, construction, $44,750,000; tanker trade-in-and-build program, $11,500,000; acquisition of cargo ships, $4,200,000; research and development program, $2,500,000; and administrative and warehouse expenses, $1,750,000. The amount approved for title V construction include $14 million for 2 combination cargo-passenger ships for the American President Lines, $19,250,000 to replace 5 cargo ships, $11,300,000 to convert 2 mariners for the Oceanic Steamship Co., and $200,000 for reconditioning 2 vessels for the American President Lines. The amount recommended for the tanker trade-in-and-build program will permit the trade-in of 10 used tankers and the construction of 5 new ships. In addition, the sum of $4,200,000 has been included in the bill to acquire the 5 cargo ships to be replaced under the title V program. The $23,500,000 requested for the construction of 3 proto-type vessels for the Maritime Administration is not recommended by the subcommittee at this time. In view of the advent of atomic-powered vessels, the committee does not feel justified in recommending the expenditure of large amounts for construction of conventional type proto-type vessels.

The amount recommended for operating-differential subsidies, $90 million, is somewhat less than the amount requested and the funds available for the current fiscal year. Here again, it is difficult to predict accurately the funds required here. However, it is believed wiser to approach this matter on a conservative basis and to encourage efficient and careful handling of these subsidy claims through tight congressional control over appropriations.

The amount provided for salaries and expenses, which appropriation finances the operations of the Maritime Administration, covers approximately the same operating level as authorized for 1955. The additional $100,000 is to be used for reserve fleet expenditures.

The committee has also provided the budget estimate of $2,085,000 for the operation of the Kings Point (N. Y.) Maritime Academy. While this amount is slightly below that appropriated for 1955, it actually provides some additional funds for maintenance, in view of nonrecurring items and estimated savings made during the current fiscal year.

The committee has restored the full amount for the State maritime schools for the coming year. After full and complete hearings on this matter, in which many Members of the Congress presented testimony, the subcommittee believes that the future of the maritime industry and the national defense of the country warranted the restoration of the same amount as was appropriated for 1955, $660,000.

PATENT OFFICE

The committee is recommending $14 million for 1956, an increase of $2 million over the budget estimates and an increase of $2,500,000 over the amount appropriated for 1955. The committee took considerable testimony on this subject from Members of Congress and outside witnesses. It was apparent that a fairly well-organized effort to impress the committee with the need for additional funds was underway, spearheaded primarily by the patent lawyers of the country. While requests totaling $15 million and more were presented to the committee, the final figure recommended in this bill was based on testimony presented by the head of the Patent Office, Mr. Robert C. Watson, to the effect that he would not be able to employ experienced and qualified examiners at a rate which would require more than $14 million during the coming fiscal year. Subsequent informal discussions with several other top officials of the Department further supports this position.

The committee is in full sympathy with efforts to increase the staff of the Patent Office in order to reduce the existing 4-year backlog. It believes that the Secretary of Commerce was in error in submitting a budget of only $12 million. At the same time it does not feel that funds should be provided in an amount greater than can be used effectively. On the basis of the testimony from responsibile officials, it is believed that $14 million is the maximum which can be justified for 1956.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

The bill includes $600 million for Federal-aid highways for the coming fiscal year, a reduction of $80 million in the budget estimate. This amount will liquidate all authorizations through the middle of the fiscal year 1955. Since actual payment usually follows 15 to 18 months after contracts are approved, it is believed that the amount recommended will be sufficient to carry this program during the next fiscal year. If additional funds are required in 1956, supplemental appropriations will be necessary. It should be pointed out that the committee has little or no control over these funds, since the authority for the Bureau to enter into contracts and thereby commit the Government is contained in basic legislation. Therefore, the principal function of the Appropriations Committee with respect to this program is to provide adequate funds to make payments under contracts previously entered into on the basis of the authorizations contained in the basic legislation.

The same situation exists with respect to forest highways. For this purpose, the committee is providing $18,500,000 for 1956, the same amount as was appropriated for 1955. This amount will permit the payment of authorizations through the fiscal year 1955. This should be adequate, considering the normal time lag between commitment and final payment.

The original budget estimate submitted for the Inter-American Highway in January included $5,750,000 and was based on completion in about 6 years. This estimate was increased by House Document No. 126, dated April 13, 1955, to a total of $74,980,000. The revised estimate is based on a recent proposal of the administration to complete the highway within a 3-year period. In view of the lack of basic legislative authority for the revised estimate, and in view of the additional cost which will result from speeding up this program, the committee is recommending only $8 million for the coming fiscal year—on the basis of completion in 6 years. Officials of the

Bureau of Public Roads stated that a speeded-up program on a 3-year basis would cost the taxpayers of the country an additional $12 million, due to the necessity of bringing in larger amounts of heavy equipment to complete the job on a "crash basis," and in view of the need to bring in more outside labor at much higher labor costs. While the committee agrees that this project should be completed within a reasonable time, probably the 6 years originally planned, it does not feel that the additional cost of 20 percent should be approved in order to complete this program in 3 years.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The committee is recommending $7 million for the operations of the Bureau of Standards for the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of approximately $1 million over funds available for 1955. The increase is recommended in order to permit the Bureau to make adjustments required by the Comptroller General in the handling of overhead charges against projects undertaken for other agencies. The additional funds provided in the bill will make it possible for the Bureau to establish a proper charge for overhead against its own programs and thereby reduce the disproportionately high rate being charged to programs supported by transferred funds. In addition, the increase provided for 1956 will enable the Bureau to expand its regular research and testing, and radio propagation and standards work. The increased demand for improvement of the Bureau's work on such projects as temperature measurements, transistors, and engineering standards and techniques, is closely related to new developments in the fields of atomic energy, particularly with respect to military operations.

The committee also has included $995,000 for improvement of the plant and equipment of the Bureau and for the construction of an addition to the radio laboratory at Boulder, Colo., to conduct research for our armed services on electronic equipment calibration. This appropriation covers the cost of constructing the necessary buildings, whereas the cost of equipping and operating the facility will be borne by the military services.

WEATHER BUREAU

For the regular operations of the Weather Bureau the Committee recommends $27,650,000 for next year, an increase of $2,710,000 above funds available for 1955. This rather large increase will permit the Weather Bureau to take over certain basic meteorological activities now being supported by the Department of Defense, including 25 upper-air basic network stations, the central analysis work in Washington, the preparation and publication of special weather maps for the armed services, and the handling of weather services in Trust Territory Islands of the Pacific. Since these facilities have been operated by the Weather Bureau for some years now by a transfer of funds from the Defense Department, it appears advisable to provide the funds directly to the Weather Bureau. The Committee has been assured that a comparable reduction has been made in military funds to compensate for this portion of the increase. The balance of the increase will cover the full year cost of certain facilities operated during the fiscal year 1955 on a part-year basis. It will also cover the additional fringe benefit costs authorized by the last Congress.

The committee is also recommending the sum of $5 million for next year for the establishment of new meteorological facilities. Most of this increase is to provide additional hurricane and tornado-warning equipment, which is so urgently needed to help reduce the devastation caused each year by the severe storms such as those experienced along the east coast last year. A small portion of this fund will also be used to improve weather facilities needed to facilitate the landing of aircraft under adverse-weather conditions, to replace wornout and obsolete equipment of the Bureau, and to provide necessary engineering and technical support for installation of all equipment included in the $5 million recommended under this appropriation.

TITLE II, PANAMA CANAL—CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The committee has approved $14,500,000 for the operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government for 1956. This is an increase of $482,000 over funds available for 1955. The increase is provided to cover employee benefits authorized under the Fringe Benefits Act adopted last year and to meet increased needs for maintenance, education, and hospital services in the Canal Zone.

The sum of $1,800,000 is recommended for the capital program of the Canal Zone Government for the next fiscal year. With the exception of a major program for the construction of a sewage-disposal facility on the Pacific side, the fund provided covers the normal annual requirement for capital improvements in the area.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The committee has recommended $3,589,000 for administrative expenses of the Company during 1956, the same amount as was authorized for 1955. The committee is also recommending that the recent decision of the Directors of the Panama Canal Company to abandon the railroad in the Canal Zone be deferred until the matter has been given further consideration by the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives.

TITLE III, INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

An increase of $55,000 is recommended for this agency for 1956, which provides a total of $175,000. The additional funds cover full-year salaries for certain persons employed for only 6 months in 1955. In addition, a small increase in various experimental projects is provided for.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $280,000 for administrative expenses of this organization for 1956. This amount provides an increase of $30,000 over 1955 for the employment of 3 additional engineers required as the major construction program gets underway.

TARIFF COMMISSION

The full budget estimate of $1,400,000 has been included in the bill for next year. The increase of $73,000 will enable the Commission to more adequately meet increasing demands for its services. In addition, it will cover the new duties required by the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that I believe this to be a very fair and adequate bill. I am sure it does not provide all the money which some people think should be appropriated. On the whole, however, it is a well-balanced bill which provides the maximum amount which can reasonably be expected in view of the present condition of the Treasury. It represents the combined opinion of the subcommittee based on thorough and exhaustive hearings and careful deliberations on each item in the bill. I strongly recommend it to every Member of the House for adoption.

Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this bill that need some discussion. The first item I would like to discuss is the request for the Inter-American Highway. The committee received a supplemental request for $74,950,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway on a crash basis rather than on the 6-year basis contained in the regular budget. It was brought to our attention by the Bureau of Public Roads that this would require a penalty or a premium of $12 million in order to build it on a 3-year basis rather than a 6-year basis. The committee decided that it could not afford to spend $12 million in order to accomplish the job in 3 years rather than 6.

One reason assigned for the additional $12 million, among other things, was the necessity of moving a large amount of heavy equipment into the area and also sending additional people. So it was decided in the committee that we would complete the job on a 6-year basis, at a saving of $12 million, rather than on a 3-year basis.

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

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

Mr. MARTIN. I wonder if the gentleman gave any consideration that the completion of the road might be helpful in promoting our good will with South America and if that would not be far more important than the saving of $12 million, which will eventually be expended.

Mr. PRESTON. Well, I can only speak for myself. I would not undertake to speak for the remainder of the subcommittee. But it was my personal judgment that it would be more beneficial to the countries involved to have this money spread out over a 6-year period, that is, as to the economic effect, rather than on a 3-year basis, because in 3 years the economic effect would have been dispensed with, been over with, and if you save the $12 million and have it spread out over 6 years, it was my judgment it would be more beneficial to the countries involved.

Mr. MARTIN. In the meantime, you would be promoting travel between the

several countries, and that would be helpful in good will and trade. South America is where America has unlimited possibilities.

Mr. PRESTON. That is true, and that is one of the prevailing arguments and one of the convincing arguments that the committee considered in even approving the item at all.

Now, there is another item in the bill: Federal aid to airports. The request that we received from the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Department of Commerce, was in the amount of $11 million. The committee increased that to the sum of $20 million, and when you take into account the fact that $2 million are administrative expenses under another category, the present level of the program will be continued during the coming fiscal year as it was during this fiscal year.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to press an inquiry at this point concerning the smaller airports in this country. I have an airport in my district that has not been able to share in the Federal funds because it fails to meet unwise regulations. One company has a franchise to operate in the city of Fall River, but it is not using the permit. Another company would like to have the airport as a stop and they are not able to get that privilege. This makes it impossible for the airport to comply with the demands. Does the gentleman believe that that situation should be allowed to continue?

Mr. PRESTON. I will say to the distinguished minority leader that that has been a matter of concern to me, also. There is language in the report which recommends that the formula be changed. The present formula is 3,000 enplaned passengers during 1 year with 30 civil based aircraft, and under the language in the report I think I can assure the distinguished minority leader that smaller airports will be included in this program in the future rather than metropolitan airports.

Mr. MARTIN. I hope this is true. It is the smaller airports we are appropriating money to help.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] the language on page 4 of the committee report in regard to this feature of the bill:

> While the committee is in full agreement with this program and is endeavoring to support it with adequate funds—

And, of course, the amount was raised by the committee from $11 million to $20 million—

> it believes that every effort must be made to make certain that they are used wisely and effectively. It is felt that the present formula prevents development of smaller airports and operates to the advantage of airports in larger metropolitan areas.
>
> It is believed that the formula should be revised and consideration should be given in justifiable cases to smaller airports and in certain cases where operating facilities are involved.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. It is a step in the right direction and I will be pleased to see if the smaller airports get the aid Congress wants them to have.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FORD. I notice in the report that the committee has recommended $8 million for the Inter-American Highway, which is, by $2½ million, more than was available during the current fiscal year, I believe, but substantially less than the budget recommendation for this program.

I have read the committee's recommendations on page 8; I would like to ask this, however. Is my understanding correct that the Bureau of Public Roads of our Government decides how the $8 million or whatever the final figure is, is allocated for construction during the fiscal year 1956, or does some other party or agency make that decision?

Mr. PRESTON. No, the Bureau of Public Roads makes that decision.

Mr. FORD. They have the final authority as to where on the overall Inter-American Highway this sum, or whatever the final figure may be, shall be spent during the fiscal year 1956?

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. They could, if they wished, put it all on one segment of the road within one country, or they could spread it out over the full length of the highway and in a number of countries?

Mr. PRESTON. That is true; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. With reference to the item of grants-in-aid for airports, and the item of $20 million, to which the gentleman has just referred, I should like to ask the gentleman how the $20 million, plus the other $2 million referred to, will be used; for what purposes will that money be used?

Mr. PRESTON. There is a formula that is employed in allocating the funds. It is much too lengthy to have put it in the report or even in the hearings. It is available in the committee, and I am sure the committee would be delighted to show it to the gentleman from Georgia at any time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that point. The point that I was interested in principally was this. The Municipal Airport for Atlanta, Ga., is in the district which I represent. Atlanta issued bonds some years ago for improvement of the airport there. There has been no matching money to take care of that construction. I was wondering what the possibility was that some substantial matching funds would be available for that purpose from this appropriation.

Mr. PRESTON. Under the $20 million level or the $22 million level, there would be approximately $450,000 allocated to the State of Georgia.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it might be well to point out that the distinguished mayor of Atlanta, Ga., testified before the subcommittee and gave us the benefit of his advice with regard to the airport situation generally over the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentleman from New York. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] for the information.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There is a considerable amount recommended to be appropriated for maintenance and operation, and so forth, including construction, at the Washington National Airport. In the past, I am told, there has been some difficulty concerning concessions at the Washington National Airport and the revenues derived therefrom.

Has that matter been entirely cleared up—the revenue from concessions?

Mr. PRESTON. The committee went into that only briefly. They did not make a full-scale investigation of it, but the Washington National Airport is self-sustaining. The revenues are sufficient to defray all expenses.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the chairman of the subcommittee, has pointed out the fact that Washington National Airport is practically self-sustaining, insofar as present income and revenue are concerned. There has never been any real difficulty with regard to these concessions mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa. Over the years and from time to time, the Committee on Appropriations has expressed the thought that they were not charging enough for certain concessions and fees. That situation has always been promptly rectified. I think this is one of the operations of the Federal Government of which we might well be proud.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I merely inquired for information and I appreciate the answer given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that we are getting revenues from the concessions that the Committee on Appropriations thinks we ought to have.

May I address one other question to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield further.

Mr. GROSS. On page 9 of the bill, under the item "Bureau of Foreign Commerce," there is this language, "including awards of compensation to informers."

What is meant by that language? Does that mean what it says?

Mr. PRESTON. I do not have a copy of the bill before me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. That is the usual legislative language in connection with operations of the customs service and export control. When an informant gives our Government information with regard to smuggling, he may be entitled to a reward.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for answering the question.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia could tell me offhand how much of the $20 million was allocated for use in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. PRESTON. My recollection is, and I could be slightly in error on this, that it is in the neighborhood of $450,000, just as it is in Georgia.

Mr. JONAS. About the same as it is in Georgia?

Mr. PRESTON. It is about the same as it is in Georgia.

Mr. JONAS. I have a case in my district similar to the one referred to by the gentleman representing Atlanta. I am interested to the same extent he is in that appropriation.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HIESTAND. There is a prevailing opinion, pretty widespread, I fear, that in the matter of Patent Office appropriations we have over the years been penny wise and pound foolish. Would the gentleman like to explain why this increase is adequate to do the job?

Mr. PRESTON. I will be glad to. The committee gave a great deal of consideration to this request and we heard a large number of patent lawyers and people from business. We must have heard maybe 15 people in 1 day. The committee was of the opinion that if we would ever overcome this huge backlog of applications, which is more than 200,000, we would certainly have to give them additional funds. However, in looking into it we learned that $2 million above the budget request would be sufficient. The budget request was $12 million and we approved an item in the amount of $14 million. The committee concluded that that was as fast as they could employ new examiners to deal with the backlog, and that after they had employed additional people maybe next year the amount should be increased to $15 million. We think we have adequately handled the problem.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it not also the fact that the committee considered the evidence before it on mechanization of the Patent Office and the study that is being made may improve the Patent Office by use of business machines and things of that type?

Mr. PRESTON. That is true. We hope we can develop some type of electronic machine that will assist in the examination of the applications.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I represent the city of Columbus, which has an airport where the city has raised funds and issued bonds, but these amounts have not yet been matched by the Federal Government. I was wondering about the table on page 286 of the hearings which shows the Federal-aid airport program distribution of $11 million, the budget figure. I was wondering whether the increase of $9 million would be proportionate or not. For instance, Ohio is down for only $268,221 in this table.

Mr. PRESTON. It would be proportionate, because there are no administrative funds in the $20 million. They are contained in another category under the title of "Operations and Regulations."

Mr. VORYS. Does the gentleman have at hand the amount that would go to Ohio under section 6 of the Federal-aid program as applied to the $20 million proposed by the committee? I understand it would be about $500,000.

Mr. PRESTON. I think the staff would be glad to provide it to the gentleman from Ohio if he would step over to the table.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] and all my fellow members of the subcommittee for reinserting in this Department of Commerce 1956 appropriation bill the amount of $660,000 for the 4 State marine schools in Maine, New York, Massachusetts, and California. The Eisenhower administration saw fit to deny these funds, or attempted to deny them, and the committee is now furnishing these funds to the Department of Commerce and the President with an instruction that they be used and that Federal aid to these academies be continued in the coming fiscal year. I commend the gentleman from Georgia for the action of his committee.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. The committee felt it was a perfectly justifiable thing to do to restore the funds and that they served a very important service in connection with the overall potential of our Nation.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I join in expressing the appreciation of the committee for the restoration of these funds. As the gentleman knows, I come from the district in which the California State Maritime Academy is located. It has received these funds under the basic law of 1874 ever since it was created and has considered them as a part of its budget operations. Without these funds it would be in very difficult straits. I do want to express the appreciation of the Academy for your generous effort in restoring the funds.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the total of the appropriations carried in this bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies is $1,121,435,000. This is a reduction of $244,958,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. It should be pointed out that of this reduction, $23,225,000 is in the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, $63,540,000 in the Maritime Administration's budget request, and $153,480,000 in the budget estimate of the Bureau of Roads.

For the Office of Secretary the committee has allowed $2,172,000 which is the same as for the current fiscal year when transfers are taken into consideration.

The Bureau of the Census has been granted $6,200,000 for "Salaries and expenses," the same amount as for the current fiscal year. The sum of $5,500,000 has been recommended to complete the census of agriculture and $4 million to complete the censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries.

A total of $159,525,000 is included in the bill for the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The committee has recommended $20 million for grants-in-aid for airports which is an increase of $9 million over the budget estimate for this item. This increase should not be construed as a signal or an invitation to build or add unnecessary airports throughout the country. I, personally, am much more interested in seeing that the proper and necessary safety facilities are provided rather than the fancy chrome-stripped dining rooms in terminal buildings.

The committee has allowed $3,900,000 for "Salaries and expenses" for the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is an increase of $123,000 over the current fiscal year and is for strengthening the field audit program. The sum of $40 million is included for "Payments to air carriers."

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has been allowed $10,200,000, the same amount as provided for the current fiscal year.

For the Business and Defense Services Administration, there is provided in the bill $6,198,000, which is the same as for the current fiscal year when transfers are taken into consideration.

The committee has allowed $1,800,000 for "Salaries and expenses" and $2,500,000 for "Export control" for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce. The Office of Business Economics has been allowed $975,000, an increase of $75,000 over the current fiscal year.

A total of $177,445,000 is included in the bill for the Maritime Administration. Of this amount $64,700,000 is for "Ship construction"; $90 million is for "Operating differential subsidies"; $14 million is for "Salaries and expenses"; $6 million for "Repair of reserve fleet vessels"; $2,085,000, the budget estimate for "Maritime training" and $660,000 for "State marine schools."

The committee has recommended $14 million for "Salaries and expenses" of the Patent Office. This is $2 million above the budget estimate and is $2,500,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. This action is recommended in an effort to get this

office on a more current basis. The committee was advised that the backlog of pending cases was 216,266 as of the end of March. An applicant for a patent should not have to wait as long as he must now do. In fairness I should point out that this backlog is not something new or something which has sprung up overnight. A check of the records will show that back in 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951 there was a backlog of over 200,000 cases in each of those years.

An examination of the record will also reveal that this situation is not the fault of the Congress. This agency has been granted substantially what they have requested of the Congress in their budget estimates each year. Last year they received $500,000 more than the budget estimate. The amount recommended for this coming year is 228 percent of what it was for 1946. Additional funds alone will not solve the problem. The necessary additional competent personnel must be recruited. Modern methods and techniques must be applied in order to give the public the service to which they are entitled.

The bill includes $600 million for Federal-aid highways. In the event that the roadbuilding program proceeds at a faster pace than anticipated by the committee's action, additional funds will have to be provided. These funds are to pay for previously authorized road construction.

The sum of $18,500,000 is recommended for forest highways, which is the same amount as for the present fiscal year.

For the Inter-American Highway the committee has recommended $8 million, a decrease of $66,980,000 in the budget estimate.

A total of $7,995,000 is recommended for the National Bureau of Standards, of which $7 million is for expenses and $995,000 is for plant and equipment.

The committee recommends the sum of $32,650,000 for the Weather Bureau, an increase of $7,710,000 over the current fiscal year. Of this sum, $5 million is for establishment of meteorological facilities, of which the largest part is for additional upper-air hurricane and tornado warning equipment.

The committee has recommended $14,500,000 for operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government and $1,800,000 for capital outlay. A limitation of $3,589,000 for administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company has also been recommended.

The committee has recommended $1,400,000 for the Tariff Commission, an increase of $73,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

While I do not agree completely with every figure in the bill, it represents the combined judgment of the committee and in most respects I am in accord with the recommendations made.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I first extend my appreciation to the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to say a few words in reference to a matter which is of grave importance to us in New England. You heard earlier in the day that my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] intends to offer an amendment to this bill later in the afternoon for which he asks the united support of the delegation from New England. The Fogarty amendment seeks to increase the appropriations for the Weather Bureau to the extent of $3,850,000 in order to increase the existing station facilities which have been substantially reduced over the past few years and which seeks also to restore some of those abandoned or eliminated weather stations, and which would permit employees to be placed on a 24-hour basis rather than on a partial or temporary work program.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the 1954 hurricanes that swept through New England were the most destructive in our Nation's history.

Three savage blows killed hundreds of persons and injured additional thousands. The first hurricane, called Carol, caused more than $500 million in property damage alone.

Insurance rates have gone up.

Felled trees in the forests have since dried out and constitute a continuing fire hazard.

While States and communities, industry, agriculture, and transportation keep their fingers crossed, hoping for the best.

As weather experts tell us that New England will be squarely in the path of future hurricanes.

We are not considering a danger that may hurt us, as in the case of a possible radioactive fallout, but of damaging storms that have hit us and will continue to do so.

In the face of these facts, there is no excuse for the Federal Government to operate the vital Weather Bureau with a skeleton staff and with facilities inadequate to provide us with an early alert.

We could prevent more than 25 percent of the property damage, and save more than 90 percent of the lives that are lost, with advanced, accurate, and widely disseminated warnings that a hurricane may have its eye on us.

Although New England is now a principal target area, every Atlantic and Gulf State, from past experience, and projections for the future, must be prepared for the worst. Individual States are in no position to pick up and trace a hurricane that begins to mobilize for the attack far down in the West Indies. This is the responsibility of the United States Government.

The Department of Defense, due to the special weather forecasts it must have to safely guide the movements of planes and ships, and because of the ample funds at its command, has become very efficient in the field of meteorology.

The military services recognize that this should be the function of the United States Weather Bureau, providing that the civil agency is given sufficient funds, personnel, and facilities to maintain a national weather facsimile network.

They concur in the belief that certain basic meteorological activities, including upper air observations at 25 locations, should be transferred from the Department of Defense to the Weather Bureau.

Wind, and rain, and pressure, and all other weather phenomena, do not operate for a few months, and then take a vacation for the remainder of the year.

It is difficult to understand why the Weather Bureau was only given enough funds to maintain facilities on a part-time basis in 1954.

Part time?

Even the increasing number of business organizations which must have special information regarding weather conditions in order to carry on their operations, failed to insist upon adequate staffing, equipment, and coverage.

This neglect resulted in heavy losses to human beings and economic enterprises last year.

All for want of a few million dollars' worth of foreknowledge. The need for advance warnings on hurricanes is a subject that cannot be disregarded.

We invite disaster when we economize at the expense of public safety.

The New England delegation in Congress, together with the Representatives from many other States, favor the additional appropriations for staff and equipment to maintain an efficient hurricane-warning service.

And to enable our Weather Bureau to become up to date.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to ask a question about the amendment proposing an increase for the Weather Bureau. In my mind there is a question as to its sufficiency, because only a short time ago I introduced a bill which was written on the advice of the best meteorologists in the country. They said they could not get by for less than $5 million, but that would also include a warning system for tornadoes and other severe storms. How does the gentleman reconcile the amount of $3,850,000 as against the $5 million the experts recommend?

Mr. LANE. I assume that the author of the amendment has conferred with the Weather Bureau division of our Government and has been informed that perhaps with that amount of money they could adequately take care of the situation. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman has been very vitally interested in this subject matter and has worked zealously here in the Congress for it. May I say to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] that I have read his bill, I have read his statement made to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I agree with him most heartily, but I was hopeful, since the matter has been brought to the attention of the committee, that since the gentleman's bill called for that sum of money, $5 million, and that with the paring down of this sum by the Fogarty amendment, that the amount would obtain the approval of the Congress by way of a compromise amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. May I say to the gentleman that the insurance companies of the country and the meteorologists of the country have agreed that my bill is the one that should be accepted.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee in charge of this bill has reduced the overall requests of the Department of Commerce by about $245 million, or, roughly, 19 percent.

Included in that reduction is a substantial slash in the funds requested by the President for the maritime ship construction program.

The request was for $102.8 million. The committee has allowed $64.7 million. The result is that the amount approved is $38.1 million or 37 percent below the request of the President. It is also $17.9 million or 21 percent below the amount allowed for the current fiscal year.

The reduction eliminates 3 prototype vessels desired for mobilization purposes, 1 high-speed tanker very much desired by the Navy and 2 cargo ships. It also eliminates 5 tankers from an extended trade-in-and-build program, a program which has been strongly endorsed by the National Security Council.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this reduction.

I am opposed to it because of the vital importance of a proper maritime-construction program to our national defense.

A proper maritime-construction program is vital from the standpoint of merchant marine vessels essential in time of an emergency.

For years we have been told by the Department of Defense of a deficiency in essential merchant ships. Two years ago the deficiency was officially estimated at 214 ships—no real progress has been made since then.

Time and time again we have been told by the Department of Defense of the need for new tankers; that those on hand are obsolete or too slow; that there are practically no tankers at all in the reserve fleet; that there are not enough tankers on hand to meet the initial mobilization impact.

It was only a year or so ago on March 27, 1954, that Admiral Leggett, then Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Navy Department advised us and I quote:

> The current and prospective scarcity of commercial ship construction constitutes a serious threat to our national security.

A proper maritime-construction program is also vital from the standpoint of the preservation of facilities and know-how which are essential in time of emergency.

Our shipbuilding industry has been in distress. It still is in distress. Employment on merchant ship construction has been declining ever since the first quarter of 1953. It is still declining. As of March 1, 1955, the total construction personnel on oceangoing ships was less than 7,000. This figure compares with that of 36,000, officially estimated a year or so ago, as the minimum required for an adequate mobilization potential in terms of our national security.

Living near the seaboard, as I do, I come face to face with ship construction problems. It is tragic to see skilled workers who have given from 20 to 25 years of their lives to ship construction, who have made a great contribution to the Nation in the past, who would be in great demand tomorrow in the event of an emergency, who are now forced to be idle or to look for work in other fields where their skills will be lost to national defense.

The construction yard in my own congressional district, which has made magnificent contributions to the Nation, both in time of war and time of peace; which employed some 30,000 construction workers during World War II; which requires probably 6,000 workers from the standpoint of an essential mobilization facility; has today only 2,000 people on its payroll.

Speaking a year ago on April 28, 1954, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Admiral Leggett also had this to say:

> The situation today in our private shipyards is so critical that I have grave concern whether the industry can meet mobilization production schedules.
>
> It is apparent that the industry is not prepared today to meet initial wartime requirements. Our private yards now have less than one-third of the total employees in December 1941, and a further drastic reduction is expected later on this year as the privately owned and mariner construction now on the ways is completed.

I repeat—

He said—

> the Navy is gravely concerned with the plight of the shipbuilding industry which promises to become the most vulnerable area in our entire preparedness program.

I do not say, Mr. Chairman, that all shipyards are essential. I do say that it is vital to keep in being those yards which are essential in time of need, and those staffs of skilled workers which are essential in time of need. A proper maritime ship-construction program is essential to these ends.

To fail in either respect is to limit our military power and to go contrary to the fundamentals of our whole national defense policy.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the reduction made in the funds requested by the President for maritime construction.

I have canvassed many Members of the House and Senate who are deeply interested, as I am, in the restoration of these funds.

I believe that additional funds can and will be added at the other end of the Capitol and that this action will greatly strengthen our hands later in opposition to the position taken by the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. The figures contained in the bill now being considered by the House were arrived at as the result of compromise.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman from New York. The matter must, of course, be reviewed at the other end of the Capitol. Neither he nor I would wish to jeopardize that review.

I am assured that the matter will be thoroughly and carefully reviewed. I am confident that funds will be restored in the course of that review, in the light of further evidence that will be available at the time.

Funds eliminated by the committee should be restored before the bill is enacted into law. I shall do my utmost to that end.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts on his very fine statement. We in Maryland, too, are very much concerned about this reduction. Our hope, which is the same as that of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is that the money will be restored in the other body.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the very able gentleman from Maryland for his contribution. He always has the best interests of the merchant marine and the shipworkers at heart.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly interested in reading the report of this subcommittee and reading the hearings conducted by the subcommittee, with particular attention to that section of the hearings and the report dealing with the American merchant marine. I want to congratulate the committee on the language in the report, and I want to let the committee know and the chairman of the committee know that this language has been of great interest to the legislative committee dealing with the American merchant marine. I read:

> It is believed that close scrutiny should be given to employment practices and similar cost factors of subsidized lines in order that future payments may be reduced to a minimum.

Yes, the American merchant marine is essential to the national defense of this country and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] I would say that we must have more ships afloat if we have any idea of maintaining the proper number of employees in the shipyards ashore. Some way must be found by all segments of industry to increase the number of American-flag vessels on the high seas.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering today a bill which contains funds for maritime activities for the coming fiscal year. Among other items there will be appropriated the sum of $90 million for the payment of operating differential subsidies. This is $25 million less than the amount requested by the administration and it is altogether possible that unless the full amount is restored, either here or in the Senate, we will be called upon to make a supplemental appropriation for this purpose later on.

This is an obligation we owe. This is not some forecast; this is not just by perchance. These figures are obligated at the present time, the full amount that was requested. To have a merchant marine we must pay the subsidy. There is no other way we can have it.

But in any event, Mr. Chairman, this is a large sum of money and the fact that this item has increased year after

year has been of great concern to many of us.

I want to assure my colleagues in this body that the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of which I have the honor to be chairman, not only are concerned but are determined to ascertain whether the taxpayers of this country are getting their money's worth in the payment of these bills. I think it is appropriate at this time that I review the activities of my committee since the beginning of the current session of Congress.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was designed to develop and maintain an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine. It provided subsidies to aid in the construction of safe, modern ships, as well as subsidies to enable those ships to compete on a parity basis with the fleets of other nations. Today foreign competition is at an alltime high. Nations which have never before embarked on maritime careers are entering the field—even landlocked Switzerland has a merchant fleet. Our coastal and intercoastal fleets have all but disappeared. This was brought to pass when the Congress placed our coastal tariffs under the Interstate Commerce Commission. That obliterated the coastal operation of merchant fleets. There never was a chance for an operation to exist after that date.

During the past year we have fallen from 7th to 12th place among the nations of the world in ship construction. Is it any wonder that I say we are dealing with a sick industry?

We began our program this year by holding a series of orientation hearings. Primarily for the benefit of the new members of the committee. These were very instructive and have served to enable the membership better to understand the problems with which we are now struggling.

We took a look into the administration of the Tanker Trade-In Act, enacted by the 83d Congress. This act is designed to encourage the building of new tankers of a high speed and improved design. The basic necessity for the legislation was described as twofold. First, to stimulate our shipbuilding industry; and, second, to enhance the strength of our reserve tanker fleet. We find that progress under this law has been slow but steady. Generally speaking, its purpose is being accomplished. However, it was found that although the legislation contemplated the construction of tankers with a speed of not less than 18 knots, several contracts were negotiated, or in the process of negotiation, calling for the construction of tankers of less than 18-knot speed. I am pleased to report that by timely action on the part of your committee, this deviation from the program as outlined to the Congress has been checked.

Soon after the first of the year charges were made that the Cargo Preference Act, commonly referred to as the 50–50 law, was constituting a bottleneck in the administration of our foreign-aid programs. You will recall that under this law the privately owned American flag vessels are entitled to carry at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currency by the United States Government. The committee took cognizance of these charges and promptly called before it all those charged with the administration of the law.

Let me pause to say at this point that I am amazed at the efforts being made, both here and abroad, to sabotage this statute. I have every reason to believe that these efforts began to generate even before the ink was dry on the President's signature. I am fortified in this belief by the fact that we found no real basis for the charges that the law was delaying foreign-aid shipments.

There were to be sure some temporary impediments which, to some, seem more apparent than real, but which the committee immediately took steps to eliminate. Measures also were recommended to prevent overlapping in efficiency and future maladministration of this most important legislation to the American merchant marine. We have just concluded a series of hearings on the problems facing the American merchant marine in connection with the replacement of the existing fleet. Between 1956 and 1966, practically the entire fleet which was built during the war period will become obsolete. Obviously, it would not be sound policy to wait until 1966 to begin the construction of new replacement vessels. This would serve only to add to the feast or famine characteristic of the shipbuilding industry. Consequently, it is in order for the Government to try to secure an orderly replacement of the existing fleet at the least possible expense to the American taxpayers. A report containing the committee's findings and recommendations for dealing with this problem will be issued in the near future. Beginning next week, the committee will begin the most important phase of this program for this session of the Congress. We are going to call up before us in closed, off-the-record meetings the top leaders in labor and management in the maritime industry. We intend to engage in frank discussions with these leaders of the basic problems and difficulties confronting the American merchant marine. We shall ask them for recommendations and solutions for improving these conditions. I do not want to leave the impression that the present Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is a pioneer in the field of attempting to find the causes and prescribe the remedy for the ills of the industry. Many studies have been made and it is not our intention to retrace the steps of other groups. We do intend, however, to take full advantage of their work and to insist by legislation or otherwise on the adoption of some of the remedies that other groups have already recognized as essential to any improvement in the situation.

Members of our staff have been sent to practically every major port in the country to study this problem and to help find the answer to it. We have received reports from these field studies, and these reports have increased our concern. I am very much afraid there has been a lack of responsibility on the part of the leaders of the maritime industry, both labor and management. And, if the Government is subsidizing irresponsibility, we shall lay the facts before the Congress and the American people. If operating costs have increased to unreasonable levels, we shall do all in our power to see that that is cut out. Labor and management must be made to realize that beyond the obligations they owe to their rank and file or to their boards of directors, they owe a great fidelity to the Government of the United States in the position they hold in the American merchant marine. Perhaps there is no more vital link in our defense setup, which we have designed to let remain under civil control. We want to keep it that way, but irresponsibility cannot be countenanced.

Mr. Chairman, I quote the Secretary of the Navy in his Maritime Day address, at the Shoreham Hotel last Thursday evening, when he said:

> Only did we begin to win World War I and World War II when the production of merchant vessels became greater than the losses we were sustaining at sea.

That one statement alone shows definitely, and is convincing, that the American merchant marine is vital and necessary to the defense of this Nation, just as great as the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, in a measure of this sort which involves $1.1 billion distributed among varied agencies including the entire Department of Commerce, it is only natural that there would be differences of opinion among the 10 members of the subcommittee; but I think it is proper to report to this Committee of the Whole that as far as I could observe our subcommittee was in remarkable accord in the overall picture.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], was most considerate. The views of all members were fully considered. While I would not want to tell this body that there is a single member of this committee who is entirely satisfied with every item, I think we have today a bill that has been brought out with as much unanimity of feeling, and with as little partisanship or sectional bias as it is possible to have in such a complex piece of legislation.

Personally, I am grateful to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on both sides for the courtesies shown me.

As has been pointed out, there are some places where perhaps some of us would have appropriated a little more money. Mention has already been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and others, of a matter which is very close to the hearts of many members of this subcommittee, and that is the welfare of our great merchant marine. I think we are all very conscious of the need of an outstanding merchant marine.

I might call attention to the fact that as far as the maritime training schools in the 4 States are concerned, this committee provided funds even though they were not requested in the budget. However, I think we should bear in mind the fact that money alone does not answer all the ills of the day. We cannot always accomplish the desired results by appropriating more and more money. It is most important in the shipbuilding program and in the entire merchant marine program to move with reasonable economy, but at the same time with dispatch. I hope it will be possible to wisely spend more money in some of that field than is provided for in this measure, but until it is definitely shown that it can be economically and wisely spent during this year, the committee, perhaps, would be in error in providing more money just because the committee would like to see progress in that field.

The same thing applies with great force to the Patent Office.

As was mentioned earlier in the debate, we are concerned with the long delay in clearing the backlog of applications in the Patent Office, but money alone will not solve the problem. The committee feels that the sum that has been allowed is all they can spend wisely, because it is not wise to hire people to fill those places without providing proper training for them, and the people who are now overworked, overburdened, are the very ones who not only would have to carry along the regular work but also train the new people. It would therefore seem unwise to appropriate more money than can be effectively used even though there is great need for improvement.

Another matter that has already been mentioned deals with the Weather Bureau. I guess there are few people more cognizant of the ills that befall the countryside from a hurricane than myself, because I was in the heart of Hurricane Hazel, that lady who did almost as much damage as Carol, and certainly made a very lasting impression on this area here in Washington as well as in my country on the Chesapeake Bay, in Maryland. We have allowed an increase in the funds for the Weather Bureau. I think an increase of some $7,700,000 over the year before; in fact, I think the committee recommended only $200,000 less than the full budget estimate on an item that runs somewhere around $32 million. Certainly, if the spending of $200,000 or $2 million would alleviate hurricane damage, there is no one on this committee, I think, who will oppose it. But truth of the matter is that, important though the subject is, the money provided may well be all that can be wisely spent under the circumstances and the situation that has been placed before us.

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we are going to be confronted here with an amendment to increase the appropriation for the purpose of expanding the hurricane warning system, does the gentleman not agree that we should also expand the facilities for tornado warnings in other parts of the country?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think the facilities in both fields should be expanded as rapidly as they can be efficiently; but I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the initial stages the mere appropriation of money does not get results.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. We want to appropriate money which will give results but only where the funds can be wisely spent.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, but I also think if any increase is provided we should couple with it increased tornado warning facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. They are equally important. Anything that causes such damage to property and loss of life is of top priority.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is not a question of repairing hurricane damage; what we want in essence is ample warning to batten down the hatches and do the things that will save our property and our lives. In the case of the last hurricane we did not know anything about it, we had no warning of it until the thing was practically over. There must be some way by which the Weather Bureau could have informed the New England coast, Connecticut, and Rhode Island of what was coming.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I am not sufficiently informed to assess properly the capabilities of this great scientific organization and how adequately it operates. I can only say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that in this bill we have given all but $200,000 of the amount asked of us to operate the Weather Bureau. We feel that they can do without that $200,000 by making reasonable economies without interfering with their service.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to call attention to page 9 of the report where we allowed $2,700,000 additional for hurricane and tornado work and warning.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. And on the showing made to the committee that that was the amount the Department felt it could use properly and to the benefit of all concerned. Is that not so?

Mr. HORAN. That is correct.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then no request has been made for extra money by the Weather Bureau? Is that true?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. As I recollect it we cut $200,000 below the budget request on an item that ran over $32 million. It is there in the report. It was merely tightening up a little bit without cutting out any of the functions. We felt they could economize to that extent.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not quite understand this because I have been in communication with people in the Weather Bureau and they inform me that they need around $5 million to carry out this program of warning people in New England, in fact, along the entire coastline, including Texas, when a storm is brewing. Now, there is something wrong some place if they tell you one thing and tell us another.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I would like to refer the gentleman from Connecticut to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia. I do not want to misrepresent anything. My understanding is that we have given them within $200,000 of what they asked.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman will see from the report of the committee, page 19, that there has been an increase this year over the appropriation for last year of $7,710,000 and that we come this year to within $200,000 of the total budget request.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is what I stated.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The gentleman from Connecticut has said he was told by someone in the Weather Bureau that they needed $5 million that we have not given them. That is what I was asking the gentleman from Georgia to verify, because I had not heard of it.

Mr. BOW. We gave them the budget request. What they might have asked the Bureau of the Budget is something else, but that is what we have given.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. That is all we know about.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. My understanding is that the Weather Bureau asked the Department of Commerce for $49 million and the Secretary of Commerce cut that by $11 million. When the Secretary of Commerce came to justify his request for the Weather Bureau, they cut it $5 million more. The gentleman from Ohio talks about a $7 million increase in the budget. Five million dollars of that increase goes for meteorological facilities which everyone realizes they need and that $5 million is $5 million less than what they put to use. The other two or three million dollars increase concerns itself with a transfer of operations from the Department of Defense to the Weather Bureau, so, actually, the Government does not lose any money there. There is not an additional $3 million outlay by the Government because you are saving the money by not having the Department of Defense do the work. I think it has been the history of the Weather Bureau that it has been very reluctant, and very hesitant, to ask the Congress for specific appropriations to take care of the warnings that are necessary to take care of lives and property in the New England area.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. If a reasonable increase in this appropriation can be of help in this important matter or even can be held to have a fair

chance of being useful in saving life, I will support such an amendment.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, there are three items in this bill that I would like to address myself to. The first one is the Inter-American Highway. Now, it was my pleasure to represent the Subcommittee on Commerce Appropriations at the dedication of a link in that highway some 2 weeks ago. I think it is a good highway. I think it is a very valuable contribution to inter-American affairs. When you realize that up until the time in 1934 when we began construction of a highway from Laredo, Tex., headed in the direction of the Isthmus of Panama, the only access to the outside world that 8 million people living in Central America had was by means of banana boats, it is quite obvious to anyone who travels in Central America that this highway is helping to bring into being a substantial middle-class. It is easy to appreciate the value of that highway. We have already invested some $46 million in that highway. It is not a bad road. There are about 130 some odd miles that today are still impassable between San Jose, Costa Rica, and the Isthmus of Panama. The President has requested the Congress to provide funds to complete that highway in 3 years. Our subcommittee did not allow these funds because the basic authorization had not yet passed the Congress, but I understand it now is out of the Committee on Public Works and that a rule is being sought, and the authorization will allow for the speedy completion of the Inter-American Highway.

The second item I want to report on is a trip that I took with other members of the subcommittee last Friday who went out to the National Airport and made an afternoon flight up to Atlantic City to a naval air base there to try to clear up some of the confusion that exists today between two systems of aviation safety facilities, namely, VOR-DME versus a new system which is called TACAN. The conclusion of all those that I have talked to who made that trip is that we had better go slow with TACAN and that it will be further investigated, preferably by the CAA.

The third matter I want to bring to the attention of the Committee is the new system of accounting down in the National Bureau of Standards where so much of their funds previously have been accounted for through transfers. They now have sort of a revolving fund working down there. That will help us greatly in appropriating wisely for the National Bureau of Standards.

When we go back into the House, I expect to ask unanimous consent to place that report in the RECORD at this point.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS.

THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

As a technique for effective fiscal management and cost ascertainment the National Bureau of Standards uses a working capital fund. This fund permits the NBS to utilize methods of fiscal management and cost control that are common to nongovernmental organizations. The concept of this fund is similar to revolving funds, and industrial funds which are used increasingly in the management of operations of an intragovernmental-service nature.

The NBS system was one of the early applications of the working capital fund technique. It is unique in certain respects, and, occasionally, its use has been confusing to persons responsible for reviewing the programs of the Bureau. The reasons for its use, and the major features of its operation are described here to clarify this aspect of the Bureau's management for those who need to understand, or are interested in how the fiscal affairs of the Bureau are managed.

BUREAU ACTIVITIES

The National Bureau of Standards serves as a national laboratory for problems relating to the fundamental standards of measurement in the physical sciences. Within the fields of physics, mathematics, chemistry, and various branches of engineering, the Bureau engages in fundamental and applied research, development, calibration, and testing and provides a variety of technical and advisory services to science, industry, and Government. The programs of the Bureau are supported both by appropriations to the Bureau and by funds supplied by other agencies. During the past 6 years, appropriations to NBS for its own basic operations have ranged between $6 million and $8 million each year. The Bureau appropriations support between two and three hundred distinct projects in 15 technical divisions. During that same period, funds supplied by other agencies have ranged from $10 million to $45 million each year to finance several hundred projects throughout the Bureau.

PROBLEMS OF FISCAL MANAGEMENT

The type of work performed at NBS, and the large volume of work for other agencies creates many problems in accounting, budgeting, and other aspects of fiscal management. The following is a partial list of factors affecting these problems:

1. The transfers from other appropriations result in several hundred separate working fund acounts for which NBS is responsible.

2. Many projects receive support from more than one source.

3. Most of the employees in the technical divisions work on several projects during a year, and many of them work on more than one project during a pay period.

4. Indirect costs—supervisory, administrative, and maintenance costs—must be supported by the various appropriations and working funds.

5. Much of the equipment needed for the technical programs is used on more than one project.

6. For effective work, a large storeroom of various supplies and materials must be maintained and accounted for.

Prior to July 1, 1950, the Bureau had a regular appropriation-accounting system. The factors mentioned above created many problems which could be dealt with only in a makeshift manner. For example, a portion of each advance of funds from other agencies was deducted for overhead expense when the advance was received, and therefore without regard to when, or whether, the portion of the fund for technical work was ultimately completely expended. The processing of payrolls was very cumbersome because the charges had to be related to the several hundred fund accounts in order to make the necessary disbursements. Thus, payments and management reports were both delayed by the processing of costs through the numerous funds, and techniques for splitting charges to two or more funds on shared services or items was very difficult.

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED METHODS

During fiscal year 1950, the Bureau decided that fiscal control of the Bureau's program, at the scientific level and at management levels, would be improved by developing new methods of fiscal management, cost ascertainment, and reporting for each of the projects undertaken by the Bureau. Action on this problem was stimulated by complaints of the House Appropriations Subcommittee based on a report by their staff. Emphasis on solving this problem was also prompted by a General Accounting Office survey.

The problem was studied, and solutions proposed by a group of experts from the GAO, the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, and officials of the Bureau. This group concluded that the use of a revolving fund would aid in the solution of some of the Bureau's fiscal problems. Costs could be initially allocated to projects in a revolving fund which could be reimbursed by the supporting funds after payments were made to vendors and reports were prepared for management use.

In the course of establishing the revolving fund, attempts were made to deal with such problems as charging for equipment, charging for indirect costs, and allocating salary costs of personnel on leave. As a result, the revolving fund took on some of the aspects of a capital fund of a corporate organization. In the accounting system that was developed, provision was made for including accrued leave and depreciation of equipment as elements of cost, for recording charges for supplies and materials as cost only when the supplies were delivered to the point of use, and for distributing administrative and maintenance expense as indirect—or overhead—cost to all programs.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER USES OF REVOLVING FUNDS

It should be noted that revolving funds, stock funds, and similar financing techniques had been used previously in the Government, e. g., the Bureau of Engraving and Printing had recently been put on a working capital fund. However, so far as is known, practically all of these financing devices were applied to programs which were wholly of a service nature, and did not mix in one organization, or financing system, the availability of appropriated funds and the utilization of a revolving, or capital, fund. The authority for industrial funds in the Department of Defense was new at this time, and generally speaking, was being used only in the financing of supply depots, manufacturing, or other operations which were wholly charged to customer units. At NBS the use of a working capital fund introduced a unique concept: The NBS as an agency which has its own program appropriations would be contracting with itself (the fund). This concept can be stated in reverse: The WCF embraces all of NBS operations which are services provided for many customers, and one of these customers is the NBS program appropriations.

DESCRIPTIONS OF THE MAIN FEATURE

The working capital fund was established July 1, 1950, by the appropriation of $3 million of working capital. (Due to an increase in the volume of work performed by the Bureau, the Congress subsequently appropriated $2 million of additional working capital.) The fund finances the initial cost of all work performed by the Bureau and is reimbursed periodically by the applicable appropriations and working funds. As of June 30, 1954, the principal of the fund consisted of $5 million in appropriations and net donated assets such as buildings and grounds of over $26 million.

For purposes of accumulating costs and for program management, the programs of the National Bureau of Standards are classified in a series of projects. Each distinct

job undertaken by the Bureau, either for other agencies or as a part of the basic Bureau program, is identified as a project. Each project is assigned to an organization unit, for example, section or division, and is in one of four activity categories established for program budgeting: Research; development; testing, calibration, and specifications; and general technical services.

All obligations and costs incurred in the performance of a project are recorded for that project in the working capital fund. Direct costs include salaries, travel, materials, contractual services, and special equipment. In addition, indirect costs, or overhead, which include costs of supervision and administration of the technical divisions, depreciation of equipment, administration of the Bureau, and maintenance of Bureau facilities, are charged on a pro rata basis to all projects.

The charges to projects for salaries of personnel include, in addition to the hourly rate for productive time worked on the project, a charge for the amount of leave earned by employees while working on the project. The amount charged to projects for accrued leave is accumulated in a leave reserve account from which salary payments are made when the employees are on leave. Since an employee engaged in the technical programs of the Bureau will often work on more than one project during a given time period, some means is necessary to determine which project shall bear the costs of his salary when he is on leave. The method of charging for leave on an accrual basis provides a ready solution to that problem.

The Bureau maintains a large storeroom for frequently used supplies and materials. These supplies are purchased by the working-capital fund and carried as an asset of that fund until such time as they are requisitioned for use. At that time the cost of the supplies is charged to the requisitioning project.

The accounting system for the working-capital fund distinguishes between capital outlay and expenses. Equipment is purchased by the working-capital fund and carried as a fixed asset. The costs of equipment are recovered by charging the using projects for depreciation of the equipment. For equipment which is of general use in a technical division, the charge for depreciation is based on estimated life and is included as an indirect cost which is prorated to all projects in the division. For other equipment which is of special use only to certain projects, or for which use beyond the immediate fiscal year is uncertain, the entire cost of the equipment is directly charged to the using project; that is, the equipment is fully depreciated at the time purchased.

THE METHOD OF APPLYING OVERHEAD, INCLUDING THE BILLING DIFFERENTIAL

The major element of indirect cost to a project is for administration of the Bureau and maintenance of Bureau facilities. Administration includes the costs of executive direction and of central service activities such as personnel and accounts. Since the Bureau is responsible for maintenance of its buildings and grounds, the costs of this activity are also included in Bureau overhead for proration to all projects.

The distribution of indirect costs to technical projects is based on salary costs in those projects. Each project is charged a percentage of its salary costs, the percentage being calculated to recover a total equal to the costs of the administrative and maintenance activities. For example, the administrative and maintenance programs of the Bureau were budgeted at about $3.4 million for fiscal year 1955. Since salary costs in all technical projects were estimated to total $11,040,000, an overhead rate of 31 percent of salary costs was derived.

The so-called billing differential arises from the fact that the Bureau does not charge all projects at a 31 percent overhead rate. Projects supported by Bureau appropriations are charged less than 31 percent and projects sponsored by other agencies are charged more than 31 percent. The difference between the amount charged to each group of projects and the amount which would be charged using the true or average rate has been termed the billing differential.

The rise of two overhead rates has its origin in the structure and size of the appropriations made to the Bureau for its own programs. For example, the Bureau received 3 appropriations in 1955: Research and testing, $3,150,000 (for technical work only); radio propagation and standards, $2,100,000 (for technical work only); and operation and administration, $990,000 ($740,000 for overhead; $250,000 for other purposes).

It is estimated that, of the $5,250,000 in the Bureau's 2 technical appropriations for 1955, approximately $4,180,900 will be expended for salary costs. At a true overhead rate of 31 percent, the Bureau's appropriations should pay $1,296,000 for overhead costs. However, the Bureau has available only $740,000, equivalent to a rate of approximately 18 percent. The difference of $556,000 is an increase in the amount charged to projects sponsored by other agencies and results in an overhead rate of about 40 percent.

The Comptroller General has criticized the billing differential practice and has stated that it is illegal and must be corrected. The elimination of the practice would simplify the administration of Bureau programs, permitting a uniform system of control and management for all projects. Also, elimination of the practice becomes more important as the Bureau approaches achievement of the program goals outlined in its budget request. A major goal is to achieve a better balance between work financed by its own appropriations and work financed by other agencies. As the ratio of NBS work to other-agency work increases, the billing differential and problems associated with it are magnified.

In its budget for 1956, the Bureau has requested funds be appropriated sufficient to permit the same rate on all projects, and that these operating moneys for the Bureau, technical and overhead, be in the same appropriation.

THE RESULTS OF THE SYSTEM

The operation of a project cost accounting system in the working capital fund has provided the solution to some of the accounting problems of the Bureau, and has enabled management control of Bureau programs at the project level. The cost accounting system lends itself readily to mechanized accounting operations, which in turn provides prompt and accurate accounting reports at several levels of detail. Summary statements of project costs are provided monthly for the use of project managers as well as central Bureau administration. More frequent interim reports on the status of the costs of a project are also available for project managers. Program costs are provided in readily usable form for presentation of the Bureau's budget requests and for reports to sponsoring agencies. The total operations of the working capital fund are summarized in business-type statements monthly to reflect the changes in assets, liabilities, and categories of income and expense.

SOME REMAINING PROBLEMS

The operation of the working capital fund and the project cost accounting system has a significant effect on the manner in which the Bureau's budget requests are presented. In terms of program budgeting, the accounting system provides a wealth of detail concerning program costs. It also provides ready summaries of costs by objects of expenditure. However, such summaries can be provided only for direct costs in particular programs and indirect costs in total, regardless of the program which ultimately bears a share of those costs. That is, the costs of the various object classes of expenditures for the administrative program can be determined for that program in total, but not for the portion of that program which is borne by Bureau appropriations, since that portion represents merely a pro rata distribution of the total. Similarly, it is possible to provide summaries of personnel costs and man-years of effort directly devoted to specific programs, but personnel costs and man-years of effort in the administrative program are not directly relatable to specific technical programs.

A similar problem occurs with regard to analysis of filled positions or Bureau employment as of a given date. It is possible to present information concerning all positions or all persons on the rolls but it is not possible to present information of the number of positions for a particular appropriation or program. Since employees work on more than one project, the single position which an employee fills cannot be related to any one appropriation or program. Relating individual positions to specific programs would either distort the costs of the programs or be incompatible with the true costs as they are now recorded.

These are problems mainly in the use of fiscal and budget data by reviewing levels who are more accustomed to the normal governmental financial techniques. They are not problems in the day-to-day management of the Bureau.

EXAMPLES OF REPORTS

As has been indicated, the accounting system uses electric accounting machines, which permit a wide variety of reports at many levels between detail and summarization. The three most significant reporting documents are the individual project cost-summary statement, the budget report, and the business-type statements. Samples of each of these are attached.

The project cost summary is prepared monthly for each project. This report shows the accrued cost by object class for the current month, and the year to date, with the total obligations compared to the authorized budget for the project.

The budget report compares obligations with budget plans. Its comparisons distinguish between programs supported by bureau appropriations and work for other agencies. The levels of summarization are section, division, and Bureau totals.

The business-type statements are a series of reports which reflect the status of the working-capital fund as a commercial entity. Some of the most significant statements cover income and expense, balance sheet, stores inventory activity, profit and loss, and the sources and application of funds using commercial categories or nomenclature.

The first two reports are of primary significance in managing the programs of the Bureau. The business-type statements are used mainly in managing the special features of the WC fund, such as inventories, equipment, leave payments, and controlling factors such as accounts payable and receivable, and profits and losses on fixed-fee work.

Examples of other reports prepared as a part of the working-capital fund accounting system and used in managing the Bureau's fiscal affairs can be supplied.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, appropriations bills, of course, can sometimes be quite dull. Money figures are not always most interesting. But, it seems to me that it should properly be observed

at this time that with all this talk of the so-called Hoover Commission saving money for the taxpayers and helping to balance the budget, according to an article in today's Washington Daily News by Mr. Albert M. Colegroce, the Hoover suggestions made headlines but no results. Not one recommendation has been carried out. Now, you have spent substantial sums of the taxpayers' moneys for this Commission and its huge staff, but whatever recommendations they have made have not been accepted in the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me that the philosophy today of the Eisenhower administration is to spend, and spend, and spend. A perusal of the printed hearings of this subcommittee on the budget requests for the Department of Commerce will show some interesting items.

The following questions were asked and the following answers given by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Moore with regard to appropriations for the office of Secretary of Commerce:

Mr. ROONEY. Is it correct that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, fixed the sum of $2.3 million for running the Office of the Secretary?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Is this the highest amount in the history of the United States of America for the running of that office?

Mr. MOORE. I have not gone back to check. We can get that for you.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, is it?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

It developed that when there was appropriated the amount $1,300,000 in fiscal year 1950 for the running of the office of the Secretary of Commerce he administered over 42,000 or 43,000 employees, which appears at page 61 of the printed committee hearings, whereas with $2.3 million now requested by Secretary of Commerce Weeks, he would administer but 36,000 employees.

The Eisenhower administration's philosophy with regard to trying to balance the budget might further be indicated in the following colloquy:

Secretary WEEKS. I have no comment particularly on the Bureau of Public Roads. That is self-explanatory. We have an amendment to the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. ROONEY. You want to add $69,230,000 to the Inter-American Highway request?

Secretary WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. That would be something like $75 million?

Secretary WEEKS. Yes. That has been discussed thoroughly in the administration.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you think that is a step toward balancing the budget, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. PRESTON. Let the record show general amusement on the part of the Secretary.

As we go further on we find that Mr. Williams, the Under Secretary of Commerce, at page 64 of the hearings, although everyone in the country knows that President Eisenhower in the campaign of 1952 promised to balance the budget and everybody thought that he was immediately going to proceed to balance the budget—we find the Under Secretary, Mr. Williams, saying:

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the budget will be balanced.

Mr. ROONEY. When?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that was the point that I was leading up to. I think that at no time did Mr. Eisenhower, either in his campaign or afterward——

Mr. ROONEY. When was the last time the budget was balanced?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Set a time when the budget would be balanced; we are working toward that end.

Mr. ROONEY. Excuse me, Mr. Williams. When was the last time the budget was balanced, Mr. Nielson?

Mr. NIELSON. I do not have the exact date here; I will see if we can supply it.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish you would and would you please insert who was head of the executive department when the budget was balanced?

All right, Mr. Williams, I do not want to take too much time.

(The information requested follows:)

"The Federal budget submitted in January 1948 for fiscal year 1949 reflected estimated budget receipts of $44,477 million and estimated expenditures of $39,669 million. The Chief of the executive branch at this time was Harry S. Truman."

Then, the committee found in the proposed budget a request by Secretary Weeks for $10,000 for entertainment expenses. I am glad that the committee unanimously agreed to turn down this request in toto because, although this country has profited and has succeeded in growing larger and becoming more healthy since the year 1933 under the Democratic administrations, we never had to spend $10,000 for the Office of the Secretary, 1 of the millionaire Cabinet members, to entertain his friends and visitors. Let me call your attention to the following colloquy:

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by an item at page 170 of the proposed committee print. It would seem that while the Department of Commerce has been trying to take over the Department of State for some little while, as I see it from where I sit, they are now going into the business of entertainment. Here is an item "$10,000 of such transfers shall be available for entertainment." What is that for?

Secretary WEEKS. Who can answer that? I cannot.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Secretary. this is your budget.

Secretary WEEKS. Quite right, sir, but I cannot answer every item off the cuff.

Mr. NIELSON. Mr. ROONEY, there is an item of $10,000 in here covering entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. This is something new, is it not, Mr. Nielson? There were some few dollars in Maritime budget, as I understand it, a few years back, about $1,025?

Mr. NIELSON. About $1,125.

Mr. ROONEY. Now we are in the $10,000 entertainment field.

Mr. NIELSON. This would provide, Mr. ROONEY, for allowing entertainment of top officials, international officials, who come to this country and have to meet with top officials of the Department. The funds for this could not be provided through the State Department allowances which are provided through your committee for the Department of State.

There are also some instances in which businessmen come to the Department and it is necessary to have luncheons or other types of entertainment. That is the basic reason why this request is contained in the 1956 budget.

Secretary WEEKS. I can assure you——

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary WEEKS. I can assure you there is not much entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. $10,000 worth, if we give you your request.

Secretary WEEKS. If a businessman comes to me to talk strictly commerce business and we have lunch, I would pay that out of my expense. We are not wasting money on entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. Would it be too much for us to expect what has been done over the years, that the person who comes to you would pay for your lunch rather than the other way around? I was under the impression we were trying to balance the Eisenhower budget, but when we see a huge budget such as the instant one before us and we find an item such as this included, we wonder whether or not there is a real intention to balance the budget as the American public were promised. Is that a fair question?

Secretary WEEKS. It is certainly a fair question. My answer is that there is every intention to balance the budget.

Mr. ROONEY. As of what date? You know you are not going to balance the budget if every department of the Government comes in with an increased budget such as the Department of Commerce.

Secretary WEEKS. I only know about this budget.

Mr. FLOOD. I have not heard an answer. Did you get an answer?

Mr. ROONEY. What would you use this money for, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. May I give an example?

Mr. ROONEY. What do you use this money for?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. Perhaps this might clear it up a bit. I went abroad for the Department of State about a year and a half ago, and was told that if any entertainment was done for us on an official basis, we should return that entertainment for our hosts before we returned to the States. We were entertained by the British and did entertain them in turn. I had 23 people for lunch and gave the luncheon at the least expensive place, which was the officers' club, and I was allowed $40 for the complete luncheon, which in Europe includes beverages.

Mr. ROONEY. Are beverages included in this $10,000? You are talking about $2 lunches.

Mr. ROTHCHILD. I am afraid it was more a $10 lunch.

Mr. ROONEY. That is a pretty fair lunch in London; is it not?

Mr. ROTHCHILD. That is a pretty fair lunch anywhere.

Secretary WEEKS. Suppose we provide you with a statement on that.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall get to this later on when we get to the reading of the general provisions of the bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as was said by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER]—and I serve with the gentleman from Maryland on the Armed Services Subcommittee as well—this bill came out with desirable though surprising unanimity.

I have only one or two observations to make, and the first one is not very important but it is one of those irritating little things you encounter in Washington that get under your skin.

In the years I have served on this subcommittee I have made a motion to eliminate this item every year and I have been getting more and more votes every year. This year I lost by only one vote. I even had the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the full committee, vote with me this year. One more year and I think I will have it.

I do not like the idea of going to the National Airport, the only airport in the country run by the Federal Government, and standing around there waiting for a plane and seeing a lot of kids and a lot

of taxpayers with their noses up against that big window looking out at the aircraft. There is a beautiful big balcony out there. It has been there ever since we have built the place. But these kids and these taxpayers, who are running that airport, the only one they are running, have to pay 10 cents into some kind of a slot machine, whatever it is they have there, before they can walk out on that balcony, their own balcony, to watch the aircraft just come in and go out. I think that is an outrage. If I sit on this committee long enough, someday I am going to get it knocked out of there, so that you can go over to that airport with those kids and they can walk through the door and see all they want to for nothing.

Another problem I want to bring to your attention is in connection with the Panama Canal, the operation of the zone and the corporation. Down there you have 3,700 American citizens; and actually they are. But we have a tendency up here most of the time to treat them like second-class citizens or colonials down there. We give them a 25-percent differential, but that is not the point. You try to live down there and raise your children as those people do. They come from your hometown as they come from mine. They have no objection to bearing their tax burden like other American citizens, but if the Congress of the United States sees fit to raise tolls or to raise any other operating expenses of the canal, that is all right with them, but they do not believe and I agree with them that if the Congress does raise the operating cost the American citizens who work for the Canal Zone should be forced to bear a higher proportionate share of those costs than any other citizens. All they want to do is bear their own equal share as American taxpayers. What in the world is the matter with that?

Second, I direct your attention to the testimony on this bill, the hearings, where for some length of time I examined the Governor of the Canal Zone and the Chairman of the Canal Company, who is the same fellow. He wears two hats in connection with this whole operation. Those who are interested can see it there. I will not take the time of the Committee to detail that. But I want to mention in passing that this Congress spent dozens of thousands of dollars to renovate the three little ships run by this Canal Company to the zone from New York. For no reason at all that I can find in this record the board of the Canal Company made one of those ships, the *Panama*, a freighter. Two weeks later, for no reason, again, they changed their minds and made her a passenger ship.

There is a classic example of how this kind of thing should not be done—clearly the problem was not thought out or it would never have happened. There is much I could say about this whole thing but I will let it pass for the time being. These matters are of importance to you as well as to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, we have no requests at this time.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; and for general administration, including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; $6,200,000.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill now before us eliminates from the Commerce Department appropriation all of the increases for economic statistics which the budget requested. It happens, Mr. Chairman, that I am a member and the chairman of the subcommittee on economic statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. This subcommittee was first established during the 83d Congress. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] presently a member of the committee, was at that time chairman. During its hearings on the President's economic report this year, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which as all Members know, is composed of Members of both parties from both the House of Representatives and the other body, had a special panel discussion on the problem of statistics, and in its report recommended that the provisions of the budget be adopted by the Congress so far as they affect economic statistics. The reason for this unanimous approach to this particular problem is very simple. The decisions which are made on a daily basis by business large and small, by all elements of our economy, by farmers, labor organizations, by government at all levels, including the Federal level, and by the legislatures of the several States as well as the Federal Government, are to a large degree in the economic field based on the factual knowledge which is at hand, most often in the form of statistics. There is absolutely no disagreement on the part of any special interest group in the country with regard to the need for improved statistics in a great many different fields. This program of improving our statistical information has the support of business, labor, and of organized farm groups. I think it is something that Congress over the years has tended to slight and tended to treat as an expendable item. I recognize the mood of the House and I am aware of the respect which all Members of the House hold for this subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations, a respect which I share; but I am hopeful that this year the other body will include at least some of the funds which are needed to move forward with a program which has been recommended by this administration and which is supported unanimously by a committee comprised of Members of both the House and the other body, by both Republicans and Democrats. Permit me to give you an illustration. There was requested in the budget money to improve statistics on construction. Today, one of the reasons that we are having a boom in many parts of the country is that there is an unusually high level of construction going on. It happens, however, that the statistics for the field of construction are among the least adequate, the least accurate. They prove out less often, in the light of actual factual knowledge, than do many other statistical efforts. If we had full knowledge of what is actually going on in the construction field today, we might be able to make wiser decisions with regard to the future plans of the economy. When I say that I mean not only those of us in Government but people in private enterprise who are making almost daily economic decisions of very great importance.

This is a subject which may seem dull to some, but a subject to which I think the Congress individually and collectively should give more attention than it has been willing to do in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the unanimous report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1955 Economic Report of the President included the following statement under "Findings and recommendations"—Senate Report No. 60, page 4:

> We strongly urge that the Government improve its economic statistical programs. Important steps forward have been made and recommended in the President's budget. Witnesses at our recent hearings were unanimous in urging congressional action. We trust the Appropriations Committees will give these requests sympathetic consideration and approval.

This conclusion was reached after careful investigation, extending back over the past year, of whether the Government's present economic statistics are adequate for the uses to which they are now put—particularly for purposes of economic analysis. Hearings were held last July by the joint committee's newly established Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, at which outstanding and representative economists and statisticians were asked to testify concerning the kind of statistics and other economic information specifically needed for analysis of the economic plans and expectations of consumers, Government, and business.

As a result of these hearings and its study of the problems raised, the committee issued a progress report—House Report No. 2628—presenting a number of preliminary findings and recommendations. Important among these findings were that, first, private economic interests and Government policymakers require an increasing quantity and improved quality of economic statistics; and, second, the principal stumbling block to providing an adequate economic statistical program is the lack of financial support.

The President's budget estimate for 1956 contained a number of increases for statistical programs, designed to meet the needs and correct the shortcomings which were stressed in the committee hearings last summer. The specific programs included in the agency appropriation requests for 1956 were again reviewed by the joint committee, when it held a hearing on economic statistics as part of its series of hearings on the 1955 Economic Report. Representatives of

business, labor, and research organizations testified in the session on economic statistics, and without exception endorsed the proposed increases as necessary to correct major deficiencies in our statistical information.

This was the background against which the joint committee reached its unanimous recommendation urging support and improvement of economic statistical programs.

A number of these programs were included in the appropriation requests for various units within the Department of Commerce—specifically, the Bureau of the Census, the Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Office of Business Economics. None of these increases was allowed by the House Committee on Appropriations in its report on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1956—Report No. 603.

Following are the specific increases in the Department of Commerce which the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has unanimously endorsed:

In the Bureau of the Census, under "Salaries and expenses":

Annual sample survey of retail trade	$99,207
Annual sample survey of manufactures	257,900
Improvement of labor force and unemployment statistics	563,115
Improvement of data on State and local government finances	95,000
Administrative and miscellaneous	184,778
Total increase	1,200,000

Also in the Bureau of the Census, $500,000 was requested for an Intercensal Housing Survey to obtain information on the number and characteristics of the Nation's housing units. The need for this survey was emphasized at the Joint Committee's recent hearings on economic statistics.

In its report, the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount requested for completion of the census of agriculture by $500,000, and the amount for completion of the censuses of business, manufactures and mineral industries by $655,000. Reductions in the final requests for these censuses mean a decrease in the tabulation, analysis, and publication of data already collected at great expense.

The budget estimate for the Business and Defense Services Administration included an increase of $800,000 for the construction statistics program. This increase was designed to correct deficiencies in the present statistics on new construction activity and to allow for compilation of data on expenditures for alterations and repairs, materials requirements, and residential vacancies.

In the Office of Business Economics an increase of $100,000 was included in the budget estimate, and endorsed by the joint committee, to allow for improvements in the national income and gross national product accounts. The report of the House Committee on Appropriations recommends an increase of $75,000 for the Office of Business Economics, but for a totally different purpose—"to finance a special study of unemployment throughout the country."

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I urge that these increases, which are requested to meet the needs of both the legislative and executive branches of the Government for more accurate information on our economy, be included in the 1956 appropriation for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to underwrite the comments made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] and emphasize the great need for improving economic statistics.

The Employment Act of 1946 provided for the establishment of what is called the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, comprising 7 Members of the House and 7 Members of the Senate. This joint committee last year appointed a Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. The membership of that subcommittee was the gentleman from Kansas, Senator FRANK CARLSON; the gentleman from Missouri, Representative RICHARD BOLLING; and myself, as chairman.

This subcommittee went about its business earnestly and held significant hearings on July 12 and 13, 1954. Cooperating in these hearings were Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, both of whom testified the first day. On the second day panel discussions were held and participating in those discussions were representatives of eight departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government, 12 expert witnesses thoroughly schooled in economic statistics and representing industry and business broadly defined. This group of witnesses cooperated earnestly and enthusiastically with the subcommittee, and for the first time it was possible to have an exchange of views and suggestions among persons representing Government administration, business administration, and lawmaking.

Briefly stated, the conclusion of this group was that there is great need for more, better, and prompter economic statistics.

Recognizing the validity of this conclusion, the subcommittee recommended to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report that the President be informed of this need.

In his budget message last January, the President acted on this recommendation and called attention to the need emphatically by including in his message what is called a special analysis and a request for a $4.8 million increase in appropriation for improved work in economic statistics. This part of the budget message was unique.

I express the hope that the cut in appropriation made by the House Committee on Appropriations may be restored before final enactment of the bill now under consideration, so that this need which has been scrutinized and demonstrated with the greatest of care, and which is in line with the President's recommendations, may be met. There is no substitute for accurate information on which to base decisions. Accurate and up-to-date economic statistics are invaluable to Government and to private business alike.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$6,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$6,225,000, of which $25,000 shall be for the purpose of gathering and publishing monthly reports of coffee stocks on hand in the United States."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it places additional responsibilities upon the Secretary to publish monthly reports. I find no basic legislation which would authorize this sort of a survey to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Missouri care to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Under Public Law 671 of the 80th Congress, it has been authorized that these reports and statistics be made. I had a letter from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, stating that they are authorized to make this study, but they do not have sufficient funds. I looked this matter up last year when the same thing was before the House.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved and the gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

PROTECTING OURSELVES AGAINST ANOTHER FAKE COFFEE SHORTAGE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to close a serious gap in our statistical information involving America's biggest import item—coffee. Everyone knows how we were victimized from late 1953 to mid-1954 and thereafter by a fake shortage of coffee. Hoarding and speculation ran rampant, and the consumer was held up and robbed. Hundreds of millions of dollars were taken out of the pockets of American consumers in tribute to a shortage which never existed.

It has recently been revealed that the former Brazilian Government administration was even participating directly in gambling on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange in an attempt to keep coffee prices unnecessarily high. That is how far reaching this price-raising drive actually was. Our coffee roasters overbought at excessive prices in fear of a shortage; the consumer paid exorbitant and unconscionable prices; yet all this time there was no shortage. But we did not know that for sure, for the statistics once kept by the Census Bureau on coffee stocks on hand had been discontinued. A year ago, I was successful in having the House agree to renew those studies. But the amendment was killed in the Senate, either under a misapprehension or deliberately, but the impression was given that the studies would be made in any event.

The studies were not and are not being made. The State Department believes we should have this information; so does the Federal Trade Commission. The

Census Bureau says it can provide it for only $25,000 a year. Think of that—only $25,000 a year to protect us against a swindle of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] took this matter up at my request in the subcommittee hearings but, unfortunately, the Bureau's answer was off the record. I inquired about that, and discovered that it was based on fear that if we had up-to-date information on coffee supplies on hand, it was possible the roasters might at some time in the future, if supplies were clearly shown to be short, be held up for a higher price.

On the other hand, just imagine what happened to all of us last year because we did not have such information. We were taken in by a hoax—by a mythical shortage. And so, I may say, were the roasters.

We would all be much, much better off to have the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote one paragraph from a letter written to me by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thruston B. Morton, on April 27, 1955, in which he says:

In the opinion of this Department it would be very useful to have information on inventories of coffee held in the United States collected on a quarterly basis if possible. The prospective supply position cannot be evaluated properly without such information. Although stocks normally constitute a relatively minor part of the total supply they can be of great importance in a situation such as that which arose last year, when frost damage to the Brazilian crop threatened to reduce supplies below current requirements.

I wish also, Mr. Chairman, to insert in the RECORD at this point a short excerpt from the hearings, pages 683 and 684, dealing with the matter of census of coffee inventories.

(The matter referred to follows:)

The next item has to do with coffee inventories. The Congresswoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN, has been trying to have coffee inventories made in this country, and funds were contained in the House bill last year for that purpose, but were knocked out in conference since the Senate did not approve that item. Mrs. SULLIVAN has received a letter from the Department of State which I will insert in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, indicating it would be a very desirable and helpful thing to have such a census made since coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at this time.

Under the studies that you now make of wholesale inventories, could this study be included without specifically earmarking funds?

Mr. GRIEVES. We did conduct a survey of coffee stocks as of the end of 1954, the results of which have been published.

Mr. PRESTON. Will that be a continuing study?

Mr. GRIEVES. There is no specific appropriation for it. It is not a very expensive project. We could do it at a reasonable frequency, but not every month.

Mr. PRESTON. You could do it quarterly and have a fairly accurate idea of the coffee inventory, could you not?

Mr. GRIEVES. If I may make a statement off the record.

Mr. PRESTON. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PRESTON. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state that you can continue this program, because it no doubt would have some value to the consuming public.

(The complete letter from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 27, 1955.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I refer to your telephone request to Mr. Cale for the Department's views regarding the desirability of obtaining periodically, through the Census Bureau, information on coffee inventories in the hands of United States importers and roasters. Such information was compiled during the period of the Second World War, as you know, and was very useful to the Government in appraising the supply position on coffee. It is my understanding that the service was discontinued after the war as an economy measure, and that only 2 spot studies have been made in recent years, 1 in 1951 and another at the end of 1954.

In the opinion of this Department it would be very useful to have information on inventories of coffee held in the United States collected on a quarterly basis if possible. The prospective supply position cannot be evaluated properly without such information. Although stocks normally constitute a relatively minor part of the total supply they can be of great importance in a situation such as that which arose last year, when frost damage to the Brazilian crop threatened to reduce supplies below current requirements.

Coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at the present time. The outlook for coffee supplies and coffee prices is a matter of very real concern to United States consumers, and to the producing countries as well. Yet statistical information on this commodity is notably poor, as the Federal Trade Commission pointed out in its Economic Report on Coffee, published last year. I believe you are aware that the United States agreed, at the recent economic conference in Brazil, to participate with representatives of the producing countries in a study of the long-run outlook for coffee. It is already apparent that the working group will be hampered in its efforts by the inadequacy of the statistical data available. Any action which the United States is able to take to fill the gaps in our information on the coffee situation would be most helpful to study groups such as this one. It might also serve, by example, to encourage other countries with an interest in coffee to improve their own statistical services. The work involved in compiling this information would be done in the Department of Commerce and the State Department is, of course, not in a position to judge whether it could be carried out under the existing appropriations of that Department.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Also in this connection I wish to include as part of my remarks a letter addressed by me, under date of May 20, to Mr. Burgess, the Director of the Bureau of the Census, and his reply to me of the same date, also a release from the Department of Commerce under date of March 4, 1955, dealing with green coffee inventories and roastings of 1954.

The matter referred to follows:

MAY 20, 1955.

Hon. ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Will you please prepare for me and have in my office by noon Monday, if possible, a statement on just what the Bureau of Census can, or cannot do, in regard to collecting statistics on coffee supplies on hand in the United States under:

1. The appropriate budget item (and please indicate which one it is);

2. The bill as reported from the House Appropriations Committee;

3. Also, will you please give me a definite figure on how much it would cost to provide monthly statistics on the amount of coffee on hand in the United States, including supplies in the hands of the importers and roasters?

In connection with the hearings by the Appropriations Subcommittee, Congressman PRESTON attempted to find out for me just what your plans were in this respect. Page 684 of the printed hearings reveals that when he asked Mr. Grieves how you could handle this problem of collecting coffee statistics, the answer was off the record.

I should like to have, on the record—unless national security is involved—the true facts on this situation. I feel that I have been given a deliberate run-around on this whole matter. I feel the Census Bureau has been partly responsible for our failure to have adequate statistics last year on the stocks of coffee on hand, and thus partly responsible for the unnecessary continuation of excessive coffee prices down to the time of the Federal Trade Commission Report. Last year, as you know, I succeeded in having an amendment accepted by the House to earmark $10,000 for this work of collecting and publishing monthly statistics on coffee supplies.

The testimony by the Census officials before the Senate Appropriations Committee last year apparently gave the Senators the impression these reports would be made without specific earmarking of funds as provided in my amendment. I know what you intended to inform them—that is, if you received the full budget request, you could make these studies and would prefer not to have the amount earmarked specifically. But that is not the impression they got, and the result was that you did not make the monthly reports.

Therefore, I would like to have, by noon Monday, a statement on what you can, or cannot do, under the bill as reported to provide these monthly statistics, and how much it would require for you to provide them.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Hon. Congresswoman LEONORE SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in reply to your letter concerning the Census Bureau and coffee statistics dictated over the phone to my secretary today.

You ask what the Census Bureau can or will do in regard to collecting statistics on coffee supplies in the United States. The answer in general is that the Census Bureau has the legal authority but lacks the appropriation to conduct a monthly survey on coffee stocks in the hands of importers and roasters. Under the law if the data are gathered more often than once a year the filing of a return is wholly voluntary.

The cost of compiling a monthly report on coffee stocks in the hands of importers and roasters would be approximately $25,000 to $30,000 per annum. The exact figure would depend largely on the amount of effort which would have to be expended in obtaining returns and in keeping the mailing list up-to-date. Incidentally, a quarterly survey would cost approximately $10,000 per annum.

The only appropriation made to the Census Bureau which could be legally employed

to finance a coffee survey would be the item "salaries and expenses." There is currently no provision in this item for a coffee survey.

You call attention to the fact that Mr. Grieves made a statement off the record in connection with the Appropriations Committee discussion of coffee statistics. For your information, Mr. Grieves briefly reviewed one of the rather delicate aspects of a voluntary reporting system which arises when the interest of the reporting companies may be adversely affected by publication of the results. There is a feeling in the trade that publication of the stock figures on occasion places the American purchasers of coffe at a disadvantage in dealing with tightly controlled foreign sources of supply. Therefore, as a practical matter, this is not alone a question of funds but also of the ability of the Census Bureau to collect sufficient returns to provide reliable est'mates.

I can assure you, Mrs. SULLIVAN, that the Census Bureau has no motive other than that of providing the most useful public service with the limited funds at its disposal. We cannot begin to undertake all of the surveys which are urged upon us, nor could we for long operate if appropriations were not provided to carry out additional surveys.

The Bureau will be glad to consider conducting a quarterly coffee stock reporting program in the coming fiscal year provided there is general concurrence amongst the interested agencies of the Government that this is a desirable project in relation to other projects as yet unfinanced, and as indicated above, provided that the continued cooperation of holders of the coffee stocks can be obtained.

In closing, may I remind you that the Census Bureau did conduct a year-end coffee survey showing the change in the stock position during the year 1954, largely because of your interest in the subject and without the assistance of any appropriation. The Census Bureau is always anxious to meet important needs and I only wish it were possible for me to assure you that circumstances permitted the monthly operation of this project in which you are so sincerely interested.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1955.

GREEN COFFEE INVENTORIES AND ROASTINGS: 1954

Inventories of green coffee held by roasters, importers, and dealers in the United States totaled 2,144,000 bags on December 31, 1954, a decrease of 35 percent from the 3,315,000 bags held on December 31, 1953, according to an announcement made today by Robert W. Burgess, Director, Bureau of the Census. Coffee roasting during 1954 totaled 17,601,000 bags, a decrease from amounts roasted during 1951 (19,051,000 bags) and 1950 (18,416,000), the 2 most recent years for which roastings were measured by the Bureau of the Census. The low level of coffee roasting was also reflected by imports of green coffee, which were at their lowest level since 1943. Imports amounted to 17,072,000 bags during 1954, a decrease of 19 percent from 1953 imports of 21,017,000 bags.

Green coffee inventories reported for the year-end 1954 were at the lowest level for any year-end period measured in surveys conducted by the Bureau since 1948 (Census data for 1952 are not available). Roastings during the first quarter 1954 were at a comparatively high level compared with those for 1949 through 1951, but for the other three quarters of 1954 were generally lower than for those years.

Of the total amount roasted during 1954, 2,052,000 bags—or 12 percent of total roastings—were used for soluble coffee. However, this amount was 32 percent of the total roastings of those firms which reported roastings for soluble coffee during 1954.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY

Estimates of green coffee inventories and roastings shown in this release represent industry totals based on reports received from virtually all known roasters, importers, and dealers of green coffee.

Inventories of green coffee were held by approximately 850 firms at the end of 1954, of which 730 did roasting. Included are firms which do contract roasting for the trade and those who own green coffee but have it roasted for them under contract. Not included are wholesalers who purchase and sell roasted coffee but do no roasting and own no green coffee. Data on green coffee inventories in this report are limited to stocks which have cleared customs and are in the United States. Stocks in foreign trade zones or those held for, or roasted by, the military services are not included.

Data on imports shown in this release were compiled by the Bureau of the Census as a part of its foreign trade statistics program.

TABLE 1.—*Total inventories of green coffee held by roasters, importers, and dealers: Year-end 1948–51, 1953, and 1954*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Date:	*Inventories*
Dec. 31, 1954	2,144,000
Dec. 31, 1953	3,315,000
Dec. 31, 1952	(1)
Dec. 31, 1951	2,759,000
Dec. 31, 1950	2,936,000
Dec. 31, 1949	3,355,000
Dec. 31, 1948	3,083,000

[1] Census data not available.

TABLE 2.—*Total coffee roasted (excluding roasting by military service)*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Period [1]	Amount roasted			
	1954	1951	1950	1949
Annual total	[2] 17,601,000	19,051,000	18,416,000	[3]
1st quarter	5,629,000	5,216,000	4,369,000	5,238,000
2d quarter	3,873,000	4,397,000	4,313,000	[3]
3d quarter	3,367,000	4,287,000	5,178,000	4,993,000
4th quarter	4,732,000	5,151,000	4,556,000	5,925,000

[1] Roasting not available for years 1952 and 1953.
[2] Of this amount, 2,052,000 bags of green coffee were used for soluble coffee.
[3] Not available.

TABLE 3.—*United States imports for consumption of raw or green coffee*

[Standard bags of 132.276 pounds each]

Period	*Imports*
1954	17,072,000
1953	21,017,000
1952	20,266,000
1951	20,301,000
1950	18,424,000
1949	22,060,000
1948	20,947,000

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman from Missouri has offered an excellent amendment. I would point out to her that this speculation really started back in 1949 and 1950 when the ECA, the Economic Cooperation Administration, bought 61 million pounds of coffee and shipped it over to foreigners. That was the lever that was used to pry the lid off coffee prices, and the gouging of housewives followed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Does not the gentleman agree, though, that this study and these statistics would be of great value?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly think so. I support the gentlewoman's amendment. I only wish that statistics regarding the importation of canned Polish hams and bacon could be included.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman, and I urge, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment be adopted. If it is, who knows—we may again have a 5-cent cup of coffee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized.

The gentlewoman from Missouri supports her contention by citing Public Law 671 of the 80th Congress. The Chair has had opportunity to refer to this public law. It states that the Director of the Bureau of the Census is authorized to "compile and publish censuses of manufacturers, mineral industries, and other businesses." The Chair is of opinion that the language of this section is sufficiently broad to cover the proposed amendment, and that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri is in order.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 683 of the hearings wherein the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], chairman of the subcommittee, brought to the attention of the Bureau of the Census and Mr. Grieves commented on the situation. I read from the hearings as follows:

The next item has to do with coffee inventories. The Congresswoman from Missouri, Mrs. SULLIVAN, has been trying to have coffee inventories made in this country, and funds were contained in the House bill last year for that purpose, but were knocked out in conference since the Senate did not approve that item. Mrs. SULLIVAN has received a letter from the Department of State which I will insert in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, indicating it would be a very desirable and helpful thing to have such a census made since coffee ranks first in value among United States imports at this time.

Under the studies that you now make of wholesale inventories, could this study be included without specifically earmarking funds?

Mr. GRIEVES. We did conduct a survey of coffee stocks as of the end of 1954, the results of which have been published.

Mr. PRESTON. Will that be a continuing study?

Mr. GRIEVES. There is no specific appropriation for it. It is not a very expensive project. We could do it at a reasonable frequency, but not every month.

Mr. PRESTON. You could do it quarterly and have a fairly accurate idea of the coffee inventory; could you not?

Mr. GRIEVES. If I may make a statement off the record.

Mr. PRESTON. All right.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PRESTON. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state that you can continue this program, because it no doubt would have some value to the consuming public.

From that you will see that the chairman of the committee said it would be well if these censuses could be had quarterly and the representative from the Census Bureau said that under existing provisions they could be made quarterly.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the inventory has been made and they can now make these inventories quarterly without any additional amount. Coffee prices are going down and cost of statistics are going up. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have a letter from the Bureau of the Census in which they state that they do not have the funds, that if they made this quarterly it would require $10,000 a year. That is what we asked for last year. If they made it monthly it would take between $25,000 and $30,000 a year. I have submitted a letter to be put in the RECORD that states both of those figures.

Mr. BOW. I submit to the gentlewoman that before the committee they did testify as I have read. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], who conducted the hearings, will bear me out that they did say they made a census in 1954 and they could make it quarterly on the present budget. I am depending on their testimony.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I called to find out what off-the-record statement was made. I asked them if they could give me the information that would not divulge anything that might hinder the security of our country. They told me that is what they had said, that because of the fact there was a delicate situation existing between countries they did not want to have any open hearings, but that they did not have the funds to make this study. They did make it once last year.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the statement that they have the funds to make a survey was made off the record?

Mr. BOW. It is now in the record, that they could continue to make it quarterly for the same amount.

Mr. GROSS. Where in the record?

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] said he was glad to hear that; so they could continue on the same basis; the quarterly basis.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman from Ohio has correctly stated the facts. I specifically inquired about it and did my very best to take care of the charming gentlewoman from Missouri in conducting these hearings and I thought we had done pretty well.

Mr. GROSS. What I am reading is:

Mr. PRESTON.. Back on the record. I am glad to hear you state you can continue this program.

It does not say anything about on a quarterly or monthly or annual basis.

Mr. BOW. In the testimony ahead there the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] asked whether it could be done on a quarterly basis.

Mr. GROSS. That is off the record.

Mr. BOW. That is on the record. Then he came back on the record and said he was glad to hear it can be continued on that basis.

Mr. GROSS. We would be clearer as to what the Appropriations Committee does if it would stay on the record more often than it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRESTON) there were—ayes 35, noes 51.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mrs. SULLIVAN and Mr. PRESTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 54, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities (liquidation of contract authorization): For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts, $7 million.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss briefly one of the controversies raging in the field of aviation today, relating to the question of the superiority of one type of air navigation facility over another. For some time the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been developing an air navigational system known as VOR–DME. The VOR part of the system refers to directions; DME is a distance-measuring device. With both, the position of an aircraft in terms of direction and distance from a particular object can be determined.

During the last few years the military has been developing an air navigational equipment which it has called TACAN, which it claims is superior to VOR–DME. I don't know whether it is. As a matter of fact, I don't know whether anybody knows whether it is superior, even the socalled experts in the field. I think for our purposes, however, it is unimportant because even in the event it is found to be superior equipment to DME, it will not be available for a minimum of 5 years and, therefore, cannot take care of present flying. needs. DME is usable at the present time and DME will make flying safer.

For the last few years we have been appropriating money for the installation of DME ground facilities and there is an appropriation in this bill for that purpose. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be no disposition on the part of the airlines to install the corresponding DME equipment into their planes so that the DME ground installations are of no value whatsoever. Of all the thousands of aircraft in our country, only about 250 have installed DME instruments. It makes no sense to me that we should appropriate funds to put the finest air navigation equipment on our airports in order to make aviation safer when the airlines refuse to purchase the instruments needed to take advantage of the ground installations. Some say it is because of the pending issue which would require the airlines to pay a user fee for facilities installed by the Federal Government. Others say it is because of the cost of installation of DME aircraft equipment, which I am told is about $6,000 per instrument at the present time. Others say it is because TACAN is a better system than the VOR–DME system. It seems to me that none of these reasons is valid when the question of air safety is involved.

Experts to whom I have spoken, however, assured me that DME will promote safety. With DME the pilot will know his exact position at all times instead of occasionally, as is now the case. Collisions with mountain tops which still occur due to unknown positions will be a thing of the past. DME will increase efficiency in air navigation, as better navigational control of aircraft is the natural result of continuous position and speed information.

Those of us who come from metropolitan areas know that the air space over our airports is shrinking quickly as more and more flights are added to regular schedules. I am told that Midway Airport in the city of Chicago dispatches a plane or lands one every 40 seconds. Present equipment requires that there be a distance of 30 miles clearance on every level for each plane flying. With DME equipment this distance could be shortened to about 5 or 6 miles so that instead of being spaced every 30 miles, planes could be spaced in shorter clearance distances. More aircraft could be utilized under these operating conditions.

I do not know how the airline companies can be compelled to install DME equipment. I would have liked to be able to offer an amendment to this appropriation bill which would have required them to install DME equipment in their planes, because I consider it so necessary for more efficient and safer operation. This is an appropriation bill, however, and such legislation would be out of order.

The military believes that TACAN is better. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is of the opinion that DME is better. TACAN will not be available for 4 or 5 years. DME is available now. I

think some way has to be found now to require the airline carriers to install DME equipment, and I would urge the CAA to do so as quickly as possible.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I would call attention to page 314 of the hearings, where Colonel Taylor was discussing these two Rho-Theta systems of distances and positions. He said that by the first of next year they should have dependable findings on TACAN, and that by that time we will know exactly where we are. We should know by that time what they will require by way of safety legislation. That would be an authorization, however, from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] that the colonel's information differs from that which was furnished to me by the various officials of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. They have told me that TACAN will not be operational for another 3 or 4 years and cannot be placed in production for another 3 or 4 years. We do have DME at the present time, and DME will make flying safer. We need it now.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. His testimony, however, was that they may find that TACAN is completely unusable. His statement was:

> We may run into something that will preclude its adoption.

Mr. YATES. That is right.

Mr. HORAN. He meant thereby that TACAN may be completely out if their findings so indicate.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

It seems to me that some way has to be found to require the carriers to install DME to make flying safer at the present time. It does not make sense to me that we should appropriate money for DME ground equipment without having the carriers purchase the equipment for their aircraft which will permit it to be used.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, the President's veto of the postal pay-raise bill is most regrettable and unwise. But the matter goes deeper than that. The issue is no longer the postal pay bill. The more important issue now, as I see it, is whether or not Congress is going to abdicate its right to legislate.

It took several months of patient, hard work by congressional committees and by both Chambers of Congress to agree and approve the measure which was forwarded to the White House. The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, S. 1, as the measure is known, was passed in the Senate on March 25 by a vote of 72 to 21. On April 20 it was passed by this House by a vote of 324 to 85, with some amendments. Both Houses met in conference and agreed on a compromise bill, which was subsequently approved by this House on May 9 by a vote of 328 to 66, and in the Senate on May 11 by a vote of 66 to 11. Thus was manifested the will of Congress and the people whom we represent here.

Now comes the President and with one stroke of his pen undoes the work of Congress throughout all these months. Furthermore, this is not the first time he has set Congress back on this issue. He did the same thing last August when he vetoed a 5-percent pay raise, and as a result of that veto postal workers and Federal employees are still without a raise. It may well be that the President's action has again killed their chances for a raise for another year.

If we, as Members of Congress, are willing to abdicate to this kind of "cooperation" from the executive branch, which evidently has a callous disregard for the welfare of the postal workers, then we must be prepared to surrender our right and duty to legislate. Under these circumstances, we can no longer act as free men and free women in this august body. We will be reduced to a status of being mere puppets of the White House. This is not a democratic process. This is not the way of a democracy; it is the way of a dictatorship, where those sitting in Parliament are told how and what to legislate.

I, for one, am not prepared to surrender my right to legislate. That was not the purpose for which I was elected by the people of my district; hence, I will not be dictated to. I voted for the compromise pay raise bill in all good conscience, and I am sticking by that vote. I ask all of you legislators, who voted for the compromise bill, to follow the dictates of your own conscience and to do likewise.

If we have faith in ourselves and respect for our own judgment, then we cannot and must not fall back now. Otherwise, how can we face the people next election day? We must keep up the fight to preserve our right to legislate, even if we lose the battle today. Should we fail to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote to override the President's veto, then we should go back and pass the same compromise measure—or change it, if we will. The point I am trying to make is that Congress must vote out its own bill, over and over again if necessary, until the will of the majority is recognized by the President. The will of the people is much more important than the desires of a single individual, even if he is the Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the difference in the bill recommended by the President for a 7.6-percent increase and the 8.6-percent increase in the measure approved by both Houses of Congress is said to be "an amount equal to the cost of a bottle of milk" per week for each postal worker. The total amount for all 500,000 employees in the postal service for the entire year is approximately $13 million, and yet the President in his veto message claims that "the enactment of such legislation will substantially increase the postal deficit."

By way of comparison, let me point out the following very interesting facts: If a 7.6-percent pay increase had been offered and adopted last year, when the 5-percent bill was vetoed, each postal employee would be about $300 richer today. Thus, figuring on the basis of the bill now favored by the administration, each postal worker has already sustained a loss of $300. If you multiply this sum by the number of postal workers, that is, 500,000, it comes to a total of $150 million. This total is $137 million more than the difference between the 7.6 and 8.6 bill approved by Congress. So, actually, the President's claim that the bill will substantially increase the postal deficit or that it is excessive, is not borne out by the facts.

I say to you in all earnestness that we have a moral obligation to the 500,000 hard-working, loyal, and devoted Americans who serve us 24 hours a day in all kinds of weather, under all sorts of difficulties and circumstances.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that not only is there a danger that we might surrender our right to legislate, but the situation appears to be even worse. Should the Senate sustain the President's veto, then we in the House will not even have the chance to vote on the President's unjustifiable action. We, as the representatives of the people, will not have had the opportunity to express the will of the people or to voice our opinion. This is a most humiliating situation in which the President has placed Congress.

I plead with Members on both sides of the aisle to stick by your convictions. If you do, this would be one battle that General Eisenhower or General Summerfield could not win. This is a battle the Congress must win if it is to preserve its constitutional right to legislate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise under some sense of obligation to the Committee of the Whole on this question of VOR/DME and TACAN. It is a highly technical and complicated subject. The reason I rise is that insofar as I can tell, looking over the Chamber, I am the only member present of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which held very lengthy hearings on that subject. Our committee went to Atlantic City and visited the naval air station there and inspected the facilities. We also listened to testimony of experts, both civilian and military, for several days here in Washington. The statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] are in substance accurate with the qualification that the testimony, as I recall it, is that it will be at least 2 years before TACAN could be ready. There are possible bugs in it, to use a colloquial expression, but

it is a very promising system. Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has issued a factual report and made specific recommendations. If I had realized that this was coming up in debate at this time I would have armed myself with the committee recommendations and read them to the Members. The committee's factual report is a very good job done by the committee's professional staff. Substituting TACAN for the VOR–DME or visual omnirange system could not be done at the present time. I think that is about the gist of the situation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. It does pose a very difficult question so far as the changeover is concerned. We find TACAN better than VOR–DME, but then we will have a big job of changing over because they will not both work in the same air channel.

Mr. HALE. May I say to the gentleman it is a terribly difficult question, but everybody agrees there should be a common system and a common system means common to civilian and military flying and civilian flying includes not merely the commercial airlines but the private and corporate flights. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that the TACAN system is more accurate, is more promising, and its military uses are more advantageous. It is more readily sited. You can put it on a carrier. That is about all I want to say on the subject, but I should like to refer the Members to the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which goes into the whole matter very thoroughly, and to the committee's recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a–883i), including purchase of not to exceed 3 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114); lease of sites and the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation, maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation at not to exceed $15 per month to each member of the crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instrument observer, and at not to exceed $1 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agencies while making oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; pay, allowances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and household effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the active list; payments under the Uniform Services Contingency Option Act of 1953; and pay of commissioned officers retired in accordance with law; $10,200,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year this appropriation shall be reimbursed for press costs and costs of paper for charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and furnished for the official use of the military departments of the Department of Defense.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask a question or two of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Did the subcommittee make any inquiries of the CAA of any intention to sell the communication centers that exist, that are owned by the Government and under the jurisdiction of that agency, located at the various airports, and which are there for the purpose of safety and efficiency and other important reasons, located at the various airports and other places?

Mr. PRESTON. We made no inquiry about it and there was no evidence of any such plan on foot. I understand there was some appearance in the press indicating that such a plan was on foot, but that was after the hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. And then, after they were sold, buy back the services. The gentleman has heard about that.

Mr. PRESTON. I have heard about that, but I am sure the gentleman can rely on our committee not approving of any such action as that.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman that he have some of his staff look into this matter, because I think you will find there is something to it.

Mr. PRESTON. We will be happy to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization): For the payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the "Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954," $6,000,000: *Provided*, That advances may be made from this appropriation to "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities," for administrative expenses (not to exceed $150,000), and for reserve fleet expenses (in such amounts as may be required), and such advances shall be in addition to amounts otherwise made available for such expenses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My purpose is to compliment the subcommittee on putting back into the bill $660,000, which will enable the four State maritime schools to continue in existence during the next fiscal year.

We in Congress are well acquainted with the valuable contributions made by those schools to our merchant marine and also to our national defense.

I particularly compliment the subcommittee because that estimate was eliminated from the budget, and the subcommittee put the sum of $660,000 back into the bill. I was very much concerned when I read the hearings to note that Secretary Weeks, who comes from Massachusetts, in reply to a question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], supported the budget recommendation of eliminating the appropriation, as a result of which these four State academies would have to be discontinued and not be able to render the excellent services they have been rendering for so many years.

Secretary Weeks, who comes from Massachusetts, testified that one or two of them were not very good:

Massachusetts, where I come from, is not one of the best. The Massachusetts school does not come up to the best.

The views of Secretary Weeks do not, in my opinion, reflect the sentiments of any person in Massachusetts; certainly they do not reflect the view of the subcommittee, because the subcommittee did not think much of his testimony in this respect; they put the $660,000 back into the bill.

I like Secretary Weeks, personally, but as Secretary of Commerce he probably is not familiar with the Massachusetts school, and he probably does not even know where it is located. In any event, the Secretary by his testimony has made himself the laughingstock of Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inter-American highway: For necessary expenses of continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), $8 million, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the committee for information.

Some years ago the United States undertook the building of the Central American Highway. The United States was to pay two-thirds of the cost and the countries through which it passed one-third the cost.

We have expended $50 million on the Central American Highway to date. It is now proposed that we spend an additional $75 million to complete that highway within a period of 3 years. We have never heretofore spent more than $6 million in any one year on the Inter-American highway. It is now proposed that we step up spending on this highway during the next 3 years to $25 million a year.

We were informed in the Public Works Committee when we were asked to authorize $75 million of spending on this road during the next 3 years that this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee was desirous of having the Public Works Committee authorize a $75 million expenditure to be made on this road in the next 3 years instead of $15 million or $20 million. I want to find out if the subcommittee or the full Appropriations Committee wished this authorization to be made and asked it be made?

Mr. PRESTON. It was the position of the subcommittee that we prefer the 6-year program and we turned down the request for $75 million.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In other words, the committee prefers that this road program be carried out over a 6-year period rather than in a 3-year period?

Mr. PRESTON. That is the position of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Is it the opinion of the committee that we could not expand this program from $6 million a year to $25 million a year and do the job efficiently and effectively?

Mr. PRESTON. The testimony presented by the Bureau of Public Roads was to the effect that to do it on a 3-year basis, a crash program, would entail a premium of $12 million on the basis of

$25 million a year, that it would cost about $4 million more for each year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to say to the gentleman as a member of the committee that the reason we did not appropriate the full amount, as far as I am concerned, was because there was no authorization for making an appropriation of that size.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the gentleman from Ohio believe it would be more efficient and effective to do this work in 3 years rather than 6?

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman that I believe the construction of the Inter-American Highway is a very worthwhile project and should be completed at the earliest possible date. But the thing that disturbs me in the suggestion of the $75 million appropriation is that we understand it will cost about $11 million more to complete it in 3 years than it would to take the whole 6 years. Whether or not an investment of the additional $11 million would pay off in goodwill on the completion of the road I do not know and I am not ready to state at this time, but we were faced with that situation. Even though we had an authorization, the testimony before our committee was that it would cost us about $11 million more to do a crash job to complete it than if we took the full 6 years.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is my understanding at the present time that under existing law our Government may spend one-third of the money entirely and completely without any contribution by the six Central American Republics. On the other two-thirds of the cost they put up one-third and we two-thirds of the cost.

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say that the subcommittee is not against the completion of this highway. The discussion resolves itself around the length of time for its completion. We were confronted with the fact that there was no basic authorization to speed up and accelerate the program.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am in favor of completing this road. I wonder, however, if it is wise to crash this job through in 3 years. I voted against the authorization for the $75 million for a 3 year job. I was the only member of the committee to so vote.

Mr. HORAN. The Committee on Appropriations is still looking into the matter and trying to make up its own mind as to which is the wisest course to pursue.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The House will have to decide within a few days whether or not it is going to favor a bill creating a $75 million authorization for the 3-year period, since such a bill has been favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to assure the gentleman from Washington that insofar as I am concerned, just because of the fact that somebody goes traveling outside the confines of the United States and makes certain promises with great attendant publicity, I am not going to fulfill such not fully considered promises at a premium and unnecessary added cost of 11 or 12 million dollars of the American taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. This highway so-called has been a long cherished ambition of the United States ever since the days of Blaine. There are many people who believe that right now it would result in a tremendous improvement in good feeling between the 2 continents if this highway were completed as expeditiously as possible. I think the committee should give full consideration to that because it might well be money well spent.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentlemen for their information.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the gentleman from New York, who has made some reference to people traveling around through Central America and making promises for the completion of the inter-American highway, that the gentleman from New York has for some years been voting for the completion of a road in Central America that somebody did not even go down there to look at, but wrote a letter. Somebody promised in that letter to build a road. In this case at least we have someone who went out to look and see and to observe the advantages of the highway. In the other case the gentleman has been voting for, it was simply on a letter written to the head of a State saying, "We will build a road for you."

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman referring to the road which was the brain child of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and for which the gentleman from Ohio voted to appropriate funds along about the 14th of April just past?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Known as the Rama Road?

Mr. BOW. That is correct. I voted for it because I believe in it as I do the Inter-American Highway. I believe that the spending of money in this hemisphere will do us much more good than many of the millions and billions of dollars that we have spent around the world and in other places. If we were met with the situation of a shooting war and we became involved in a submarine war on both coasts of Central America, the completion of that highway might well be worth $11 million or $11 billion to the defense of the hemisphere. I believe, too, in the development of friends to the south, that that is a necessary thing, and that it should be done as promptly as possible.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to observe that it is amazing how viewpoints can change. I have sat on this Appropriations Committee all these years and have advocated the building of and appropriations for the Inter-American Highway when most of those on the other side of the aisle refused to appropriate a dollar for it. They were always the great objectors to it. I remember the distinguished Member of the other body, a gentleman from the State of Michigan, who sat in our conference each year, the conference on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill. It really is amazing how liberal you can now get with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how it is that the gentleman has now changed his viewpoint? Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I most certainly have not changed my viewpoint. He evidently does not get the point I am making.

Mr. MARTIN. Then we are in agreement on this project.

Mr. ROONEY. I want it finished as fast as possible when it is properly authorized by the legislative committee but not at a premium to the taxpayers of $12 million out of $75 million requested to be appropriated. I think we know as much about this as our celebrated traveler.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and not to exceed $10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, as authorized by law; $27,650,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the act of June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall be $5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said act, for employees conducting meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be $6,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such employees at any one time may receive a base rate of $8,500 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 22, line 11, strike out "$27,650,000" and insert "$29,900,000."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am instructed by the subcommittee to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to propose an amendment to this bill which would increase the funds allotted to the Weather Bureau by $3,850,000. However, after full consultation with the committee, and with that body's agreement to unanimously accept a revised figure, I am submitting an amendment which will add $2,250,000 to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am introducing will increase by $2,250,000 the total appropriations allotted to the Weather Bureau. This critically needed sum would be especially earmarked for the immediate establishment of an improved emergency hurricane and severe storm warning system within the Weather Bureau.

Many of you may be surprised to learn that the eight hurricanes of 1954 together caused about $1 billion of property damage—yes, $1,000 million of property damage—and in addition, the loss of about 850 lives.

In fact, a single storm, hurricane Carol, on August 31, 1954, caused property damage amounting to about $500 million. With each hurricane my own State of Rhode Island suffers new and staggering losses which affect the lives of thousands of its citizens and the entire economy of the State. The same is true of the entire New England region. The New England and New York Interagency Committee has estimated total damage in the seven State region as running into the hundreds of millions of dollars for the three major 1954 storms. The damage in Rhode Island alone has been estimated at close to $200 million. As an indication of the very severe property damage experienced, I would like to point out that hurricane losses in 1954 for just the State of Rhode Island amounted to 7.4 percent of the State's total personal income. In addition to property damage, consideration must also be given to the hundreds of fatalities from the storm in 1938 as well as the loss of 19 lives in the 1954 hurricane. It was only for the fact that the storm last year happened to hit at midday that even more casualties did not result.

We in Rhode Island and New England now know—beyond the shadow of a doubt—that we are in the hurricane zone. The pattern over the past few years has definitely established that fact. We also know that we must have earlier danger warnings in order to reduce the horrible loss of life and property in future hurricanes. The Rhode Island Development Council in October of 1954, published an interim report of its hurricane rehabilitation study in which it said:

> The time of day a hurricane strikes is unpredictable, but the amount of warning Rhode Islanders get of a hurricane's approach is something which can be controlled.

I should like to add emphasis to that statement by having it read: "Warning of a hurricane's approach is something which should be controlled."

Today, after more than 70 years of systematic weather observations, the general effects of hurricanes on wind velocity and tide are known. Hurricanes can be traced from their point of origin and warnings given to those endangered. But to do this the Weather Bureau must have sufficient manpower and suitable facilities.

The Weather Bureau now definitely does not have the staff or facilities to provide modern or reasonably adequate hurricane warning service along the entire coastline from Maine to Texas—not to mention the sparse facilities now available to warn the public promptly about other severe storms like blizzards, cold waves, and tornadoes.

The committee bill as presented is fine as far as it goes—but it hardly begins to meet the problem. For example, the bill does not provide for even a single additional storm forecaster, nor for even a single additional research meteorologist, nor for even a single additional weather chartman or weather communicator. Besides there is not one new station to be established along the coast in this bill. Finally, there is not a single part-time station that will be made into a full-time station under the present allotment.

Additional observational equipment to replace obsolete types of existing equipment over the United States obviously is long overdue. What the people who have suffered from hurricanes want most of all, however, is the additional protection that comes from improved forecasts and quicker warnings. All weathermen agree that these requested improvements in 1955 and 1956 can come only if staff and facilities are provided to deal with the many deficiencies which are known to exist.

I believe you will all agree that these improved night and day warning services cannot be realized without increase in their present professional staff. During the past 8 years, the Weather Bureau has had to operate with a smaller number of employees each succeeding year until they now have about 1,000 fewer weathermen than they had in 1949. Nevertheless, aviation and general weather services requirements have increased to the highest levels ever recorded. My amendment will provide for the addition of about 300 more professional meteorologists.

As pointed out in the New York Times editorial of May 9, 1955:

> The public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Weather Bureau's facilities and personnel.

There are millions of people along the coast who also would agree with the New York Times editorial that it is "shocking and nothing of the sort is included in the estimate for the next fiscal year." Accordingly I urge all to support my amendment which would call for an increase of $3,850,000 in the Weather Bureau's appropriations for the coming fiscal year. This, it seems to me, is a small price—in fact, less than 1 percent of the total property damage that occurs every year from storms in the United States—and I think it is a small insurance price, indeed, for the added protection to property, not only along the coast of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico but, in fact, for the entire United States.

The following is an analysis of the increased activity which passage of the amendment which I originally intended to introduce would have permitted the Weather Bureau. I am advised that the reduced figure which I have submitted will be sufficient for the Bureau to provide for most of these improvements to be put into effect. I am convinced that passage of this amendment will result in a much improved hurricane warning system and better storm forecasting throughout the country.

First. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing Weather Bureau offices are now open only part time, and at other points in the United States. Stations involved follow: Apalachicola, Fla.; Athens, Ga.; Avoca, Pa.; Bishop, Calif.; Block Island, R. I.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Bristol, Tenn.; Columbus, Ga.; Concord, N. H.; Del Rio, Tex.; Dubuque, Iowa; Eugene, Oreg.; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Florence, S. C.; Grand Island, Nebr.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Green Bay, Wis.; Havre, Mont.; Key West, Fla.; La Crosse, Wis.; Lewiston, Idaho; Lynchburg, Va.; Marquette, Mich.; Meridian, Miss.; Milford, Mass.; Muskegon, Mich.; New Haven, Conn.; Norfolk, Va.; Peoria, Ill.; Prescott, Ariz.; Roseburg, Oreg.; Roswell, N. Mex.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Sheridan, Wyo.; Spartanburg, S. C.; Texarkana, Ark.; Valentine, Nebr.; Victoria, Tex.; Williamsport, Pa.; and Williston, N. Dak.

Second. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in 5 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed, and at additional points in the United States. Stations to be reopened are: Albany, Ga.; Butte, Mont.; Eastport, Maine; Ellensburg, Wash.; Elkins, W. Va.; Erie, Pa.; Melbourne, Fla.; Raton, N. Mex.; Rock Springs, Wyo.; Santa Catalina, Calif.; Terre Haute, Ind.; and Valdosta, Ga.

In addition to the stations to be reopened, new Weather Bureau offices are required at the following strategic locations: Alexandria, La.; Donner Summit, Calif.; Flint, Mich.; Johnstown, Pa.; Lancaster, Pa.; New Bedford, Mass.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Ocean City, Md.; Rockford, Ill.; Saginaw, Mich.; Waterloo, Iowa; Wheeling, W. Va.; and Worcester, Mass.

Third. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

Fourth. To provide staff and observing equipment to obtain additional rawinsonde observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of 12-hourly intervals during periods of hurricane or other severe storm threat.

Fifth. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico.

Sixth. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Seventh. To establish an improved high water warning service in order to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnoral water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

Eighth. To provide meteorological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning centers and for mobile storm warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterwards to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts, (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media, (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, (d) and the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

Ninth. To obtain weather reports of upper-air conditions in the path of approaching hurricanes similar to the information obtained at the ocean vessel ship station formerly located half way between New York and Bermuda. This will be accomplished as a result of a cooperative project with the Coast Guard and will be more economical than a fixed station.

Tenth. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental public information program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to include in my remarks a press release of a speech delivered by the senior Senator from my State of Rhode Island, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN; two news stories from the New York Times for September 27, 28, and 29, 1954, dealing with the Weather Bureau; a release from the Weather Bureau entitled "Statement of Future Requirements of the Weather Bureau"; a paper written by Norman R. Hagen, of the United States Weather Bureau, regarding losses from the 1954 hurricanes; an editorial from the New York Times for May 9, 1955, on hurricane warning; and an analysis of the appropriations history of the Weather Bureau from 1951 to 1956:

A LEGISLATOR VIEWS THE STORM TIDE PROBLEM

(Address of United States Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN on the occasion of the symposium on meteorologically induced changes in water level. Thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Geophysical Union, in Washington, D. C., on May 4, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to address this illustrious group of scientists and to present my views as a legislator as to the storm-tide problem. This is particularly so since it concerns the citizens of my home State of Rhode Island who have been visited by four disastrous hurricanes in the past few years.

After the 1938 hurricane which caused many deaths and millions of dollars of damage, not only in Rhode Island, but along the entire Atlantic coast, I received many letters about it from my constituents and others. Practically all of these were adversely critical of the Weather Bureau's activities during that emergency. Some of these communications were from persons deeply concerned over what they believed was the inactivity of the Weather Bureau in giving sufficient warning of the approaching storm. So, acting in their behalf I had considerable correspondence with that agency and became deeply interested in the administration of that Bureau, and have watched carefully the appropriations of funds for its operation.

In August and September of 1954 the hurricanes Carol and Edna visited us with even more disastrous results, and a little later a visit from Hazel also was expected. At these times I again received a flood of similar critical letters and the press of my State published critical editorials regarding the Weather Bureau. As a matter of fact news stories in papers in some of the larger cities of other States were also critical of it. As a Member of the United States Senate I recognized the significance of these letters from constituents and the editorial opinions of the press. As a resident of Rhode Island and one who on personal inspection tours viewed the damage done by the hurricanes in practically every city and town in my State, I concluded that some explanations were in order from the Federal agencies involved.

Therefore, I communicated with officials of the Weather Bureau and obtained reports on these matters, some of which were satisfactory, and others of which were disappointing. I also obtained reports from other Government agencies, such as the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Navy and the Coast Guard. As a result I became firmly convinced that there was no proper coordination of the various agencies involved in weather reporting activities.

However, I learned that the Navy, contemplating the visit of Hurricane Carol, took appropriate steps at the great naval establishments in my State to protect lives and Government property. Further than that, when the hurricane struck the naval establishments there, the officers and men did an excellent job not only during but also after the storm. The Navy, especially the Seabees stationed at Davisville, provided essential assistance to civilians in neighboring towns by lending heavy equipment, such as generators, to those who were left without electrical power. In fact, the Navy worked closely with the State civil defense administration during the whole disaster period, and as a result of this cooperation, many cities and towns recovered more quickly from this disaster. We are thankful that the loss of life suffered was not so great as that which occurred in the 1938 hurricane.

As a result of my correspondence with the Weather Bureau, I learned that the average citizen does not understand the Weather Bureau advisories and bulletins in the sense the Bureau intends they should be understood. To add to this handicap, during the hours just prior to the visit of Hurricane Carol, most of the advisories and bulletins were issued from the Weather Bureau at Boston and not from the station in Rhode Island. I am convinced that there were not sufficient employees manning the Rhode Island station during that emergency. This conviction is borne out by the fact that during the visit of the next hurricane, Edna, a full staff of employees was on duty at the Rhode Island Weather Station and a continual stream of advisories and bulletins came over every radio station in the State. This was in definite contrast to the meager information given out during the visit of Hurricane Carol. It seems to me that during emergencies of this kind, some authority should be given to the person in charge of a weather station, such as that in Rhode Island, to allow additional personnel to be called to duty, and additional personnel to be hired for the duration of the emergency. This would insure adequate reporting to the press, radio, civil defense, and other State agencies which are deeply concerned and spread the news to the public.

I believe the public should be constantly advised when a storm of this kind is forecast but realize that even if all the people were well aware of the advent of such a storm, there would be some criticism, especially if the storm veered off in a different direction and did not strike as forecast. However, in the long run it would prove best for all concerned, for if, on the other hand, the storm did strike as predicted, the preparations made and precautions taken to decrease damage would be well worthwhile.

I hesitate to be critical of the Weather Bureau because there are excellent men working with that agency—some of the best in the country. However, they cannot work without adequate funds and proper tools and I believe they should have increased appropriations so that they can maintain the best in equipment. It is also important that the best men possible be procured and assigned to extensive research of violent storms.

Beyond that, I believe that adequate warning systems and advisories, expressed in plain language which the average citizen can understand, should be developed by the Weather Bureau. An understandable warning system would allay the fears of many persons who at the present time are very weather conscious. For example, since the visits of Carol and Edna to New England, and in particular Rhode Island, the weather in all its aspects has become front-page news—especially so to those who lost their homes and all their belongings as the result of the disastrous storms. Recently the Providence Journal, which has been at the forefront in the reporting of weather news since the visit of Carol, conducted a "Forecasting Sweepstakes." The results were based on a rating system established by the Providence Journal to compare the forecastings of the United States Weather Bureau and those of the Northeastern Weather Service, a privately owned operation. Daily reports and 5-day outlooks from the United States Weather Bureau and the Northeastern Weather Service were printed on the front page of the Journal, starting March 20 and ending April 24, practically in a tie. The "Sweepstakes" was unique and was followed with interest by the citizens of my State.

Many estimates have been made of the amount of damage in dollars and cents caused by these 1954 hurricanes. I do not have any exact figures but I do know that it amounted to many millions of dollars. According to the press over $276 million in claims have been paid by insurance companies as a result of the visits of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel in 1954. Of course, there have been additional millions expended by individuals who lost their property but were not insured. Of course, there will always be extensive damage done by storms such as these, regardless of how accurate the forecasting may be. However, I also recognize the fact that an improved warning system and proper coordination of Federal, State, and local agencies during such a period, would greatly decrease property damage and loss of life.

I know that meteorologists and forecasters of the Weather Bureau cannot materially improve their forecasts and give sufficient warning of the approach of hurricanes, unless and until they improve their knowledge of storm structure and movement. To improve this knowledge it will be necessary to institute a comprehensive research program

which will cover not only hurricanes, but all sorts of storms such as tornadoes, hailstorms, and the like.

It is my understanding that the Weather Bureau has recently been able to improve its hurricane warning system and to arrange for better collection and distribution of information. I understand that the Bureau is proceeding with the installation of radar at certain points—that aerial reconnaissance for locating hurricanes has been worked out with the armed services—that a special telephone service has been arranged with certain priorities being given to the Weather Bureau during such emergencies—and that better press relations have been established so that the press will be kept informed of approaching storms, with a view to passing understandable information along to the public. All these steps which have recently been taken by the Bureau are in the right direction. However, I am firmly convinced that the Weather Bureau does not have sufficient funds to improve its research and to maintain the service which is expected of it. I am one of those in the Congress who believes that the Weather Bureau is one of the few Government agencies which does not waste any of the taxpayers' money and that appropriations are used with discretion.

As a legislator I have reviewed the requirements for hurricane research as recommended by the Interagency Hurricane Research Conference which was held last December here in Washington. The report of this conference is, in my opinion, far-reaching and practical, and funds to put the recommendations into operation should be appropriated immediately. I concur with the recommendations of the conference, particularly with regard to the establishment of a Federal advisory committee on hurricane research. A group such as this would be comprised of representatives of all Government agencies interested in weather reporting activities. It would be of inestimable value by providing for an expanded research program and better coordination of all agencies concerned with weather forecasting.

Therefore, as a Member of the Senate and one who is deeply interested in the activities of the Weather Bureau, I intend to do my best to have Congress appropriate adequate funds for that agency's research program. I know that there are some legislators and Government officials who are economy-minded and hesitate to increase any appropriation. In this case I call it false economy and shortsightedness. The total funds allotted to the Bureau are very small in comparison with the funds appropriated for some of the other agencies and I fully intend to solicit the support of the members of the New England United States Senators Conference relative to working as a unit for increased appropriations for the Weather Bureau.

The country needs men such as the members of your organization, with your training and scientific knowledge of the elements, to guide the Congress and to advise the public in matters of this kind. I know that Congress appreciates highly the cooperation and assistance of your organization and your continued interest in all Federal legislation affecting the agencies interested in weather forecasting and reporting. I trust that it will take advantage of your helpful advices.

[From the New York Times of September 27, 1954]

Failings of Weather Bureau Laid to Parsimony

(By Robert Alden)

The United States Weather Bureau, charged with a grave responsibility in terms of life, property and commercial interest, is severely handicapped by a lack of funds to carry out a complex operation. As a case in point, meteorologists say that if the trend toward eliminating weather observation stations continues there is a very real danger that the Bureau's forecasts will become less accurate.

In 1947 there were 443 such weather stations. Next year there will be 321. In 1949 the Weather Bureau had 4,517 full-time employees. Next year there will be 3,728.

The plight of the Weather Bureau was brought into focus by Hurricane Carol, which roared into an unprepared New England at the end of August, killing 60 persons and causing damage estimated at $500 million.

As a result of that storm this newspaper interviewed about 40 persons in the field of weather study and prediction, most of them privately employed and thus holding no special brief for the Weather Bureau.

To a man they agreed that the Bureau had been treated penuriously by Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget, and that, consequently, its product was not up to what it could be.

One description characterized the Weather Bureau as a neglected "horse-and-buggy outfit struggling to get along on just a pittance—a fraction of the money it should have."

The more generously inclined commented that in spite of severe budgetary handicaps the Weather Bureau through constant struggle was "almost" managing to keep abreast of the times in a branch of science that was said to be much more complex than such a notably difficult field as the development of the hydrogen bomb.

All of those surveyed agreed that the Weather Bureau, with only a token amount available for research, was not able to take the lead in attempting to solve the knotty problems in weather prediction.

Such an accelerated research program does not necessarily hold out the key that will enable the Weather Bureau by next year or the year after that to warn us with certainty that a hurricane like Carol will strike a specific area at a specific time with a specific force.

It does mean, however, that unless such research is done now, in 10 and 20 years from now other Carols will still be roaring in from the sea, violently and unexpectedly. And again there will be the consequent tragedy of lives snuffed out, homes and life-long possessions destroyed and business establishments, built up through a lifetime, wrecked without hope of repair.

Government bureaus have seldom been notable for economy of operation. Apparently the Weather Bureau is exceptional in this respect.

A committee of private citizens, expert in the field, was appointed last year by the Secretary of Commerce to study the Weather Bureau and its functions: That committee's report said:

"A review of the history of the Weather Bureau's budget has impressed the committee with the frugality of this Bureau's operation and its management is to be commended for the manner which they have administered public funds. We know of no other governmental agency that has been so economical in the expenditure of its funds."

Comparatively low expenditure

The committee went on to point out that while countries such as Iceland spent $1 per capita a year for a weather service, while the Soviet Union spent 47 cents (last available figure 10 years ago) and England spent 20 cents, the United States, with a gross income far higher than any of these countries, was allotting each year only 18 cents per capita for its Weather Bureau.

Yet, quite literally, billions of dollars are at stake in the United States as a result of the foibles of the weather. It is not only a question of whether a lawn party can be held or a ball game will be played—the sort of thing that many associate with the weatherman.

A merchant fleet unwarned of the approach of a storm can be wiped out overnight. A crop of oranges can be destroyed by a cold snap. Hundreds of persons can be killed in a tornado when a scant 10-minute warning might save them all.

It was for this reason that the Secretary of Commerce's committee, headed by Brig. Gen. Joseph J. George, superintendent of meteorology at Eastern Air Lines, recommended "that the Weather Bureau receive the strongest possible support in budgetary matters at the department level for the next few years when adequate funds will be absolutely essential."

In spite of the fact that this recommendation was made last December, Congress appropriated only $24,750,000 for the Weather Bureau this year, a figure well under the $27,250,000 allotted for the Bureau's high year, fiscal 1953.

But these bare figures do not tell the story. As a science, meteorology has exacting demands. Talented and trained personnel are required to tackle the tough job of weather analysis and prediction. Such personnel are not being attracted by the meager salaries that the Bureau is forced to pay. Similarly, research, the life-blood of science, is getting scant support from the Bureau.

Another result of the continual cutting of the Bureau's budget is that the amount of data upon which the forecaster must depend to make his predictions is becoming less each year as additional weather stations are closed.

That trend, of course, is very dangerous.

The Bureau's equipment is also becoming antiquated and newly developed equipment that should be in the weather stations is not being acquired. A good case in point is the matter of radar sets.

A new radar set is prohibitively priced (as far as the Weather Bureau is concerned) at something over $200,000. Fortunately, the Navy gave the Weather Bureau a hundred old radar sets. But even the money to convert this equipment—about $10,000 a set—was not available.

With some financial sacrifice, four of the sets were installed along the Atlantic seaboard to watch hurricanes and other severe storms. (It is generally agreed that about 14 are needed to track storms adequately along the east coast.)

The other sets were offered to communities willing to pay the price of converting the equipment. Several cities in Texas, plagued by tornadoes, assumed the financial responsibility and a few of the sets were installed there.

However, there are many other cities and weather stations that could profitably use the equipment, which now lies gathering dust in a warehouse.

Another solution to the problem of adequate employment of radar in weather detection lies in the Air Defense Command. This command has an excellent radar net and it is perfectly willing to cooperate in every way with the Weather Bureau.

But reading radar in connection with the weather is difficult. For example, rain squall lines appear on the scope in such a way that they seem to indicate the presence of the eye of a hurricane. Such a false reading can be misleading to a disastrous degree.

To do this difficult job accurately, the Weather Bureau should post a man either at the Air Defense Command's radar machines or at least at the radar report filter center.

But, lacking this personnel, these centers remain uncovered by the Weather Bureau and the radar reports that finally get to the Weather Bureau from the Air Defense Command's radar net are late, incomplete, and possibly misleading.

Left in the lap of Congress

As a result of all these factors, the weather experts in the field agree, the country is not getting the kind and quality of service that should be available to it. Consequently lives may be lost unnecessarily and millions of dollars of preventable damage may be done.

This year, as in the years before, the Department of Commerce will urge on the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress an increased appropriation for the Weather Bureau. Until now the pleas met with no success. The Bureau, it seems, always loses "the Battle on the Hill."

If the weather experts could go to Congress and say: "Give us more money and we guarantee that next year there will be no more Carols striking the coast without warning," the Bureau would undoubtedly get an adequate appropriation.

But in the difficult science of meteorology no such guarantee can be made. Progress comes only slowly and the results cannot be assured in advance.

It is certain, however, the meteorologists agree, that unless an attempt is made to improve the situation, everything will remain as it is at present. The weatherman will continue to be the butt of jokes and the Nation will be a heavy loser as a result of the unexpected quirks in the weather.

[From the New York Times of September 28, 1954]

CAPRICES OF CAROL DEFIED FORECASTS—HURRICANE STILL IN DISPUTE—EXPERTS DISAGREE ON ROLE OF WEATHER BUREAU ECONOMIES

(By Robert Alden)

The capricious and destructive Hurricane Carol, which tore into New England without adequate warning on the morning of August 31, still remains a lady of mystery.

No one, for example, can say with any certainty whether an additional dollar investment in the Weather Bureau through the years would have enabled the bureau to forecast the course of the storm any sooner than it did.

At least two responsible meteorologists (outside the Weather Bureau) argue that if a weather ship, formerly stationed about half way between New York and Bermuda, had been at its post, the New England coast could have been alerted to the storm 12 hours sooner than it was.

Other equally responsible meteorologists think that the presence of the weather ship, removed last year for reasons of economy, would have made no difference at all. They maintain that it would not have been in the right position to give the data pertinent to the course of the storm.

The fairest appraisal of this situation was given by a high official in the Weather Bureau. He said:

"I don't think the ship would have done any good. But, after all, the ship wasn't out there. We don't know whether the data she might have picked up would have helped because there just weren't any data. It's one of those things you can't possibly figure out."

VALUE OF RESEARCH WEIGHED

Similarly there is the matter of research. The meandering course of a hurricane seems to be governed in large measue by upper air currents. Some meteorologists maintain that if a comprehensive research study of those currents and other factors influencing hurricanes had been instituted years ago, Carol's mad middle-of-the-night dash toward the New England coast could have been plotted in advance an a substantial advance warning given to the area.

TOUCHES OFF POLITICAL DISPUTE

Carol is destined, it seems, to have a political career. Already there has been a sharp exchange on the subject in Washington.

Senator THEODORE GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, has charged that false economy was one reason that no adequate warning was sounded.

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks replied that there had been no false economies in the Weather Bureau that would weaken the agency's hurricane-warning system.

Meteorologists are inclined to straddle the fence on the issue. Hurricanes are strange and difficult-to-predict meterological phenomena. The general feeling among the scientists is that while one cannot buy the answer to the hurricane problem in a year or 2, perhaps in 10 or 20 years such a purchase can be made.

They feel that with 1 hurricane like Carol costing 60 lives and $50 million in property damage, even 20 years of payment might prove a good bargain.

Other weather experts say it is speculative to predict what might have been uncovered by research.

All agree, however, that the institution of a large-scale research program years ago certainly would have done no harm. If no solution to the hurricane problem had been found by now, at least meteorologists would be that much closer to finding a solution.

At the same time persons critical of the Weather Bureau point out that even without benefit of the additional research or the weather ship, at least one private forecaster advised his client in Providence, in advance of the Weather Bureau, that a hurricane was about to strike that city.

To understand that situation it is necessary to trace the history of the storm.

Carol, like most hurricanes, was peculiar. For several days it idled off the Carolina capes, not doing anything in particular. At times it would stand still. Then it would move northward or northeastward at 3 to 4 miles an hour. Sometimes the winds at its center would increase in intensity. Then they would diminish.

During the day of August 30 Carol began to move north northeastward, first at 5 miles an hour, then toward evening at something more than 10 miles an hour. Highest winds at the center were measured at 100 miles an hour.

Without warning, at about midnight, the hurricane started a wild dash toward the New England coast. Soon the winds at its center were boiling up the sea at 100 miles an hour while the hurricane herself was skimming across the Atlantic at a speed of over 50 miles an hour.

SAFETY CUSHION SUDDENLY LOST

All through the night Carol raced onward.

While a few hours earlier it had seemed that those 500 miles of water that lay between the Carolina capes and New England would provide an ample safety cushion for sounding a warning, it was now apparent that the storm if it hit land at all would strike the New England coast by morning.

But New England was still sleeping. And it is impossible for the weather bureau to pour a warning into a sleeping ear.

There were other complicating factors. The Weather Bureau was not receiving very much data about the storm in the middle of that critical night. Frequently information from the sea areas is scant.

From the material it did receive, it appeared at one point as if Carol were veering out to sea and might miss the coastline completely.

By 5 a. m., however, the Weather Bureau in Washington, utilizing radar information it had received from Norfolk, Va., issued a bulletin that all precautions should be taken for high tides and "on-shore gales" from central Long Island to Nantucket. Gales are a notch below hurricanes in intensity.

In view of the complexity of the situation that night, most meteorologists agree that this 5 a. m. advisory was a "pretty fair" prediction.

The private forecaster who warned his client in Providence telephoned that client at 6:49 a. m. that a hurricane would strike the area at about noon.

In explaining this divergence of opinion meteorologists will say that plotting the course of a hurricane is much like handicapping an immensely complicated horse race. One studies all the available data and then comes up with his choice. Sometimes he is right and sometimes he is wrong.

BUREAU BACKED WRONG HORSE

In the case of Carol, when the Weather Bureau's forecaster had picked the word "gale" he had backed the wrong horse, although he had done a good job, in the opinion of meteorologists, in handicapping the race.

As for the private forecaster, working from data supplied by the Weather Bureau, he had picked a better horse and had come in first. At the same time it is apparent that any other private forecaster who hadn't picked a better horse would not be advertising the fact.

On another occasion it will be the Weather Bureau's choice that will nose out that of the private forecaster's. Horse races and hurricanes are like that.

The Navy, in New England, was also able to batten down its hatches and make ready for the storm in plenty of time to avoid serious damage. People have wondered publicly why the Navy was forewarned while civilians weren't.

Here, an entirely different factor is involved. It is best illustrated in the words of a Navy weather forecaster in a discussion of a hurricane other than Carol.

"As a meteorologist," he said, "I was fairly certain that that storm wasn't going to strike our docks or our air bases.

"As a Navy officer, however, I recommended that all hurricane precautions be taken in the harbors and that all flyable aircraft be evacuated. We just can't take a calculated risk on a thing of that kind. It just isn't worth it to us."

On the other hand, if the Weather Bureau were to alert the public too often to storms that didn't strike, it would be severely criticized, particularly because of the big commercial loss that might be involved.

After a time, as in the case of the fable about the boy who cried "wolf!" no one would pay much attention to the Weather Bureau.

[From the New York Times of September 29, 1954]

PUBLIC AID URGED BY WEATHERMEN—PALLED BY STALE JOKES, THEY ASK BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR COMPLEX WORK

(By Robert Alden)

The weatherman is tired of being the butt of a parade of stale jokes.

He wishes the public had a better understanding of his job and the economic problems connected with it.

He would especially like the public to know that meteorology has turned out to be one of the most complex sciences man has undertaken to explore.

It involves the study of a layer of gases cloaking the earth to a height of several hundred miles and weighing something in the neighborhood of 4 million billion tons.

These gases are in a constant state of flux—boiling upward, spinning, turning, and then plunging down again. In this devildance of the earth's atmosphere, the weather is created.

It is something of an exaggeration to say that if a man sneezes in China a hot day in Texas may result. But it is true that any action in the atmosphere in any part of the world may have an effect on the weather anywhere else in the world.

"Man doesn't know the complete answer to problems involved in such things as economic cycles, polio, or cancer," the meteorologist will say in his own defense. "Why should people expect us to be able to tell them everything about the weather?"

The weatherman's job begins with the gathering of data from weather stations all

over the world. At those stations things such as temperature, wind velocity, humidity, and atmospheric pressure are measured.

UPPER AIR DATA NOW TAKEN

Formerly these measurements were made only at ground level. Now some of the weather stations also take soundings in the upper air. These new measurements have proved extremely valuable.

The data from all these stations are transmitted to the forecasting centers where they provide the raw material with which the forecaster works.

The limited budget provided for the Weather Bureau coupled with the inflationary trends of the times has made it necessary for the Bureau to effect economies. Consequently there has been a steady whittling away of weather observation stations.

The committee appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to study the Weather Bureau said in its report that it viewed "with considerable concern" the elimination of those stations and advised that the matter be carefully considered before further reductions were made.

If the trend were to continue important gaps would appear in the weather map and the forecaster would be hobbled almost to a crippling degree in trying to do his job.

In general the meteorologists queried for this survey felt that the present land net of observation stations in the United States was adequate for forecasting. Several, however, complained about the closing down of particular stations.

Most felt that more frequent soundings of the upper air (it is now done twice a day) would be helpful for those involved in weather research.

MORE SEA INFORMATION NEEDED

Many of the meteorologists also felt that not enough upper air data were available from sea areas. There is a gap in the Pacific Ocean, for example, that is as big as the United States itself. And much of this country's weather is born in the Pacific.

As a result of this situation instead of solid data with which to work the forecaster must, substitute an educated guess. Such a procedure is hardly satisfactory from his point of view.

At this point the cruel matter of economics again interjects itself. The operating cost of a land weather observation station is about $25,000 a year. A year's upkeep of a weather ship at sea, providing the same kind of information costs $1 million.

At some point along the line it must, therefore, be decided if the data obtained from the ship are worth $1 million a year. In the case of Weather Ship "H," which was stationed in the Atlantic about halfway between New York and Bermuda, it was decided to discontinue its services. Meteorologists are still arguing about that decision.

Once the data are obtained, the next step is to disseminate it to forecasters and private users throughout the country. Here again the Bureau is encountering trouble because of budgetary difficulties.

Officials of the Weather Bureau say that their communication network just isn't adequate; that a lot of the data picked up at the observation stations cannot be transmitted because of a bottleneck in the wires.

NEW DEVICES REQUIRED

Were the Bureau able to purchase a new type of teletype equipment, which can handle 600 words a minute instead of the 60 that the present equipment can transmit, that bottleneck would be eliminated.

When the data does arrive at the forecasting center, it is then worked on by the meteorologist in the Bureau. A weather map is prepared from the data, and then the forecaster must pit what he knows about the science against what shows on the map.

His answer comes out in the form of a prediction. How good that prediction is depends on the ability of the forecaster—how well he is able to estimate the product of the many, many forces that are at play in the atmosphere.

And again monetary factors are interposed. One of the crying needs of the Weather Bureau is good personnel. Not many young men are entering the field of meteorology. To get the good men in the field it is necessary to pay them an adequate salary. The salaries paid by the Weather Bureau are not high.

Many of the employees of the Weather Bureau leave to work elsewhere for economic reasons. And young men just entering the field are attracted by the salaries offered by private industry.

RESEARCH PROGRAM PINCHED

For years now the Weather Bureau, for reasons of economy, has been spending just token sums on research. So badly has their research program been pinched, that the Air Force and the Navy have been forced to undertake research functions, which are not properly within their realm.

Everyone concerned with the problem is anxious to see the Weather Bureau undertake the basic research in the weather field. But this cannot be done until the Bureau receives a larger budgetary allotment.

It is axiomatic that the fewer employees there are in a weather station, the less direct service can be given to the public.

Beyond a straight forecast there is controversy as to exactly how much information the Weather Bureau should give to the public. Most meteorologists feel that the Weather Bureau should not take upon itself the burden of supplying a special service to a special business.

That kind of service falls within the province of private meteorology, a profession which those connected with weather study and prediction feel has great potentialities.

While the Weather Bureau will be issuing general forecasts, the private meteorologist will be thinking in terms of the particular conditions that will affect a company's operation.

Occasionally, however, the Bureau does step across the line and give special advice—perhaps to a utility company, perhaps to a candy company, which doesn't want to make shipments when it is very hot.

In another instance, some of the large airlines depend entirely on the Weather Bureau to provide their pilots with the detailed and specialized information they require.

Many persons in the field feel that these special services of the Weather Bureau should be discontinued. They feel it is a disservice to the public to take the time of the Bureau's limited personnel to perform such special jobs.

Others disagree, maintaining that these services are a proper function of the Weather Bureau.

[Press release of U. S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau]

STATEMENT OF FUTURE REQUIREMENTS OF THE WEATHER BUREAU

The Weather Bureau is responsible for forecasting severe storms, floods, and general weather conditions and making such forecasts available to the public promptly for the protection of life and property and for the economic benefit of the Nation. In summarizing what is required for an optimum weather service for the modern needs of the Nation, it should be kept in mind that weather is a highly variable phenomena which affects the daily activities of almost every citizen and the entire national economy. Furthermore, the weather forecast problem is one of the most difficult in the physical sciences and requires a large network of weather reporting stations equipped with modern instruments for accurately measuring weather elements from the earth's surface to high levels in the atmosphere (80,000 feet or more) at frequent intervals. There are certain serious limitations in the Weather Bureau facilities for preparing accurate forecasts and warnings and for disseminating such information promptly to the public.

I. IMPROVEMENTS PLANNED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1956

The Weather Bureau's plans for fiscal year 1956 include provision for improving its forecasts and advices by installing improved equipment for measuring high altitude wind and weather conditions at all upper-air observing stations, radar for detecting and tracking severe storms will be installed at 12 stations, equipment for measuring the height of cloud bases and visibility near the end of the instrument landing runways will be provided at 45 airports, and other improvements will be made in facilities for reporting surface weather conditions.

II. IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS

A. Observational requirements

1. Land reports: Additional radar facilities should be provided for detecting and tracking severe storms so that radar weather coverage can be maintained along the Pacific coast and over the entire area from the Great Plains eastward to the Atlantic and gulf coasts. The completed network will require about 70 additional sets of high-powered radar equipment. End-of-runway observational equipment should be provided for approximately 120 additional airports for protection of life and property during marginal weather conditions. Airway observations for airline operations are required at a number of airports used by scheduled carriers where there is no Weather Bureau or other Government weather reporting facility. Weather stations at these airports are needed. The frequency of observations taken at all upper-air sounding stations should be increased from 2 to 4 times daily and a few additional upper-air stations should be established. These improvements will complete the observational facilities currently needed over the continental area.

2. Marine reports: Approximately 75 additional marine reports of surface conditions by merchant vessels are needed daily from the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific areas. The need for additional nighttime reports from ships in the Gulf and Atlantic areas during the hurricane season is especially urgent.

3. Instrumental development: Intensified work needs to be done on the development of improved instruments for weather observational purposes. Most urgent are the needs for (1) development of improved and cheaper methods of obtaining upper-air observations, particularly over the ocean areas; and (2) development of automatic equipment and remote reading instruments for observing and reporting weather conditions, so that the large amount of labor required for weather observational purposes may be reduced and reports may be obtained from isolated locations which are difficult and costly to staff.

B. Forecasts and severe weather warning requirements

1. Staffing: Additional staffing for preparation of forecasts should be provided at most of the forecast centers, particularly for the preparation of agricultural weather forecasts. Modern river forecast centers now provide forecast service for approximately half the streams of the country. Eight additional river forecast centers with supporting facilities should be established in order to provide full coverage.

2. Communications: Facsimile receivers for the reception of charts and maps from the Central Analysis Unit should be provided for about 200 offices in order to improve the

preparation of forecasts and severe weather warnings. The installation of additional teletypewriter facilities in the tornado and hurricane areas also is needed for the transmission of data required for the forecasting of severe storms.

C. Facilities needed for dissemination of forecasts, warnings, and related weather information

1. Staffing and stations: Approximately 125 counties in the United States having a population of 75,000 or more are outside the areas served by a local Weather Bureau office. Stations should be established in each of these locations and in several less populous areas where severe weather seriously affects the public interest. Service to agriculture would be given high priority in the programs of most of these offices. Additional staffing also is needed at practically all stations in large metropolitan areas in order to facilitate the dissemination of forecasts and warnings to the general public.

2. Communications: Automatic equipment for disseminating aviation and general weather information by radio and telephone has been developed and is in use at a few locations. Equipment of this type should be provided at about 90 locations in the Nation, so that routine information can be disseminated rapidly without need for a large staff.

D. Climatology

Additional professional climatologists are needed in each State to develop, in cooperation with the land-grand colleges, better utilization of climatology by agriculture and other interests. The climatological archives contain a vast amount of data which is potentially highly valuable to business, industry, commerce, and agriculture but the limited facilities of the Weather Bureau have prevented adequate use of this material. A comprehensive climatic atlas of the United States should be developed to meet the great variety of climatic problems confronting agriculture, commerce, industry, public works, and transportation. More intensive studies of drought, of long-term climatic changes, and of the influence of climate on agriculture should be conducted.

E. Research

For a number of years expenditures for research have amounted to only about 2 percent of the Weather Bureau's budget. The complex nature of meteorological processes and the urgent need for improved forecasts justify a substantial increase in funds for research purposes. The following items should receive high priority during the next few years.

1. Severe storms: An intensive research program on the various aspects of the hurricane forecast problem is very urgently needed. Research on other types of severe storms, such as tornadoes, also should be intensified. Improvement in the forecasting of severe storms and other weather occurrences is dependent to a large extent upon a better understanding of their structure and nature.

2. Numerical weather prediction: Trials now being made in the application of high speed electronic computers to weather forecasting offer great promise that the accuracy and quality of weather forecasts may be substantially improved. However, the preparation of weather forecasts with electronic computers is a highly complex procedure and needs intensified study.

3. Long-range forecasts: Within recent years moderate success has been achieved in preparing monthly outlooks or forecasts. The technique employed is dependent upon analysis of the large scale atmospheric circulation over the entire northern hemisphere. The improved high altitude wind observations which will be available in the next few years will provide valuable basic data with which to improve this technique. Studies in this field should be increased because even limited improvements in the accuracy of long-range forecasts would be of great benefit to the Nation.

4. Additional research also is needed concerning the physical processes involved in the formation of precipitation and on the possibilities of artificially modifying weather conditions. The manner in which water vapor in the free atmosphere is transformed into precipitation or cloud masses is imperfectly understood and constitutes one of the major basic problems in meteorology.

The foregoing improvements will provide a highly effective national weather service but will require about 6 years to accomplish in a sound and efficient manner, because of the time requirement for recruiting and training technical staff and the procurement and development of supporting facilities. Funds in the President's Budget for 1956, therefore, represent an important step in this long-range improvement plan for the Weather Bureau's observing, forecasting and distribution system.

Notes on the Record Losses From 1954 Hurricanes

(A paper presented at the joint spring meeting of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society at Washington, D. C., May 2–6, 1955, by Norman R. Hagen, meteorologist, U. S. Weather Bureau)

(Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel not only broke many meteorological records, but together far surpassed previous annual records for damages by all types of North American severe storms. Hurricane Carol on August 31, 1954, alone caused damage amounting to nearly $500 million. Comparisons with previous losses, some storm highlights, and damage assessment problems are discussed briefly.)

The 1954 hurricane season at many localities broke a variety of meteorological records, such as highest wind speeds, lowest pressures, greatest rainfall amounts, and deepest salt water inundations.

The purpose of these notes is not to enumerate all such observation data, but rather to highlight facts showing that hurricane damages in 1954 far surpassed previous annual damage records by all classes of North American storms. These recently collected figures on the size of the 1954 losses, however gruesome, may be of more than passing interest to coastal business interests and to meteorologists already concerned about preparations for the 1955 hurricane season.

Annual storm damage, to some extent, is a measure of the worth of warning services that could be provided by a forecast organization. There would be less public demand for storm protection services if there were no severe storms, or if our severest weather occurrences were of no economic significance. Conversely, there would be more public demand for better forecast services if the total number of severe storms were large. Moreover, if total annual property damages were tremendous, and total loss of life exceptionally high, there would be reduced strain on scientists in justifying adequate warning program budgets before fiscal-minded officials.

It seems useful, accordingly, to review the estimates of damage that occurred as a result of the 1954 hurricanes.

First of all it must be realized that only general estimates of property damage are possible. A complete catalog would be needed to total all the areas affected by hurricanes, and all the various types of losses which occurred. Such assembled statistics, however, still would be subject to criticism as to the damage criteria and the census techniques used.

Figures on fatalities also may be misleading, since some of the deaths are only indirectly attributable to hurricanes. Nevertheless, the actual figures for 1954 are very large indeed.

In one 1954 hurricane a quarter-million telephones suddenly went out of order, and millions of feet of wire were blown down. In another 1954 hurricane, hundreds of thousands of homes and business establishments were deprived of electric power, and the business economy of many communities quickly came to a full stop.

In many States repair crews worked night and day for a month untangling the devastation. In a single city thousands of employees were thrown out of work for weeks because of salt water damage to vital production machinery and stock material.

Along some beaches dozens of houses disappeared without trace. In other communities hundreds of buildings were completely demolished. Food spoilage was immense. Crops covering entire counties were ruined. Thousands of small craft were sunk or damaged. The real cost and social loss of millions of downed trees perhaps never can be measured satisfactorily.

From the data readily available I have abstracted the following brief statements on general damage from the 1954 hurricanes in North America (it should be remembered that figures on property damage, and on the loss of life from hurricanes are prepared by several different procedures, and are not always comparable in different States or countries):

1. Hurricane damage in 1954 was the largest in history. The total loss in North America, by conservative estimate, was nearly $1 billion.

2. In North America 750 lives were lost because of hurricanes in 1954.

3. Hurricane Carol on August 31, 1954, caused more property damage than any single storm in North American history. Estimates of the damage caused by this New England storm now total about $500 million.

4. About 600 people lost their lives throughout the long twisting passage of Hurricane Hazel over Haiti, the Bahamas, the United States, and Canada.

5. Mexico also suffered large damage from 1954 hurricanes. Hurricane Alice caused 38 deaths in that country, and 5 more Mexicans died because of Hurricane Florence.

6. The tropical disturbance Gilda caused very heavy rainfall in British Honduras, and resulting floods brought death to about 30 people, and left thousands homeless in Central America.

7. In the United States alone the 1954 hurricanes caused about 200 deaths, and caused property damage of about $800 million.

8. It is sometimes mentioned that the number of claims made to insurance companies is a rough indication of total storm damage. If so, Hurricane Carol was the worst catastrophe in history, since more damage claims were made as a result of Hurricane Carol than any other storm or natural disaster in American records up until September 1954. Insurance men say that about 300,000 damage claims were made following the onslaught of Hurricane Carol across New England. Yet, in the National Underwriter magazine of last month, it is stated that Hurricane Hazel resulted in more damage claims than Hurricane Carol and Edna combined.

9. Approximately $150 million were paid out by insurance companies to the property owners in New England who claimed damage as a result of Hurricanes Carol and Edna. The total damage in New England, both insured and uninsured, apparently was about 4 times the $150 million actually paid out to insured property owners.

10. One insurance official stated that 840 insurance adjusters worked around the clock for 5 months settling claims resulting from Hurricanes Carol and Edna, and that this small army of adjusters paid out an average of $350,000 a day for this entire period.

11. A report in December 1954 by the National Board of Underwriters estimated that total insurance property damage caused in the United States this year by all 3 major hurricanes, Carol, Edna, and Hazel, exceeded $276 million.

12. The losses of many insurance companies in 1954 were staggering. For example, in Massachusetts one large group of insurance companies received $8 million of premiums in 1954, and paid out losses of $54 million. That is about a 7 to 1 loss. Many individual companies reported a 10 to 1 loss. Naturally, insurance rates for the coming years have already gone up, in some cases several hundred percent.

It is not known to meteorologists what part of total property damage, on the average, is covered by insurance. Much damage obviously is not covered, since certain types of damage usually are not included in standard insurance policies. Moreover, there are many policies which contain special deductible and exemption clauses.

Many complaints, and many new protection coverage problems, have arisen. For example, the problem of wave-wash damage recently has caused much discussion between policyholders and adjustment agents. The extent of television antenna damage also raises new problems.

All the damage figures have not yet been collected, and all the damage claims have not yet been paid. For those interested in taking action for future protection it might also be said that all the solutions proposed for better warning services have not yet been collected nor publicly discussed.

The record property damage and loss of life figures listed above suggest that the 1954 hurricane season not only warrants a second look by meteorologists, but also calls for a thorough study by those directly interested in added protection of life and property in our coastal areas.

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1955]

HURRICANE WARNING

Last summer's hurricanes killed 200 people and caused about $800 million damage to property as they tore into the coasts and back country of our Northeastern States. They also confirmed the grim presumption that this part of the country is now definitely in the hurricane zone. Disaster experts, however, estimate that 90 percent of the loss of lives and possibly as much as 25 percent of the property damage from hurricanes could be prevented if the Weather Bureau were able to give more precise and timely warnings broadcast over all our communications media and based on much more knowledge than it has about the air currents far aloft and out to sea.

In view of all this, the public has a right to expect an immediate and substantial increase in the Bureau's facilities and personnel. Shocking as it will be to those unfamiliar with the Federal budget now before Congress, nothing of the sort is in sight for the next fiscal year (July 1, 1955–June 30, 1956). In a letter published on this page a well-known meteorologist raises a timely alert as to this dangerous situation. His letter, however, suffers from understatement.

If the appropriations called for in the budget are not increased, the Weather Bureau will not, in practical effect, get a cent more for research and its general weather reporting services next year than this. The Bureau itself states in its budget justification that "research in 1956 is planned at about the same level as for 1955," and there will actually be one less staff member assigned to this work.

The overall budget for next year, it is true, is $3 million more than last ($27,850,000), plus a special $5 million extra for equipment to be spent over the next 4 years. But the $3 million is to cover the expenses of taking over observation activities which the Air Force previously carried on, and the $5 million—except for new radar installations—is largely to replace old equipment. No more stations are provided for and no strengthening of the present inadequate and underpaid but expert staff. (The Bureau has lost 1,000 employees since 1949, and the average annual pay for those who remain is $4,864.)

The very least that should be done by Congress is to pass the Patterson bill, H. R. 5260, which provides an additional $5 million above the budget allowances for the Weather Bureau—to be used exclusively "in the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system." But Congress might well look into the adequacy of the Weather Bureau's budget all along the line. As far as hurricanes are concerned, additional expenditures now may well be covered, and many times over, by savings to the public in the long run.

WEATHER RESEARCH ASKED—NEED SEEN FOR FULL-SCALE PROGRAM TO IMPROVE WARNINGS SYSTEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Last fall your paper carried an interesting series of articles by Robert Alden on the hurricane prediction problem. This was followed, as I recall, by an editorial in which you pointed out the need for more research in the general field of weather prediction.

I would like to take the liberty of referring your readers to that series of articles and to your editorial at this time, because there are now before Congress several bills aimed at providing funds for research on the hurricane problem and for development work on a system of improved hurricane warnings (e. g., H. R. 5260, introduced by Congressman PATTERSON). It is to be hoped that the interest and enthusiasm which was enkindled last fall by your discussion can now be brought to bear on the important matter of making funds available for such work.

In the matter of weather prediction in general, and in the case of hurricanes and tornadoes in particular, we are confronted with one of the most difficult scientific problems of our times. However, we have seen time and again during the past weeks, months, and years that scientific problems of great difficulty have succumbed to a sustained and intensive research effort. As a professional meteorologist, I feel that the weather problem in time will also be brought into hand.

In order to do this, however, we must be prepared to support the full-scale program of research and study which will be required. The measures now before Congress asking for this kind of work are rather modest relative to the magnitude of the problem, but unless they are supported we are only going to defer positive action on a weather problem which has in the past, and may in the future, take a frightening toll of life and property.

THOMAS F. MALONE,
Director, the Travelers Weather Research Center, the Travelers Weather Service.
HARTFORD, CONN., *April 26, 1955.*

U. S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, appropriation history 1951–56

Year	Requested of Department	Requested of Budget Bureau	Requested of Congress	Amount appropriated
1951	$35,578,242	$28,817,000	$26,100,000	$24,897,000
1952	41,850,967	32,173,000	28,565,000	26,970,000
1953	42,305,000	30,315,000	28,000,000	27,244,775
1954	42,434,600	30,456,400	26,700,000	27,000,000
1955	28,022,200	26,810,500	25,135,000	24,940,000
1956:				
Salaries and expenses	33,956,744	27,950,000	27,850,000	----------
Establishment	15,284,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	----------

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment on the basis of assurance given by the sponsor, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that the increased appropriation will be used to expand Weather Bureau facilities in the middlewest as well as improve the hurricane warning system along the east coast.

In his statement setting forth the need for an increased appropriation, the gentleman from Rhode Island includes Waterloo, Iowa, as one of the strategic locations for a new Weather Bureau station.

I am pleased to note that the gentleman specifically singles out Waterloo, Iowa, as a strategic and necessary location in the chain of stations gathering and disseminating weather information and it is to be expected that the Weather Bureau in Washington will take full cognizance of this recommendation in the opening of new stations.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, offered by my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, to increase the proposed appropriation for Weather Bureau activities, in order to provide more extensive hurricane warning service and more efficient storm forecasting throughout the country.

This comparatively small amount of money is designed primarily to permit Weather Bureau offices in 15 coastal cities from Maine to Texas to maintain warning operations throughout 24 hours and allow the opening of new offices in several geographically strategic locations from California to Massachusetts, including forecasting facilities at New Bedford and Worcester, Mass.

Anyone familiar with the recent history of terrible destruction of life and property following in the wake of sudden and violent weather changes realizes they have cost the Nation thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of dollars in damage and disintegration of physical properties.

In my own home city of Worcester, and the surrounding area, we experienced the actuality of such terrifying weather phenomenon in the nature of a vicious tornado which struck unexpectedly without warning on June 9, 1953, leaving 98 deaths and 1,000 injured, 12,000 homeless and 25,000 demolished homes. Conceivably, many of these lives might have been saved and a substantial part of the physical damage prevented if full and adequate warning and directing facilities were available.

In these days of very heavy Federal spending, none of us are inclined to increase appropriations without serious

justification but under conditions and circumstances where a relatively small sum could well preserve the lives of American citizens and prevent millions of dollars of damage to their homes, with accompanying tragedies, this action certainly cannot be termed an extravagance but is more truly described as a service and precaution we can ill afford to be without.

God forbid that the time should ever arrive when we succumb to the temptation of trying to save a comparatively few dollars instead of many American lives.

I urge you, therefore, to unanimously approve this amendment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. Chairman, weather is the Nation's business. The Weather Bureau is a service function of our Government. This was so recognized by the Congress in 1870 when it established the Signal Service of the Army. The service this agency of the Army performed spilled over into civilian life and it soon became evident that a civilian bureau was necessary to collect and disseminate weather information. The organic act establishing the Weather Bureau under the Department of Agriculture came in 1890. The rapid strides in aviation placed greater emphasis on weather information and, in 1940, the Weather Bureau was transferred to the Department of Commerce.

The service the Weather Bureau has rendered to the Nation is incalculable. Every segment of the Nation's economy benefits from its functions, for every segment of the Nation's economy feels the impact of the elements, whether fair or foul.

One of the functions of the National Weather Service is to issue severe storm warnings, cold wave warnings, and flood warnings to the general public where extensive danger to life or property is involved. And this is the particular area in which the Weather Bureau activities have been most criticized by the press, the public, and, strangely enough, by the Congress itself.

I think it elementary that the Weather Bureau is prohibited from exercising its maximum efficiency in this field unless, first, it is adequately staffed with competent personnel; second, it maintains sufficient observation stations; and, third, it is equipped with the most modern and up-to-date equipment. Without these three basic requirements, it is not possible for the Weather Bureau to adequately perform the tremendously important task of detecting severe and unusual weather, and issuing timely warnings to the public to save lives and protect property.

The record will show that the Weather Bureau has never received adequate funds. Its budget requests have been consistently cut by the Department of Commerce, again by the Bureau of the Budget and many times by the Congress. In the face of these dollar slashings, how can anyone expect the Weather Bureau to give adequate service, particularly with reference to severe and unusual weather—hurricanes and tornadoes?

It has been well said that the Weather Bureau has been for many years a stepchild. This attitude has resulted in a hesitancy on the part of the service to push more vehemently for adequate funds to perform its functions.

Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of this House to a very significant report published on December 1, 1953, by the Department of Commerce Advisory Committee on Weather Services. In its findings the committee deplores the moneywise meagerness paid the Bureau. Let me quote from that report:

> We have been aware of the need for effecting budget savings when compatible with acceptable efficiency. This has been difficult because, as will be seen, this is one Government organization which has been frugal to the point of diminishing returns.

And again:

> Throughout the activities of this committee budget difficulties of the Weather Bureau have been encountered at every turn. It is only fair to state that part of the recommendations contained in this report cover deficiencies recognized by Bureau officials and could have been remedied if sufficient appropriations had been available.

Mr. Chairman, the Advisory Committee on Weather Services has reviewed budget estimates and fiscal matters of the United States Weather Bureau dating back to 1938 to obtain background information on the development of the Weather Service. It came to the conclusion that—

> A review of the history of the Weather Bureau budget has impressed the committee with the frugality of this Bureau's operations and its management is to be commended in the manner which they administered public funds. We know of no other governmental agency that has been so economical in the expenditure of its funds.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Appropriations, and specifically the members of this subcommittee, for granting some increases—particularly with reference to the item dealing with the establishment of meteorological facilities. The acquisition of modern equipment has at long last been recognized as a must.

But, Mr. Chairman, as pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], it has not gone far enough. There is an urgent need now for increased personnel; the reopening of old and the establishment of new observation stations; the setting up of a better warning system. The amendment under discussion provides these deficiencies. The Weather Bureau recognizes their need; the Advisory Committee on Weather Services recommended the addition of trained and adequate number of forecasters.

This is one way in which we can meet our responsibility to the public. To provide sufficient funds to warn the public of possible impending disasters to life and property is the duty of this body. No, Mr. Chairman, we cannot, at least now, stop the severity of the hurricane, the tornado, the tidal wave. But we can and we must lighten their impact on the public. This amendment does just that. It ought to be overwhelmingly adopted by this committee.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join my colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in support of his amendment. The Weather Bureau budget originally called for $49,731,000; the Secretary of Commerce reduced the amount to $38,441,000; the Bureau of the Budget cut out another $5 million; the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount still further. The United States Weather Bureau is expected to service airlines, farmers, travelers—in fact all our citizens for this pauce amount.

But above all, we who live on the Atlantic coast need first class storm warning. Last year, for example, there was inadequate warning before Hurricane Carol struck. Had we been given even 12 hours' notice, lives would have been saved and property protected. The first action I took after this great hurricane was to call the Acting Chief of the Weather Bureau, Mr. Little.

After a long and detailed conference on this subject with Mr. Little, I became convinced that the Weather Bureau had been given insufficient funds. This year they have also been given insufficient funds. The fault, for once, does not seem to lie wholly with Congress. The Commerce Department and the Bureau of the Budget have mauled the Weather Bureau requests. By our action in supporting Mr. FOGARTY's amendment, we have restored $2,250,000.

This money will be used to provide a sufficient staff to keep the weather stations open 24 hours a day at such important locations to those of us who live on Long Island as New Haven, Conn.; Block Island, R. I.; Bridgeport, Conn.; and New Bedford, Mass.

Specifically, these funds will be used to operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

It will also provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Of great importance to Long Island and to our fishermen will be the improved high water warning service which will inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

I have been told the funds will also be used for the establishment of emergency hurricane warning centers. I suggested the establishment of such centers in my

conversation last year with Mr. Little. We will also be able to obtain reports of upper-air conditions in the path of approaching hurricanes similar to the information obtained from the ocean vessel ship station formerly established as a weather station halfway between New York and Bermuda.

Finally, I would like to pay a tribute to the men of the Weather Bureau Service for the grand work they do under extremely difficult conditions. They are always to blame if in the smallest degree wrong—and they never receive any credit when right. Maybe these funds will give them a better break.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusets?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this amendment to increase the funds for the Weather Bureau and heartily congratulate the very able gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for persistency, zeal, and great ability which have led in such large measure to favorable action.

Those of us who reside in areas that have been stricken by the ravages of Mother Nature's great and unexpected catastrophes particularly appreciate the urgent need for adequate hurricane warning and accurate storm forecasting.

Some of these great storms strike with startling suddenness and with little or no warning. Such a storm was the Worcester, Mass., tornado of about 2 years ago which inflicted heavy loss of life and property damage. It tore a path through parts of the district I have the honor to represent and through the district represented by my able and good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], and in the short space of minutes left a trail and wake of death and devastation never before known in New England and with few equals, indeed, throughout the Nation.

Hurricanes of great severity and fury have repeatedly taken a toll of lives and property in New England. Last year we were visited by three very destructive storms.

It is believed by expert meteorologists and climatologists that much of the loss of life and property damage could have been avoided or minimized if proper warnings had been sounded in advance of the storm and failure to give such warnings was due in large measure to the fact that the Weather Bureau was not sufficiently financed and organized in the area.

Thanks to this amendment, these added most valuable services will now be provided. Established offices of the Weather Bureau will be improved and new offices will be opened, including one at Worcester, Mass., and New Bedford, Mass. I think that this is a very helpful and constructive amendment and I am glad, indeed, to support it. Our great friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has rendered another distinct public service in securing agreement on this amendment.

In brief, this amendment, as a matter of actual benefit, makes possible the following extensions of Weather Bureau service:

First. It will provide staffs to keep Weather Bureau offices additionally open in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas.

Second. It will reopen certain key observatory offices across the country.

Third. It will permit installations and utilization of special technological equipment for proper relay of weather information.

Fourth. It will improve and extend all facilities for weather forecasting, "emergency hurricane warning centers," and other modern methods of weather broadcasting, and on the whole it will have a most salutary effect on the agency. It will provide a stimulus and encouragement to personnel. It will improve the administrative tone. It will bring many good results.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation of the recognition given today to the objectives of my bill, H. R. 5260. Today's amendment to H. R. 6367 by the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee provides $2,250,000 of additional funds to the Weather Bureau for the immediate establishment of an emergency warning system for hurricanes and severe storms.

Today's action will mean a small amount of increased protection during the hurricane seasons of 1955 and 1956, but I feel our citizens should be guaranteed a much greater reduction in unnecessary loss of life and property damage from storms along the eastern and southern seaboards of our country than can be procured through such a meaningless amount as adopted today.

This increase of $2,250,000 will carry out only a small part of the complete warning program which was planned under my bill, H. R. 5260. But I admit it is at least a timely step in the right direction. In my opinion a $5 million increase to the original 1956 fiscal year estimates of the Department of Commerce would be needed to establish the minimum facilities and staff required for a modern hurricane warning system. This opinion is backed up 100 percent by meteorologists all over the country, and by insurance companies and businessmen who know the problem firsthand.

Passage of the $2,250,000 Appropriations Committee amendment means that only a few additional stations can now be reopened in hurricane-swept areas, and only a few additional stations can now be kept open 24 hours a day. Passage of this amendment also means that only some minor improvements can be made in hurricane warning communications systems, and means that some key warning centers can not be provided the increased staff actually needed to do the job forecasters want to do.

I know that many citizens along the coast will not be satisfied with these modest improvements in hurricane protection services. But since I well know that business firms and trade associations are vitally interested in better and more timely warnings, and without further delay, I have not objected further to this small increase in funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

I have assembled below several excerpts of the hundreds of letters I have received from citizens located in all States along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts who have commented on the objectives of the bill I introduced on March 28, 1955, H. R. 5260.

A similar bill, it is of interest to note, was introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, of Connecticut, on May 11, 1955, S. 1932. I feel certain Senator PURTELL will receive numerous letters supporting our stand that $5 million is the minimum amount needed for a modernized hurricane warning system that will give the type of complete protection against storms demanded by millions of our citizens.

I commend Connecticut's Senator for his foresight and consideration of the lives, welfare and prosperity of the people of our great State, and for the protection Mr. PURTELL offers through his legislation for the people of the east coast and the tornado-torn areas of the Southwest and Middle West. I feel certain the other body of this Congress will see the great need for the requests in his legislation.

From the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New Bedford division, New Bedford, Mass.:

I think the bill is an excellent one.

In a survey of the damage sustained it was noted that the direct cost of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel amounted to over $9 million. This did not include the loss of jobs, profits, and other tangible and intangible costs. In the instance of our own company, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., we sustained a loss of $1,455,000.

If we had had early warning on hurricane Carol it is estimated that our loss would have been reduced by $300,000 to $500,000. I venture to say that the same is true of our waterfront firms in this area.

Including the industrial loss, New Bedford suffered a total loss of over $50 million in the series of hurricanes last year, a considerable amount of which could have been saved had the area had sufficient warning.

As you pointed out, along with the early warning we could expect a reduction in "unnecessary fear and apprehension in the areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes." This is a very important item with industrial plants, and it is best exemplified in this area by the fact that over $350,000 was expended by our 35 industrial firms in getting ready for hurricanes Edna and Hazel, which did not cause any serious damage.

To sum it up, we are wholly in accord with your bill H. R. 5260.

From the chamber of commerce, Greenwich, Conn.:

The board of directors agree with the proposal outlined in H. R. 5260. We believe your proposal has real merit.

From the Acushnet Process Co., New Bedford, Mass.:

The city of New Bedford, Mass., was very badly hit in 1938, in 1944, and by Carol in 1954. In 1938 we had 230 deaths in the Greater New Bedford area, and in 1954 we had more than $50 million damage. There were 35 industries in New Bedford which were badly affected by flood and salt water and extremely high winds. Damage to these industries alone amounted to more than $10 million.

Surveys which we have run among the 35 industries indicate that probably one-half of the $10 million damage could have been spared if the plants had ample warning to move material and equipment to higher ground and bulwark their plants against the surge of the salt-water flood.

We recognize that in the long run it may be possible to get physical protection, but we also realize we may be able to get relief from future hurricanes if we are able to get accurate forecasting as to the probable path of the hurricane and as to the time of arrival.

The New Bedford committee on hurricane damage and each of the industries it represents is wholeheartedly in favor of your program, and would like to do anything we can to get speedy passage and prompt action.

From the Union Reinsurance Co., of Zurich, Switzerland, the United States branch office:

Anything that will be done to reduce, as far as possible, the loss of our life and property has our wholehearted approval and support.

From Mr. Thomas F. Malone, director Travelers weather research center, Travelers Weather Service, Hartford, Conn.:

Your active interest in a matter of deep concern to New England is much appreciated, and, as a meteorologist, I am happy to endorse your proposed bill.

The loss of life and property from hurricanes has been so great that a concerted program of research on this problem seems obviously justified.

From the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I think there is no question but that the east coast is entitled to the additional protection that a better hurricane warning system might provide.

I think in these days of needed reduction in budget, one should hesitate to ask for even a modest increase in appropriations, but this is a case where I have no hesitancy in recommending an enlargement of Government facilities.

From the president of the Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am glad to tell you that I join with Dr. Malone, director of the Travelers weather research center, in endorsing your proposed bill.

From the president of the Bankers Fire Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

I think this bill is a splendid and very worthwhile work, and that it certainly should be approved.

From the vice president of the Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford, Hartford, Conn.:

Your proposal, H. R. 5260, is to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones, and we all here at this company readily concur in your proposal. We wish you complete success in this undertaking.

From the president of the Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am in favor with the purposes of this bill and believe that if passed it will perform a very useful service to many millions of citizens and property owners in the Atlantic coastal area from Maine to Texas.

The payout on claims by property insurance companies, such as ours, for the storms in 1954 was a rather devastating experience and naturally resulted in a substantial underwriting loss to our company. Anything that can help people to protect their property by being alerted in advance would be advantageous and interesting to our industry.

The advantages in being alerted to storms can accrue to insurance companies through loss prevention by protecting property when advices of an approaching storm are available. Closing shutters, securing doors, and moving contents, particularly from exposed property on the waterfront, can go a long way in keeping the ravages of wind from doing unnecessary damage.

From the Committee of American Steamship Lines:

Improved hurricane detection is desirable and your efforts to assure adequate provision for this purpose are very much in the public interest.

From the American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., 2382 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.:

We know that such a bill will be greatly appreciated by our members, and we are accordingly advising them of it and requesting that they support it.

From the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass.:

In a recent survey of New Englanders' opinions of issues before Congress there semed to be substantial support for the services proposed in your bill.

Unlike many of the other issues on which opinion was solicited where there was a fairly equal division of opinion, the vote was more than 3 to 1 in favor of increasing the appropriation to the United States Weather Bureau for more intensive study and reporting on hurricanes.

Congratulations on your preparation and submission of this bill. The New England Council intends to support it and we wish you the best of luck in gaining its passage in the House.

From the New Orleans Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.:

We are in favor of your proposal that an emergency hurricane warning system be improved to provide better protection.

From the Dixon Sintaloy Co., Inc., Stamford, Conn.:

I am in complete agreement with the need for a satisfactory appropriation for hurricane warning service to the eastern seaboard.

Your bill, H. R. 5260, certainly should serve to provide the means for saving many times over the amount of the appropriation required.

From the PM Industries, Stamford, Conn.:

We support enthusiastically the legislation which you propose and hope that the necessary action will be taken to enact it.

The appropriation under consideration to enable the United States Weather Bureau to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system would be of benefit to the manufacturers in our area.

From the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.:

There is no question but what these hurricanes have done a terrific job in Connecticut. No one was prepared for hurricanes which we had not had in quite a number of years, but it is quite evident that we can look for many more of them, and we should be better prepared than we are.

From the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Administration Building, Fish Pier, Boston, Mass.:

What happened in New England during the hurricane which visited us last fall indicated a willful lack of an adequate warning system.

The matter of preserving life and property as much as can be humanly expected should be of immediate concern to our Federal authorities.

The commercial fishing industry of New England is a hazardous occupation at best, and a timely and adequate Federal weather forecasting system would aid immeasurably in reducing the perils of fishing during the season in which we are subject to sudden changes in the weather.

From the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Members of this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry, who operate on all of the inland waters of the Nation, suffered severe losses during hurricanes last year and thus, I am sure, will actively support the above-mentioned bill in the hope that much of these losses can be eliminated in the future.

From the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council, 308 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.:

The matter of appropriating $5 million, in order that the United States Weather Bureau may be enabled to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system, was discussed with a number of manufacturers who are members of the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council. This matter was also brought up at our executive committee meeting, and I was authorized to write to you in support of this bill.

I do not need to advise you on the extent of damage done by wind and high water in this area.

Certainly the appropriation you ask, which would serve the entire eastern seaboard, is well justified. We believe that effective and reliable warning service, provided by the United States Weather Bureau, is imperative.

From the president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.:

I should like to assure you of my personal support for your measure, which would seem to me to be of great advantage to the American merchant marine, as well as to others affected by weather and hurricane conditions,

From the executive director, Rhode Island Development Council, Providence, R. I.:

I believe that all New England Congressmen and Senators should use every effort to see that this type of legislation becomes a reality.

From the head of the department of meteorology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:

Since our department is in the forefront of research on the problem of hurricanes, we are keenly aware of the need for action on the part of the Congress.

We are urging our friends to support your bill, or a similar proposal to achieve the same end, as well as any well-conceived proposal which will meet the urgent requirement for a hurricane research and development program.

Your active interest in the hurricane problem is a source of gratification to professional meteorologists, and a great service not only to your constituents but to all the millions of Americans who live along the Atlantic Seaboard and the gulf coast.

From a professor of meteorology at the Blue Hill Observatory of Harvard University of Milton, Mass.:

I was much pleased to see a news dispatch that you had filed a $5 million independent appropriation bill to provide greatly expanded forecast facilities up and down the east coast.

A forecast's accuracy depends mostly on the adequacy of the information available. In my opinion, the greatest inadequacy affecting forecasting for New England is the lack of a complete and dependable surface and upper air station in the Atlantic Ocean a few hundred miles offshore.

I think your proposal is definitely worthwhile.

From the chairman of the department of meteorology and oceanography, College of Engineering, New York University, University Heights, New York 53, N. Y.:

My colleagues and I in this department are well aware of the importance of this bill for the welfare of the population in the affected area.

You have in preparing this bill, of course, been in touch with our weather bureau, and know the excellent work which they are doing with inadequate financial means. Your bill will go far toward remedying this situation. It is very gratifying to know of this support for meteorology in Congress, and to find a realization of the contribution which meteorology can make to the welfare of the Nation.

The effects of this bill will be of great benefit to the people in the regions visited by hurricanes, including the people of New York State.

Your bill will go far toward alleviating the financial difficulties impeding the development of a really adequate warning service.

If ship station Hotel had been available in the fall of 1954, much property damage and many casualties could have been avoided.

From the president, American Meteorological Society, 3 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.:

It is most encouraging to learn that some of our Representatives in Congress realize that the weather service in this country deserves more, not less, support. In the long run such support will, I feel sure, result in a net savings to the taxpayers through a more efficient weather service.

I believe the records will show that for last season, involving only hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, insurance companies paid some $276 million in claims (New York Times of December 26, 1954).

I know there must have been many additional millions of dollars spent by individuals which do not appear on the record since several members of my own family in Rhode Island suffered uninsured damage as a result of last season's storms.

Thus, it seems to me that the expenditure of $5 million to improve the storm warning service for the protection of our citizens is a very modest outlay to accomplish the desired objectives.

We in the American Meteorological Society have for some time been concerned about the problem of severe storms of all types. The council of the American Meteorological Society recently voted that the council recognize deficiencies in the state of our knowledge of severe storms, particularly tornadoes and hurricanes. We strongly endorse an increased research effort in this area.

In view of the great losses of life and property suffered by our citizens from the destructive action of tornadoes and hurricanes, the American Meteorological Society recommends that special funds be appropriated to enable the United States Weather Bureau, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research projects on tornadoes and on hurricanes.

From the head of the meteorology department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge 39, Mass.:

I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this important matter which affects the life and property of so many persons on the eastern and gulf coasts of this country.

You are to be commended for your active interest in these problems and for your realization that the Weather Bureau must have additional funds if real progress is to be achieved.

From the editor of Motor Boating magazine, 572 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.:

We are much interested in your bill, which we hope will receive favorable action by Congress.

From the executive vice president of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

It is known that the various hurricanes which have visited the northeast section of our country have done a great deal of damage to property insured by our members. Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, last fall, were particularly devastating.

The advance warning of approaching storms should give more opportunity for protection of property, and for possibilities of moving such property to safer locations. Accordingly, the marine insurance underwriters are definitely interested in any provisions and actions leading to adequate and timely warnings of hurricanes and severe windstorms.

We wish to express our appreciation of your foresight in presenting this legislation.

From the general manager of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

Surely, the Weather Bureau services are invaluable to the people of this country. If additional funds are needed in order to make the Bureau more useful, such funds should be made available within proper limits.

We appreciate fully the great damage which many of us suffered at the hands of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel.

From the executive vice president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.:

May I commend your alertness in watching out for the interest of southern New England in this peculiar climatic change which we are undergoing.

From the general manager of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.:

We have on many occasions suffered losses from hurricanes and we would like very much to have the Gulf of Mexico coast included in H. R. 5260.

In addition to the above letters, I have received dozens of letters from Representatives, Senators, and governors of States along the east coast and bordering the Gulf of Mexico who have warmly endorsed my bill, H. R. 5260. They have not only written to me expressing their vital interest in the passage of this bill, but have frequently telephoned with offers of their support.

I also have received numerous letters from private citizens who are not connected with any particular company or organization, but who have wished me well in my efforts to secure congressional support for increased protection against the loss of life and property from hurricanes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on that bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) was given permission to address the House 1 hour on Friday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted.

INQUIRIES RELATING TO HOUSING

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 203, Rept. No. 621), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (2) the rate of default and foreclosures of Government-insured mortgages, and the disposition of such properties, (3) the refinancing and extension of Government-insured project mortgages, (4) the status and adequacy of the several Government mortgage insurance funds, (5) the disposition of Government-owned war and related housing, (6) operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (7) the operation and activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

INQUIRIES RELATING TO FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 210, Rept. No. 622), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters concerning (1) the composition, operation, and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee, (2) the fluctuation in rates of interest and prices of securities issued by the United States and the effect of such fluctuations on the public debt, general price level, employment, the cost of State and municipal financing, and other segments of the national economy, (3) the various types of Government securities, manner of issue, method of payment, maturities, character of investors, and amount and degree of speculation therein, and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county, and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof) highway and school programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under active investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "and."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "directed."

Page 2, beginning on line 2, change the comma to a period, and strike out the following language ending on line 5: "and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof) highway and school programs."

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 251, Rept. No. 623), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HURRICANE WARNINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to ask the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] about his bill with regard to warnings of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other unusual acts of nature.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentlewoman will yield, I do not see the gentleman from Connecticut here at the moment, but I understand that the need to which his bill refers was taken care of by the Fogarty amendment to the appropriations bill that was just passed a few moments ago.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, but that did not appropriate nearly as much money as the gentleman from Connecticut asked for. I have seen editorial after editorial all over the New England States and elsewhere endorsing his bill. I have read hundreds of letters and telegrams about it. An editorial in the Lowell Sun, Lowell, Mass., of May 12, 1955, reads as follows:

HURRICANE ALERTS

Since there is reason to believe that New England may now be directly in the course of some hurricanes that churn up the coastline from the Caribbean, it would be stupid to wait for the howling winds before doing something about it.

The question was scouted thoroughly this week at a meeting of the New England Region, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in Boston. It was practically a unanimous opinion that steps must be taken to protect this area against new storms—which may or may not arrive in the latter part of the coming summer.

The general opinion expressed at this Boston meeting is one that will be promptly applauded by the people of New England. It was proposed the Army engineers should make an immediate survey "for the most effective protection against damage from tidal flooding in New England." Moreover, it was proposed that the Federal Government should exert itself in more ways than one to launch a campaign that would give extraordinary protection against the fury of hurricanes.

The conference apparently forgot (at least, it was not reported), that the Federal Government and all military bases in this area should step up their meteorological efficiency so that all the people of New England would have a fair idea of what might be in store for them when one of those turbulent twisters is spotted off Florida, moving north.

New England suffered two major hurricanes late last summer—and it was threatened with a third. The first and worst big blow struck and caught the whole section by surprise, simply because satisfactory and sufficient warnings were missing.

We hope the Government will see to it that all stations responsible for alerting the people to approaching danger are functioning around the clock at all times and will be in position to send out the alarm to New England well before a hurricane strikes.

In the second hurricane we had in New England, Hurricane Hazel, I bailed water from an upstairs room in my house from 12 o'clock noon until 7 o'clock at night. I would not have been at my house to bail out the water if I had not received the warning that the hurricane was coming.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I commend the charming and distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her remarks. I was on a railroad train during Hurricane Hazel, and I fully appreciate what the gentlewoman is talking about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. May I say also that at least part of the house I was in would probably have been destroyed if the hurricane had lasted any longer. I know my sufferings were absolutely nothing compared to what happened to other people, but the damage to property was great. I think every one of us in all of the hurricane areas would like to have something done about this matter. I believe the Department of Commerce recommended $5 million for the Weather Bureau for reports. After the tornado at Worcester I asked for various surveys and investigations but they did not take place.

These hurricanes are horrible things. There was much loss of life in Rhode Island during these hurricanes in New England, and a great deal of loss of life in Worcester, Mass., after the tornado there. I visited Worcester and saw the damage. I think there was a wonderful spirit in these communities that were damaged. They certainly ought to be helped in every way. The military was very helpful in Massachusetts in sending troops to remove trees that had live wires in them.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I compliment the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on her interest in this subject matter. I know she has been one of the prime movers since last fall when we were visited by those hurricanes in New England. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON] requested an appropriation of $5 million to help do something in the way of these weather stations, but in the appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce as it was passed today at least the committee compromised that request by adding the sum of $2,250,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is not nearly enough.

I know all of the New England Members and other Members of the New York delegation have fought very hard for this. I think the other body may put it in, and I will do everything I can to help. I know you and I talked about the damage of the hurricanes. It is appalling to my mind that we do not take care of the civilians and the military, too, because some of them were injured in the hurricanes. It is little enough to do for the people in our country. We try to save them from war and certainly we ought to protect them from so-called acts of God.

THE LATE HONORABLE PETE JARMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that some of our colleagues, especially our Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and our former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], could pay tribute to our wonderful friend, Pete Jarman.

I yield at this time to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend, FRANK BOYKIN, and the Alabama delegation, in paying tribute to Pete Jarman, soldier, legislator, and diplomat. He served his country with distinction and great ability.

Following a fine military career he served 12 years as a Member of Congress. He was faithful to the best interests of his district and at the same time zealously fought for the welfare of the country. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he was conscious of the need of world cooperation. It was from this service he was aroused to our relationship with other countries. This caused him to accept an appointment as Ambassador to Australia, where he served most creditably.

Pete Jarman was a friendly, likeable man, and his death is the cause of much sorrow. Alabama and the country have suffered a great loss in the passing of this fine American statesman.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I attended the funeral services for our late friend, and also spoke on the floor of the House later. Pete Jarman was one of the most lovable characters I have ever served with, and one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives. I join with my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in expressing our keen regret at his recent passing. It was shortly after that I spoke at greater length, more fully expressing my feelings on the passing of our late friend.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in paying tribute to the fine record of our late friend and colleague, Pete Jarman. It was my privilege to know Pete quite well during his years of service in the Congress. He was possessed of a keen sense of humor and he also took his job most seriously. In saying that, I mean he tried in every way to live up to the high ideals that representation in the Congress of the United States carries not only for the people he represented, but for the position itself. It was my observation that nobody did a better job of work for his constituents and for the country at all times trying to carry on the splendid traditions of the people from whom he came. I have truly missed Pete Jarman in the years since he left the Congress, but during that time we followed his work and came to appreciate and look forward to his visits with us. Now I know that America is poorer because of the passing of this fine American and this splendid Congressman.

Mr. BOYKIN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I knew Pete Jarman for a quarter of a century. I do not think I ever knew a finer American or a greater Christian gentleman than Pete. When I was first elected to the Congress, I was serving in the Navy at Pearl Harbor.

The first letter that I received after having been nominated in Alabama to represent the Third District was from my friend Pete Jarman, offering to help me in any way he could.

On coming to Washington I found that Pete was sincere, and he was a great help to me as a young Member. Pete served his State and his Nation well. I think the first office that he held was that of public examiner for the State of Alabama. As examiner of public accounts, he traveled all over the State of Alabama and made friends. To know Pete Jarman was to love him. Later he was elected State Commander of the American Legion. And then he was elected overwhelmingly to the office of secretary of state in Alabama. Following a distinguished service in that office, he was elected to Congress from the Sixth District.

Pete Jarman was sincere and able, and over the period of 10 years that I knew him in Congress, he was an outstanding Member. He was an expert in his chosen field of foreign affairs. He had a keen sense of humor, and it was a genuine pleasure at all times for me to be with him.

Pete Jarman possessed what I think are three necessary characteristics for a good public official to have. First and foremost he was an honest man. He was a man of integrity. Second, he was an able man. Third, he was a courageous man. Many times I have seen him vote against the majority of the Members of his own delegation on certain matters because he had the courage of his convictions.

I have missed Pete and always will miss him. I think one of the finest things that could be said about Pete was his unfailing devotion to his lovely wife, Beryl. At the time I knew him in Congress Beryl served very efficiently in his office. I have never seen a more beautiful relationship between husband and wife than that which existed between him and Beryl. I knew that her loss was great. I hope that she finds some comfort in the knowliedge that those of us who knew Pete Jarman, who knew and worked with him, and who loved him, feel some of the loss that must be hers.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise that in the rush of our everyday life we pause to pay a well-earned tribute to a former Member of this body. Of course I speak of our late beloved departed friend, a former Member of this

body, Pete Jarman, who represented so ably the Sixth District of Alabama for many years.

Prior to my coming to Congress, I had known Pete for many years. I had served with him when he was State department commander of the American Legion, and also when he was examiner of public accounts. Later he was elected as secretary of state of Alabama, and served in that office with credit and distinction to himself and to his friends, until some years later when he was elected to Congress.

It seems that I can see Pete's smiling bright face now coming down this aisle. I do not think Pete hated anybody; he loved his fellow man. He not only loved America, but Pete loved the world and I think he as much as any man worked as hard as a person could work on the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and when we had Pan-American Day here he always took the leadership in celebrating that great day.

Our colleague from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] has referred to Pete's helpmate, Beryl Jarman, who, I think, had much to do with Pete's success in life. She also served as his secretary.

After Pete left Congress he was appointed by President Truman as Ambassador to Australia. He served there with honor and distinction. And, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I know that in his immortal soul, Pete Jarman now sleeping over the banks of the Potomac in Arlington secretly watches our every move here and he watches our movements as representatives of one of greatest bodies in the world.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT] and now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, [Mr. HAYS]. I would like him to say a few words about our departed friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the generosity of my friend from Alabama in according me the opportunity to join my friends from Alabama in paying tribute to this great American.

It was my privilege during the thirties when I was employed by the Department of Agriculture, to go into the State of Alabama and into the district served by our late respected colleague. I had an opportunity to learn something of the great affection which the people of Alabama had for him.

I later had an opportunity as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to appraise his work as a student of foreign-policy problems, and I want to join in tribute to him as a leader in that field. I know that he made great contribution to the cooperation between the Latin-American republics and our own Nation, and I know that he had great influence in this field.

I also wish to join, Mr. Speaker, in the tributes to his wife. I was deeply impressed by the beautiful companionship which they enjoyed, and I am sure the Members have an appreciation of her contribution to his service here.

He was ideally fitted for the post of Ambassador to Australia. I have heard from many quarters of the globe statements of appreciation of his work as the representative of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in appreciation of Pete Jarman's outstanding career.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. BOYKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] is rendering a distinct service to his State and to the Congress in giving those of us from other States the opportunity to express our deep appreciation of our late friend, Pete Jarman.

I would not say that I speak for North Carolina, but I am sure that every member of the North Carolina delegation joins with the gentleman now giving us the opportunity to express our high appreciation of this late friend, their deep appreciation of Pete Jarman.

I simply say that I join with his colleagues from Alabama in expressing our great admiration and that I would express to his relatives that I join with them in the great loss they feel.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death of Pete Jarman brought to an end the career of one of Alabama's most outstanding and distinguished sons. His record of public service and his many accomplishment are a source of pride to the people of his State and especially of the Sixth District which he served so long and so well.

It was my privilege to know Pete Jarman well and to admire and respect his sincerity of purpose and the greatness of his character. Pete was already an experienced legislator when I came to Congress, and I shall ever be grateful for his kindness to me and the help and guidance he so willingly and generously offered.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Pete Jarman played a leading role in formulating legislation necessary to carry out the foreign policies of our Nation. He was diligent in his committee work and no man gave more time, thought and study to committee legislation than Pete. He was respected for his thorough and complete knowledge of committee affairs.

This outstanding record of achievement and devotion to duty won for Pete the important appointment as Ambassador to Australia. This post he filled admirably. In fact, it has been said by those who visited in Australia during his tenure that no Ambassador has ever been so well liked or so respected as Pete Jarman. He won scores of friends for our country, and he enjoyed a popularity that was unequaled in diplomatic circles.

True to his State and to the best traditions of our Republic, Pete Jarman met every test as a public servant. Alabama will long honor the distinguished service her loyal and faithful son gave. I salute his memory and shall ever cherish his friendship.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS.]

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to join in this tribute to the late Pete Jarman. I was not privileged to serve in Congress with Pete Jarman, but I did know him intimately. I believe the first time I ever saw Pete was when he was making his race for the office of secretary of state. He won approval at the hands of the voters of Alabama and served honorably and well in that capacity. Prior to that time he had served as commander of the American Legion of the Department of Alabama. He was always interested and battled for the servicemen of this country and made a great contribution in that field.

As has been said here, he served a long term in this body, a body that he loved and was devoted to.

Pete Jarman was the first Ambassador produced by the State of Alabama. Prior to that time we had produced a Minister to Spain, Dr. J. L. M. Curry, but Pete Jarman had the distinction of being the first with the rank of Ambassador who came from and was a native of the State of Alabama. He made many friends for us in Australia because he had been well trained in the principles of diplomacy at high levels and made a great contribution in that field.

He came back to this country I believe in 1952 and frequently visited the Members on the floor here. He had many friends not only in the Alabama delegation but in the delegations of other States as well.

I think Pete's life epitomized the wisdom of what Henry Van Dyke said about the way a man should live. He said that "four things a man must do if he would make his record true. To think without confusion clearly, to act from honest motives purely, to love his fellow man sincerely, to trust in God and Heaven securely."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in this tribute, and my heartfelt and deepest sympathies go to his wife and to the members of his family.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jarman and his lovely wife were great friends of mine. I had a very deep affection for him and his wife. I always think of them as one, because they worked as one. Everybody who has spoken has mentioned the fact that they were a wonderful couple. I certainly never knew a couple that was more lovable or did more kind things. I served with him on several committees. The most recent one was the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was extremely able while he was there and extremely gracious. I would like to speak of one incident that, I think, typifies the man's courtesy and helpfulness. He and I were on a national radio broadcast hook-up. It was a very controversial subject, and I remember his extreme courtesy at that time. But, he made his point very effectively and very courteously. I think

perhaps I was a little too vigorous. After that the people in Massachusetts and elsewhere wrote me what a wonderful, fine, and able gentleman Congressman Jarman was. They spoke of his great courtesy at that time. I know what an extremely able Ambassador he was, and I know of the constant letters he wrote to me and other Members of the Congress asking us to visit Australia and wishing us well and asking how he could help. The Nation can ill spare such a man. I mourn with his wife especially and with all of you very fine gentlemen from Alabama. There is no finer delegation in the Congress than you are, and I mourn with you in his passing. You may well be proud of him, and I know his memory will not be forgotten.

Mr. BOYKIN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this time like to read a letter from the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House. He is unavoidably detained, so he wrote me this letter:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1955.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I have your letter of April 21, 1955, regarding Pete Jarman, and I want to make the following statement, which I would like to have put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"I am deeply grieved to hear of the death of my old friend, the Honorable Pete Jarman. It was my pleasure and privilege to serve in Congress with him for many years, in which position I found him faithful, patriotic, and able. After he left Congress, he did a great service as our Ambassador to Australia. In every position in which Pete Jarman was put, he did a good, honest, capable job. With his loved ones, I shall miss him very much. To his wife, who was his loyal helpmate, I tender my deepest sympathy."

With every good wish to you and thanking you for the opportunity of joining in tribute to Pete Jarman, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAM RAYBURN.

I think that is wonderful, and I appreciate the statement made by Speaker RAYBURN. Here are two of the greatest men in the land paying tribute to our departed colleague, former Speaker MARTIN and the present Speaker of the House. Those two men would have been President of the United States had anything happened to the Vice President during the last few years. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was Speaker for two full terms, and I served under him. The present Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], has been Speaker longer than any man who ever served in the Congress of the United States, even longer than Henry Clay. It is wonderful to have my two beloved friends talk about this great man, Pete Jarman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of Hon. James G. Fulton on the late Pete Jarman.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

REMARKS BY HON. JAMES G. FULTON

Mr. Speaker, we on the House Foreign Affairs Committee have served on the committee with Pete Jarman during his service in Congress, and it was a real pleasure to have Pete as a personal friend. Friendly, and with a quick smile, Pete Jarman was always loyal to his friends and to his congressional responsibilities.

We friends on the committee were especially pleased when Pete Jarman was appointed as United States Ambassador to Australia, for the recognition given by the President to the committee, and as a special tribute and honor to Pete Jarman as a former Member. During Pete's service as Ambassador, he took the time to keep up his correspondence and contacts with many of us, so we know directly with what care he handled his duties, and how closely he followed events in our friendly ally, the Great Dominion of Australia, during his period of service there.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield to the gentleman who now represents the district once represented by Pete Jarman. He comes from one of the greatest districts in the Nation. We have had some of the greatest men on earth come from that district. I want to mention just one of them. He was Richmond Pearson Hobson who sank the *Merrimac* and won the war against Spain. At that time we first came to the world's attention as a great and powerful Nation. Hobson served in the Congress of the United States from this same great district. I yield at this time to Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama's Sixth Congressional District.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep respect and great admiration for the late Pete Jarman.

His career in the government of his State and Nation has placed him high on the list of outstanding Alabamians.

After serving a term as Alabama's secretary of state, Pete Jarman was elected in 1936 to represent the Sixth District of Alabama in the United States House of Representatives. He served with distinction in this great body for six consecutive terms.

In 1949 Pete Jarman was appointed Ambassador to Australia. Although there have been a number of men from Alabama who have served in high diplomatic posts, Mr. Jarman was the only Alabamian who ever actually held the rank of Ambassador. After 4 years of outstanding service in Australia, Ambassador Jarman returned to Washington during the summer of 1953. He was living here in Washington at the time of his sudden death last February.

Although I did not serve with Pete Jarman as did others who speak here today, I knew him as a friend for many years. Our friendship became even closer after I was elected to Congress and he returned from Australia. During the year preceding his death, he visited my office on numerous occasions and we had many pleasant conversations. Our talks often reminded us that we were both born in Greensboro, Ala., received degrees from the University of Alabama, and were members of Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity. The district that he so faithfully served for 12 years I now have the privilege to represent. One of the last communications I received from Pete Jarman was a card expressing pleasure that I had been assigned to the Foreign Affairs Committee. He had been a diligent and able member of that committee until his retirement from Congress.

Pete Jarman was a man whose gentle manner and gracious personality won friends wherever he went.

Here was a man whose heart was good,
Who walked with men and understood.
His was a voice that spoke to cheer,
And fell like music to the ear.
His was a smile men loved to see,
His was a hand that asked no fee
For friendliness or kindness done.
And now that he has journeyed on,
His is a fame that never ends
And leaves behind uncounted friends.

Pete Jarman's passing is an irreplaceable loss to his gracious and lovely widow, Beryl Bricken Jarman, who stood so faithfully at his side throughout their married life. It is a great loss to those of us who knew him as a friend. It is an even greater loss to Alabama and the Nation.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read a statement from the senior Senator from Alabama, Senator LISTER HILL:

REMARKS OF LISTER HILL, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ALABAMA, ON THE LATE PETE JARMAN

It was with sad hearts that we laid Pete Jarman to rest in historic Arlington Cemetery. It is fitting that he should sleep there, where rest so many of the Nation's heroes who served our country so nobly and so well.

Pete Jarman spent his life in the service of his people, his State, and his country. He made his way up in public service to become secretary of state of Alabama, Member of Congress for 12 years, and United States Ambassador to Australia. In every position he demonstrated his exceptional ability, his high character, his steadfast faith, and his unswerving devotion to his country and its ideals of freedom, justice, and democracy.

As a soldier in the American Army in France in World War I, he saw at first hand the destruction and horrors of war. He sought membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, that he might give his best to the building of peace for ourselves and for all nations. As a member of the committee, he traveled to many countries seeking the answers to the problems of peace. He was dedicated to the great cause.

Pete Jarman and I were schoolmates at the University of Alabama, comrades in the American Legion, colleagues, neighbors, and friends. I know how fine he was and how today he would wish me to add my tribute to her who was his kindest critic, his wisest counselor, his best friend, his devoted wife, Beryl Bricken Jarman. Alabama is proud to have given to the Nation the stalwart patriot, the distinguished statesman, the devoted public servant, and the fine American, Pete Jarman.

At this time I should like to read the remarks of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina. We call him "Dick," as you know:

REMARKS BY HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

Mr. Speaker, may I say a few words of tribute to the life and works of a distinguished public servant.

Pete Jarman's life was a full and unselfish one, dedicated to the service of his fellowman and of his country. I came to know him well during his service in this House from the 75th through the 80th Congress.

He served as chairman of the House Committee on Printing from the 76th through the 79th Congress. During his first term, he served as chairman of the Committee on Memorials, and also on the Committees on Irrigation and Reclamation, and World War Veterans' Legislation. From the 76th through the 80th Congress we served together on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His diligence, energy, courage, and keen mind quickly won for him a position of great respect on the Foreign Affairs Committee, which was his primary committee interest. Later on, he served as United States Ambassador to Australia from June 9, 1949, until his resignation on September 17, 1953. During this period, he rendered distinguished service, and his ability and great understanding won for the United States many Australian friends and brought about an increased understanding of our mutual problems.

Pete Jarman's kindness, friendliness, energy, and unselfish dedication to duty will long stand as a monument to a colleague and friend who knew so well the meaning of life and its significant opportunity for devotion and service.

Truly, our friend's life has enriched and ennobled the lives of all who were fortunate to have known him. May he rest in the heavenly peace he so richly deserves. May a kind providence dry away the tears of the fine and faithful wife who survives him.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked you for 1 hour for our friends and colleagues to pay tribute to a great man, a great soldier, a great statesman, and one of the most wonderful friends a man ever had on this earth, the Honorable Pete Jarman, of Alabama.

Pete Jarman had a full life. He worked—he worked for his district, he worked for his State, he worked for his beloved Southland, he worked for his Nation, and he worked for the entire world. Pete Jarman had a brilliant Army career; then he served in the Congress of the United States 12 long years—6 terms—representing the Sixth District of Alabama. Then he was appointed as Ambassador of the United States to one of the greatest countries in the world—Australia. Australia is as large, or larger than our great country, the United States, and this soldier, this statesman was selected by the State Department and the President of the United States, and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, to serve there as our great Ambassador; and what a wonderful job that he and his precious wife, Mrs. Beryl Bricken Jarman, did there in representing this Nation. I have had letters from Australia and from many places all over the world about the wonderful way they handled this, one of the highest positions in the land. They served well; they served with dignity; they served with loyalty; and they did a lot of good. They will always be remembered—both of them—not only Pete Jarman, but Lady Jarman, as we always called her.

This great man was in my office for 2 hours just 4 days before he went to his reward. He looked so well; he had just been down in Florida, playing on the beaches and getting ready to do more deeds of good—the same as he had been doing all of his life. He was stricken early one morning, and when his wife telephoned our good friend, Congressman GEORGE GRANT, who in turn telephoned ARMISTEAD SELDEN and me, we at once went out to the hospital. He died very quietly and went away to his reward. You cannot do anything for loved ones after they have gone, but you can do this—you can help do something, if the opportunity arises, for the loved ones they leave behind, and he left a wonderful person—one of the most marvelous women I have ever known. My wife and I, my office force, and my entire family love her very, very dearly. Everybody seems to love and respect this great woman, and I will just have to say a word about something that happened in Pete's passing that impressed me very much. There is another great and outstanding and successful woman that is really a very unusual woman in so many ways. She has raised a fine family and has been very successful in that, and she is one of the partners in one of the great businesses of our beloved Southland. I am speaking of Mrs. Mildred Warner.

When the Alabama delegation, headed by Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, went out to the beautiful old Lee estate; that is, the Arlington Cemetery, there Mrs. Warner stood, to be with her beloved friend, Beryl Jarman, to help and comfort her—she and many others flew many, many miles—over a thousand miles—to be here with this wonderful woman. I thought that was one of the finest things I have ever heard of anyone doing. Of course, many people do this, but in these busy times it does not happen as often as it used to. I just wanted to mention this as I go along.

There is one thing that I want to say. I believe every man and every woman here in the Congress of the United States loved and respected not only Pete Jarman, but also Mrs. Pete Jarman.

Pete Jarman was one of the best loved men in the Congress of the United States, and we have here 435 Representatives from every district in this entire Nation and representing every human being in the United States. I know that our great Alabama delegation will tell you there never has been, and in my judgment, there never will be another man that did better work and was more loved and respected than our own wonderful, good and beloved Pete Jarman.

At this time I wish to include a statement by our junior Senator, Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, another great man, whom our Democratic Party chose as our candidate for Vice President of the United States in our last election. He, like our senior Senator, has made a great record.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN

Pete Jarman was a great Alabamian, a patriotic American, and my friend.

It was my pleasure to know him well and to work with him in the House of Representatives for many years. In fact, Pete and I came to Congress together. He had the rare distinction of being designated chairman of the Standing Committee on Memorials during his first term in Congress.

He always placed duty above selfish gains and the welfare of his country above personal motives.

Pete met you with a smile and a friendly word of greeting. Never have I known a more sincere and conscientious man—nor one more devoted to public service. Your problem was Pete's problem—he stood ready always to lend a hand to a friend. Pete had the personal touch.

After serving in Congress, he was Ambassador to Australia. He was respected and loved by the people of Australia as he was by his fellow countrymen. In my opinion, Australia came to think even more highly of our country because of the fine job performed by Ambassador Jarman.

Pete Jarman had many friends all over Alabama. Prior to his election to Congress he was active in State government and in this capacity traveled widely over the State making friends wherever he went. He served as secretary of state and as a member of the State Democratic executive committee.

Pete Jarman was a soldier. He was active throughout his life in military affairs and attained the rank of colonel. In World War I he was wounded in battle.

The veterans of this country have lost a real friend. I personally know of many veterans he helped. In addition, he was active in veterans organizations, at one time serving as commander of the Alabama department of the American Legion. He also was active in the work of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was a statesman and a diplomat.

Pete was truly a Christian gentleman and active in the Methodist Church.

Alabamians and others who knew Pete Jarman mourn in his passing. We grieve with his dear wife, Beryl, and we know that her loss is easier to bear because of the generosity, the loyalty, and the acts of kindness displayed by her husband and my friend, Pete Jarman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Pete Jarman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this privilege of joining with my colleagues to pay honor to the outstanding public service of Pete Jarman, our departed friend.

Pete Jarman was active in the political life of Alabama, and of the Nation, for a period of 30 years.

In the Congress of the United States, he carved out a great career for himself, and a great record for Alabama.

His understanding of the Nation's problems in the field of our foreign affairs was deep. His contributions to the solution to those problems stand today in silhouette against the times in which we live. They speak for themselves.

As a climax to his career, he served as our Ambassador to Australia.

Pete Jarman was a man of high ideals. He was a man of great principle. He was a hard worker. He was faithful to the trusts reposed in him.

Pete Jarman is survived by his lovely wife, Beryl, who in life shared his joys and his heartaches. I leave with her this thought:

Death is only a quiet door
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond the light lies still;
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart
Nothing to hurt at all
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] who was previously granted permission to include in her remarks on the Commerce appropriation bill certain letters and a press release that the matter indicated on the second page of the press release in tabular form may be printed in tabular form in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have permission until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 3822.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, is there any opposition to that bill that will require a minority report?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I regret that I cannot inform the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman include in his request that the minority may have the same privilege?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. I will be glad to include that in my request, that the minority be granted permission to file a minority report if so desired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be inserted following the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] regarding the Weather Bureau, during the debate on the appropriations bill this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ (at the request of Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today on Commerce Department appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an address.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter which will exceed the amount allowed and is estimated to cost $640.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for several days, on account of death in family.

Mr. ALLEN of California, for the period from May 25 to June 2, 1955, inclusive, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; and

H. R. 3322. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public health purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 23, 1955, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4876. An act 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

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

833. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

834. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board and the Atomic Energy Commission"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

835. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, pursuant to Public Law 276, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

836. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 244. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4802. A bill to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land; without amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5597. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national-park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6410. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all

other work incidental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area; with amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 232. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial gift from the Government of Venezuela; without amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to housing; with amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee, and other matters; with amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 251. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3990, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6382. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3822. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by striking out the termination date; with amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 6424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6425. A bill to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the trade-in of old vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 6426. A bill to protect the public health by providing for grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 6427. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 6428. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that awards of pensions made under part III shall not be discontinued solely by reason of an increase in the annual income of any beneficiary of such pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6429. A bill to amend paragraph I of Veterans Regulation No. 3 (a), as amended, to provide that in the application of any schedule for rating disabilities no differentiation shall be made between disabilities which are organic in nature and those which are functional in nature; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6430. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made from the benefits of certain widows having dependent children in their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6431. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer for himself and his spouse, and the additional exemptions for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000, and to increase the exemption for a dependent from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6432. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 6433. A bill to provide for the national defense by encouraging the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6434. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in planning and financing the construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6435. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Fire Research Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6436. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 6437. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6439. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the various States with respect to civil causes of action and criminal offenses committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6440. A bill to appropriate $40,000 for the restoration of a navigable channel 10 feet deep in Bayou Bonfouca, La.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 6441. A bill to provide that a levee shall be constructed and maintained by the United States along the north shore of Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 6442. A bill to exempt from duty under paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 certain crawler-type diesel tractors imported into Puerto Rico for agricultural use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6443. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt transportation by air taxi from the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 6445. A bill to provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo., the first national monument, established by the President of the United States pursuant to the Antiquities Act of 1906; to authorize the addition of certain land to the monument, to permit land exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6446. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics", to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 6447. A bill to provide that where a veteran has been totally disabled or permanently and totally disabled for 20 or more years, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall not thereafter reduce the veteran's rating of total disability or permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6448. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6449. A bill to erect in Bossier City, La., a Federal and post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 6450. A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in 1955 in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects

of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to study aspects of the common system of air navigation in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution to request the President to review the functions of the various agencies of the Government concerned with air navigation, to report the results thereof to Congress, and, if justified, to submit a reorganization plan with respect thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the necessary legislation and regulations to achieve an improvement in the quality of product offered for sale in foreign markets by raising the standards, and lowering the tolerances for foreign material, damaged grain and mixed varieties, and to tighten inspection procedures in the case of export shipments to insure that wheat moved on a grade basis actually meets the official requirements for the grade assigned to it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 6451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Behar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of William H. Foley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ines Meneghetti Tatko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

287. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Donald S. McCall, Jr., and others, Henderson State College, Arkadelphia, Ark., urging approval of Senate bill 533, which would increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

288. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Margaret Burnop, president, Ladies Auxiliary, No. 45, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, Naugatuck, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the minimum wage be increased to $1.25 per hour, etc.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Hon. Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before the 20th Annual Meeting of the Delta Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address delivered by our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] before the 20th annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., on May 12, 1955.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE 20TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE DELTA COUNCIL, CLEVELAND, MISS., MAY 12, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, I was highly pleased and greatly flattered when I received an invitation to address your annual meeting. It is always good for those of us who believe in farming as both a way of life and as the touchstone of our Nation's economy to meet, to exchange ideas, and to compare our experiences. I do not propose to exhaust your patience with a long speech today. I realize that most of you probably know more about the practical side of farming than I, for it has been much too long since I followed behind a plow and watched the shining steel cut into the rich soil of my own State.

I will attempt to review briefly with you today some of the factors which have made the great Mississippi Delta the thriving agricultural area which we know today. I would also like to share my thoughts with you as to what our agriculture must do in order to continue to flourish—in order to remain strong to meet future demands.

My philosophy, both as a farmer and as a United States Senator, is a simple philosophy. I like to treat it and regard it as basic. It is this: "A sound agriculture is the greatest single bulwark our Nation has against the tide of 'isms' which are lapping at our shores."

It has therefore given me considerable pain to note that selfish interests and unscrupulous politicians have sought to pin the red tag of socialism on our agriculture, on our price support program, and even on our individual farmers. Unfortunately, their efforts, aided and abetted by the trumpeting of nationwide propaganda devices, have gone far towards blackening the good name of American agriculture.

It is high time that these people, as well as the millions of men and women who are supported by the products of our soil, realized that the tar brush they have wielded is blackening our greatest single hope for the future.

By 1975, our Nation shall number its inhabitants not in the one-hundred-and odd millions, but in the two-hundred-and-odd millions. We shall have more mouths to feed, more bodies to clothe, than we ever dreamed of having only a decade ago. At the same time, we are going to have to produce the extra food and fiber required to meet these demands on even fewer acres of land than we now have. We will be compelled to use every form of American ingenuity in coaxing from our dwindling stock of precious soil the cotton, the corn, the wheat, the vegetables and the hundreds of other commodities our population will need in order to eat as well in 1975 as we did in 1950 or even now.

To meet this task, our agriculture must remain strong. It must prosper. It must be made attractive.

As I stand before you today, I cannot honestly report that we are building the strength that we shall so urgently require in the years to come. On the contrary, American agriculture is bleeding to death. Farm income is falling. The waters of the great river which flow past our doorstep continue to carry down to the gulf 2 million tons of precious, irreplaceable topsoil every day. That is 730 million tons of soil a year; put another way, enough topsoil to cover a 40-acre farm to the depth of 6 inches is dumped into the Gulf of Mexico every 3 minutes.

And besides the Mississippi River, other great rivers—the Colorado and the Columbia—are doing their share in washing away the very source of agricultural abundance for generations as yet unborn.

Make note of this waste, ladies and gentlemen, for it is problem No. 1 on our agricultural agenda.

Problem No. 2 is somewhat less tangible—but of infinitely great importance. That problem is the economic health of our American agriculture—of the men and women who till our soil.

Just a month ago, the Department of Agriculture reported that farm income has fallen 10 percent below last year. This downward spiral has not stopped, contrary to what the bright-eyed economists who sit behind the mahogany desks in Washington may

say. Every day, more and more of our American small farmers take a look at their dwindling income and decide to abandon farming and seek employment in the city. Only 30 years ago, 1 out of every 8 Americans lived on a farm; today, 1 American out of every 19 lives on a farm.

This mass exodus from the farm has been caused primarily by declining prices and spiraling operating costs. In 1949, nearly 43 percent of our total gross farm income was retained in the form of profits; in 1954, only 37 percent of our farm income went into the farmer's pockets. In 1951, the average net income of our farm family workers was $2,120; in 1954 this had dropped to only a little more than $1,900. President Eisenhower reported to the Congress only a month ago that over a million and a half American farmers have cash incomes of under $1,000. During this same period, corporate profits increased. The wages and salaries paid to nonfarm workers skyrocketed from a total of $195 billion in 1952 to $207 billion in 1954. At the same time, farm income fell from $14 billion to $12 billion.

In the face of this disastrous trend, the Congress last year was presented with a most unattractive farm program—the so-called sliding scale, or flexible price support program. The objective of that program, as announced by President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, was to achieve for our farmers "full parity in the market place." That laudable goal would be attained by discouraging production to the point where supply and demand would come into balance. Coupled with this laudable objective, however, came the most abusive description of the American farmer I have ever witnessed. The Secretary of Agriculture left no stone unturned in blackening our farmers and our farm program. The Senate Agriculture Committee, the Congress, the Nation as a whole was deluged with totally misleading estimates of what our farm price support program cost our Government. Our farmers were pictured as regimented robots, feeding at the Government trough and looking for their sustenance in the pockets of the American taxpayer. Never before had there been such a concentrated effort by so few to hurt so many, so much.

The Secretary of Agriculture himself told the Senate Agriculture Committee that our farm program had cost the American people since 1932 a grand total of $16 billion. Since the occasion of the Secretary's appearance before the committee was to present testimony on the price support program, the impression was left that price supports alone had cost our Government $16 billion. Many newspapers carried stories to that effect.

Secretary Benson could have determined the true facts; he could have stated specifically what the price support program had actually cost instead of presenting a "loaded" table to the committee. The Commodity Credit Corporation records plainly showed that the total cost of the price support program was not $16 billion, but only a little more than $1 billion over a 20-year-period—and that $1 billion covered losses on all commodities, including losses on milk, honey, and—last but not least—the potato program which accounted for almost 50 percent of the total loss. As for the basics, well, the total cost of price support operations for the basics had been only $21 million—or something more than $1 million a year. Under these circumstances, I was led to only one conclusion—that the Secretary of Agriculture was "out to get" our price support program.

But agriculture should not have to stand alone, and it does not stand alone, in receiving benefits from our Government. American business gets its share. According to figures in my files, our American businessmen have received nearly $26 billion in rapid tax amortization benefits since 1951. Yet, there has been no great hue and cry arising about this program. Only the farmers have been treated with scorn. Labor has its minimum wage, a floor placed on wages and, indirectly, a floor beneath prices charged for manufactured goods. There has been no cry for repeal of the minimum wage; to the contrary, the President has only recently recommended that the minimum wage be increased to 90 cents an hour. No one will argue that should wages be increased, the farmers income will not be affected. Only the farmer has his "minimum wage" program whittled away.

Ladies and gentlemen, we shall never build a sound agriculture, an agriculture able to meet the food and fiber demands tomorrow will bring, by laying the economic foundations of this great industry on the shifting sands of insidious propaganda and flexible price supports.

In the South, our agriculture is comprised of many small farmers. We shall not attain assurance of agricultural abundance by concentrating our lifeblood—food and fiber—in the hands of too few farmers. The gamble is too great.

This, then, is problem No. 2. We need a sound, forward-looking farm program upon which to build our agriculture for tomorrow, one that will make it attractive for more and more farmers to remain on the farm and encourage others who have left to come back to the farm.

But we need something more—we need more adequate agricultural research. It is time for us to give our scientists the tools they require in order to develop higher-yielding varieties, better farming equipment, improved methods of soil conservation.

As you have been told, I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; I am also a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which recommends funds for all flood control and navigation projects in our country.

Only a few months ago, we received a budget request from President Eisenhower to appropriate some $551 million for all flood control and navigation projects in the United States. This represents less than 1 percent of our total budget for the next fiscal year. We were also asked to appropriate $55 million for our soil conservation program, plus $250 million for the agricultural conservation program. Between all these programs, we have budgeted slightly over 1 percent of our total Federal budget for conserving our precious topsoil and for expanding our network of Federal waterways.

This, to my way of thinking, is folly. It is shortsightedness. We have seen, during the last 15 years, once-great nations submit to the yoke of world communism because their people were hungry and their agricultures weak. We face a similar danger in this country. Today, we curse surpluses and search for ways to dispose of them. We do not stop and consider that tomorrow these surpluses will dwindle. By 1975, they will be gone entirely and our scientists tell us that our farmers are going to be hard-pressed to produce enough food and fiber to feed the 220 million mouths for which we shall then have to provide.

We are committing one fatal mistake; we are failing to keep our agriculture strong and prosperous. We are leaving the gate wide open to the entrance of the companion evils of dissatisfaction and ultimate destruction of our way of life. Let me tell you now that a lack of food and fiber breeds isms and the Red plague of communism is anxiously waiting at our doorstep for the day when hunger shall stalk this land.

We have found billions to spend in foreign lands, but we pinch our pennies here at home. Such a course must be halted and more attention given to our domestic requirements. American generosity to those nations less fortunate than our own has been hailed far and wide, but I wonder how many of our allies realize how niggardly we have been with our own people. I am certain that few, if any, of our friends across the seas know that our generous contribution to them has been borrowed money—every cent of it.

The time has come for us to look around at our own backyard. There are multitudes of things which we have too long neglected here at home. Our agriculture is one of them, and the most vital, if we are to survive as a free nation.

Before I am charged with preaching gloom and doom, let me tell you that I am proud of our farmers for the things they have already done, despite the odds against which they must toil. Here, in this rich delta, we have seen a transformation. Twenty-five years ago, one traveling by train from New Orleans to Memphis, could, for mile after mile, see the effects of poverty, of depression, of eroded lands along many stretches of the way, and human spirits swept by despair. Only 2 weeks ago I made the trip from Memphis to New Orleans and I witnessed signs of much progress. We have made tremendous headway, and we shall continue to go forward. Because our southern farmers have the "git up and go" to get things done, southern agriculture shall not stagnate. Cotton is still king here, but we have a few crown princes to help him. We have licked the cattle tick, and our beef and dairy herds are second to none. We have planted alfalfa, clover, soybeans, and kudzu among other crops and restored the fertility to thousands of worn acres.

You delta folks have linked arms with your county agents and gone out to attack the evils of the one-crop system. Working with your State legislatures, you have attracted industries from other parts of our country. No more must southern cotton be shipped to New England for spinning; the textile mills are locating next door to the cotton fields—where they should have been in the first place.

Just the other day, one of my colleagues referred to the "new South." This is not the new South; this is the same old South, with new ideas and without discriminatory freight rates.

It is a South that is beginning to flex its long-dormant economic muscles, to roll up its sleeves, and to gird itself for tomorrow's battles.

Winston Churchill told the world a decade ago that he had not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire. You and I know that the South has not become our Nation's most rapidly expanding region in order to witness the dissolution of the American way of life.

We are not going to be crushed—we are going to triumph. Folly and false economy, propaganda and twisted outlooks are not going to strip our Nation of its great agricultural heart land. But it is time for us to get to the task.

We need a sound price program, one which will keep our families on their farms, one which will fill our agricultural arsenals with the weapons of scientific research. We need an enlightened program of soil and water conservation, one which will halt the dissipation of our soil and restore the fertility of the lands we have.

I frankly do not feel that the enactment of rigid price supports this year would do our farmers any good, for the simple reason that because of the set-aside provisions in the present law, all basics except wheat are to be supported in 1955 at 90 percent of parity. But I am equally sure that adherence to the flexible price-support program—a program which lends itself to the concentration of our agriculture in the hands of the few—will lead us to ruin. It is my hope that in the early part of next year the Senate Agriculture Committee will have be-

fore it for presentation to the Senate a price-support program which is geared to tomorrow's needs. I wish to add that I am still a strong advocate of rigid price supports for our basics, and I shall continue to champion them until a better and more suitable program can be devised. I have named subcommittees to hold hearings on the proposed two-price plan for rice. I intend to work closely with our other southern Senators and Congressmen, and with all other members of all congressional delegations who have an interest in American agriculture, to the end that a program designed to prevent disastrous price fluctuations is achieved. I am convinced we can do this without so far depressing farm prices that only the wealthy can afford to stay in the farming business.

Your representatives in Congress are going to continue to wage an unrelenting fight to obtain enough soil and water conservation funds to halt the shameful waste of the very source of agricultural abundance—our precious topsoil.

We are going to do everything in our power to see that agricultural research is expanded; that new and more efficient farming methods are devised, that higher-yielding, disease-resistant crop varieties are developed and made available, and that expanded uses for our agricultural products are discovered and utilized. Last, but not least, a realistic approach in expanding our foreign markets is urgently required. We must devise ways and means of competing in world markets. American exporters of farm commodities must not continue to be placed in the position of having to consult and obtain permission from the State Department before they are able to sell our farm products abroad. Experience has shown us that our diplomats sometimes seem to have more concern for foreign farmers than for our own.

This effort will require the all-out assistance of every farmer and every farm organization in our country. It will require a tell-your-neighbor campaign in order to dispel the attitude of distrust which too many of our people display toward our American farmers. We must make sure that we give the lie to the theory that a reasonable farm price-support program carries with it high consumer prices. We must let the folks who live in the cities know that a shirt which costs $4 has in it but 1 pound of cotton worth whatever the current market price for cotton happens to be. They must understand that out of every dollar spent in the grocery store, slightly over 40 cents goes to the farmer. We must tell them that a loaf of bread has in it only 3 cents worth of wheat—even though the grocer must charge 17 cents for it in order to make a profit.

This is a time for counterattack, and I know that the leaders of our southern agriculture will be in the vanguard.

Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Georgia, and the other agricultural States have embarked upon a farsighted program of balancing their agriculture with industry. We must also embark upon a program of combining realism with commonsense; we must be realistic about the future and utilize sound, commonsense methods of strengthening our agricultural industry.

One of the best ways we can achieve this end is by increasing our markets as I have just stated, and thus reduce the burdensome surpluses which have forced our farmers to accept drastic acreage reductions in order to remain eligible for price protection. We must expand markets, however, without destroying the abundance we need to supply those markets, both domestic and foreign. We have heard much about price, and I am in agreement that if we are to compete with synthetics here at home and foreign cotton abroad, we must price our cotton so that it will sell. But we must also price our cotton so that the farmer can make a decent living. As the Senate Agriculture Committee studies possible price programs, these two objectives will be first and foremost in our minds.

This year, our farmers' production belts are drawn tight. The result is hardship; of that I am well aware. But let us remember to take the good with the bad. As much as these acreage reductions hurt right now, they are not without their compensating factors. Our farmers, you folks who produce cotton in particular, have learned to make each acre of land yield its utmost. You are using new varieties, harvesting them with new means, and generally making each acre of land do what it required 2 acres to do only a decade ago. This increased efficiency is going to be our salvation 20 years hence. The things you have learned in producing more cotton per acre of land are going to spell the difference in 1975 when 220 million Americans instead of 164 million are going to depend upon the fertile soil of the Mississippi Delta and other agricultural areas for their very livelihood—food and fiber. This year of tight acreage controls is a cloud on our national agricultural picture, but it is not without its silver lining.

In the dark days of this Republic's infancy, Thomas Jefferson wrote that the man who tilled the soil had a duty to his fellowmen to till it well. There is a corollary to that basic philosophy. It is this: Those of our people who wear the mantle of national leadership have a duty to safeguard the future interests, as well as the present interests, of all inhabitants of this land. I feel sure that the time will come, and come quickly, when the smokescreen of misrepresentation surrounding our industry will be blown away. It must be, for the future welfare of 220 million Americans hangs in the balance.

As farmers, as Americans vitally interested in a vigorous agriculture, you folks in the delta have been true to the trust imposed upon you. Those of us who have been chosen by you as your agents in the Congress will not let you stand alone. Working together, we can bring a sound program from out of the confusion into which our agriculture has been plunged.

And working together, we will.

Poland's Constitution of 1791

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in our continuing struggle against the forces of world communism, we must never forget those historical landmarks which show the development, over a period of several hundred years, of man's struggle for liberty and independence. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is such a milestone. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that free people everywhere, pause to commemorate the anniversary of this great document. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me, pertaining to Poland's Constitution of 1791.

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

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION OF 1791

The year 1791 was a critical one in Europe's turbulent and revolutionary history. The political principles of the French Revolution were beginning to spread, and the sparks of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" were being scattered in all directions. Those peoples suffering under foreign or unrestrained and despotic monarchs of their own, were becoming restive, and nearly all of them were striving feverishly under enlightened and farsighted group leadership to free themselves from foreign oppression or from despotic tyranny at home. And, at the same time, they were working toward remodeling and revitalizing their governmental institutions with a definite view of widening the area of freedom within their own countries or of strengthening themselves against actual or potential foreign aggressions.

In 1791, Poland seemed to be at an ideological crossroads. She had already undergone a partition at the hands of her three powerful and greedy neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. In order to forestall any such steps in the future, certain liberal leaders of Poland, imbued with genuine democratic ideas, had been working on a new constitution. It is that document adopted in May of 1791 that we are commemorating.

This historic document seemed at the time a true bill of rights for the Polish nation. By that constitution, a government of limited monarchy was established with definite ministerial responsibility. The electorate of the Parliament was considerably enlarged, and numerous privileges formerly enjoyed by the small upper classes alone were, by this constitution, made available to other classes. Certain rights of the peasantry were restored and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. And, above all, freedom of conscience was guaranteed and absolute religious toleration was established.

Today, so many years after that epochal event and after so many advances in all forms of democracy, this document may seem somewhat outdated, but nevertheless, it is regarded as a forerunner of later liberal constitutions, particularly in central and eastern Europe. In many respects it was a pioneering document and therein may be found its real significance.

Unfortunately, there was little chance to put its provisions into operation. Soon Poland was again partitioned by her three more powerful neighbors and was removed from the map of Europe as an independent country. Even so, all Poles regard this document as a landmark in their history, and I am glad to join them in the 164th anniversary of that memorable constitution. Let me express my wish that the principles of the 1791 constitution will give hope and boldness to the people of present-day Poland in their struggle against their Communist tyrants.

Statement in Support of a Proposal To Raise Personal Income Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is one act of simple justice that the 1st session of the 84th Congress should not leave undone before it adjourns for 1955. Earlier this year, those of us who believe that our income tax unfairly burdens the recipient of low income, suffered a defeat in the rejection of the $20 tax refund. This was most discouraging, but I am sure that we can turn this defeat into victory. We can do this if all supporters of higher personal income tax exemptions will rally around a bill that offers much delayed justice.

I have introduced a bill which I feel provides a very minimum of relief. It is my thought that the present $600 exemption is hopelessly inadequate for a single person, and $1,200 is just as hopelessly inadequate for a married couple. Certainly no one is prepared to argue that $600 will support a single person in accordance with any real concept of a true minimum standard of living. And how many married couples are there today who can live decently and healthfully in proper surroundings on $1,200 a year, or $23 a week? All studies show that it simply cannot be done. If the income tax is a tax based on ability to pay, it must be recognized that persons with incomes below a reasonable level have no tax-paying ability. If a tax is nevertheless exacted, then our tax law becomes an instrument of degradation. That is why I propose to raise the exemption for single persons to $1,000, and for married couples to $2,000.

It is also my thought that the added exemption of $600 allowed to the blind should be raised to $1,000, while the exemption for each dependent should be raised a minimum of $200 above the present $600 level.

Sound though my bill is on equitable grounds, it is just as sound economically and administratively.

It is sound economically because the little tax saving accruing to each of many millions of taxpayers will run into billions of dollars of increased consumer purchasing power. Every mother and father in this country fears the day when the wheels of industry are shut down and the family pay envelope ceases to exist. The wheels of industry will never be silent so long as there are consumers with dollars to spend on the necessities of life. That is why I feel it so important that we should take every opportunity to leave the low-income groups with a few extra dollars, because they will spend them. When they do spend them, that makes jobs for retailers and wholesalers and keeps men employed in the factories.

Finally, great administrative costs will be saved by the Internal Revenue Service because millions of recipients of low income will be dropped off the tax rolls. No longer will the Service be swamped with returns that yield only a few dollars in tax but which nevertheless must be received, recorded, and checked and filed. Not only will administrative expense be saved for the Government—which could, by the way, then apply itself to a more careful scrutiny of the larger returns where the real money is—but also the burden of computing and filing a return will no longer be the periodic headache it is for many with low incomes. And industry, too, will benefit in saving tax compliance costs. Industry has long been an unwilling tax collector for Uncle Sam, and my proposal will reduce some of its burden, too.

Just one last thought. In 1954 Congress provided tremendous tax savings for corporations and the well-to-do in the higher income brackets. Congress now should do something for those of small income. My bill shows the way.

Address by Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, on the Subject of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by me at the Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., on March 28, 1955.

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

THE SENATE LOOKS AT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Address by Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at Southwest Regional Conference, Child Welfare League, St. Louis, Mo., March 28, 1955)

Mayor Tucker, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real privilege as well as a personal pleasure for me to participate in this Southwest Regional Conference of the Child Welfare League of America. The history of the league is a distinguished one, and I think it is no exaggeration to say that it is, in considerable measure, through your leadership that we have made such great progress as a Nation in improving services for children. From the early days of your organization in 1920 and under the leadership of Mr. C. C. Carstens, you have consistently focused national attention on the dangers and problems confronting our young citizens. You have been flexible in a field where flexibility is tremendously important, and your program has changed to meet the problems brought about by changes in the social, economic, and cultural conditions in the world.

That you have made a place on your program tonight for the subject of juvenile delinquency is continuing proof of your alertness to the problems of children and youth, and I must say I am honored that you should feel I can make a contribution to your distinguished group of professional men and women.

First of all, I want to make it clear that I do not proclaim myself an expert in the field of juvenile delinquency. I cannot help being suspicious of self-proclaimed experts in this field, as we are of self-proclaimed experts in other realms of knowledge. There is no need for me to tell you, who deal in the whole field of human relationships, that the causes of maladjustments—and delinquency is, in a broad sense, a maladjustment—are many and diverse, and that some partial answers to the problem must be found in many places. Out of my experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—as you have learned through your experiences in working with children and families—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that there are no easy answers to it and that there is a tremendous amount of work to be done—unspectacular, ofttimes, but none the less rewarding and productive.

Now, I don't need to tell you that when we deal with the science of human behavior, we are likely to be either misunderstood, abused, or ignored. Since we do not speak in the authoritative terms of the exact sciences, we are likely to be derided by our friends in those fields for our lack of precision, and because we do not accept many of the unqualified broad assumptions about social behavior, we are just as likely to be misunderstood by the general public. I might say that the professions of social work and politics share this problem in common. The profession of social work needs no defense before this audience, but I do want to say that you have reason to be proud of your goals, your methods, and of the fine dedicated men and women, like yourselves, who are giving of their lives for progress. Fortunately, the public is coming to a better understanding of your field, and you have the satisfaction of knowing that you are serving your fellow man in a manner that helps him to preserve his self respect and to fulfill his best opportunity for usefulness as a citizen.

Now, we think we know something about human behavior, but we have had considerable difficulty in translating what we know into terms of constructive programs. We know that every child needs certain physical conditions—he needs nourishing food, warm clothing, and shelter. Since these needs are universally understood and accepted, it has not been difficult to secure support and funds for institutions to care for dependent children. The equally pressing needs of the same child for individual attention, for love and understanding, and for a sense of worth and achievement are less apparent—less easily recognized. For this reason, adequate funds for the support of necessary case work services, for foster-home care for dependent children, and for training personnel in juvenile court and institutional work are much harder to come by.

Yet, it is true that many of the behavioral problems of young people stem directly from the failure to meet these emotional needs. And it is also true that an adult who may be, for example, attacked and robbed by a juvenile, is not likely to react sympathetically or to understand that this violence is probably the result of early and perhaps prolonged parental neglect or other contributing factors beyond the control of the particular individual.

In the work of our Committee on Juvenile Delinquency over the past 2 years, I have been impressed over and over again by the appalling gap between what we know about delinquency and what we do about it. Our committee has had the opportunity to discuss this problem with police officers, psychiatrists, social workers, parents, teachers, representatives of Federal agencies, and juvenile offenders throughout the country. We have held extensive hearings in the District of Columbia, in New York and Philadelphia, in Chicago, El Paso, Denver, San Diego, Los Angeles, Bismarck, N. Dak., and other places. We have heard and questioned hundreds of witnesses. And we have received thousands of letters from judges, educators, recreational workers, and citizens in every walk of life from communities of every size. I shall not attempt to review the testimony here this evening. It is voluminous and I am sure that most of the details form a pattern all too well known to you.

I would like to say a word, however, about the size of the problem. Because of varying definitions and different methods of reporting from city to city and State to State, it is impossible to get absolutely accurate statistics. But taking into account all the figures that are available through local, State, and national agencies, it appears that at least a million and a quarter youngsters each year are getting into trouble with the police or law-enforcement agencies. While this represents only about 5 percent of all American boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 17, it is nonetheless an alarming figure, and it indicates that we have a tremendous problem, not only to rehabilitate boys and girls after they get into trouble, but to pre-

vent their getting into trouble in the first place. From the mass of data compiled by our committee, I would like to make a few observations about the course of action which, in my opinion at least, will be required if we are to meet realistically the problem of young people in trouble—as I prefer to call it—and deal with it effectively.

We know that the seriously delinquent boy or girl is not what we are pleased to call a normal individual. We know that his delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect—and by this I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation, as well as physical. I am not talking just about broken homes, nor about children of working mothers, although we know that in many instances these conditions have had damaging effects on children. I am talking about the homes where, irrespective of economic circumstances, the child does not feel the warmth of love and affection, does not feel that he is an integral part of the family unit and is wanted and understood. I am talking about the homes where the child is overindulged, which, of course, may be just a form of compensation for the parent who, consciously or unconsciously, rejects the child. I am talking about the homes—and there are many of them in this generation—where parents have swung to the school of thought that teaches that children should not be disciplined nor should they be made to assume responsibility. I think our recent experience is demonstrating that lack of discipline makes the child feel insecure and that lack of responsibility makes him feel that he really doesn't belong.

All of these are forms of neglect, and the child's reaction, is probably well known to the neighbors, perhaps to the police officer on the beat or to community agencies. Certainly it is known to his teachers, because it has undoubtedly found expression during his early school years in one or more symptoms, such as withdrawal, day-dreaming, lying or cheating, fighting, learning difficulties, or truancy. In other words, both the child's early family situation and his outward behavior in school and elsewhere provide clear and unmistakable evidence that here is a child who needs special help if future trouble is to be averted.

Yet, in the face of such an apparent and obvious need on the part of many children, what does our society provide in the way of help? The crucial role in child preservation is one that can be filled by skillful protective services geared to detecting and reaching neglected children and to working with parents while the family situation may yet be repaired and before a child is too severely damaged. Yet, on the basis of our committee's study, it is apparent that in the average American community today there is no service specially equipped to perform this crucial child-saving function—no service capable of detecting and giving special help to the child suffering from some form of neglect in his daily family life, his school or his community.

May I quote very briefly from our recent report on this aspect of the problem?

"The subcommittee is forced to conclude that such essential defenses against delinquency are today weak, inadequate to the task, poorly manned, and, in some measure, even totally lacking in every community in the Nation. This is not to say that the quality of homelife for the average American child is grossly inferior, nor that the average American community is lacking in decency, nor that educational standards in our schools are universally poor. It does mean, however, that services designed to support these institutions and to catch children falling through their chinks are not only weak but literally gaping with holes.

"A family deprived of its breadwinner may be broken up for lack of financial aid; mental health services are so scanty that a family member with a serious emotional problem may disrupt the whole fabric of family life for want of specialized treatment; schools spilling over with youngsters are undermanned by underpaid teachers; utterly no services exist in the average community which are designed to identify and provide early remedial treatment for the child exhibiting unusual problems at home, in the school, or elsewhere in the community."

The school is the one agency in the community which is in contact with virtually every child. The testimony before our committee amply supports the conclusion that the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school. In a few metropolitan areas, special programs have been inaugurated, but in the average school in the average American community, there are no special classes for children with specific learning disabilities; there are no specially trained remedial teachers; and there are no skilled social or welfare services working with the schools by means of which they may reach out and help families and children experiencing difficulties.

From the standpoint of prevention, we are particularly concerned about the plight of what we call the predelinquent youngster. Through his early experiences of neglect in the home, this child has come to believe that the world is a hostile environment peopled with aggressive fellow human beings, and so he deliberately isolates and insulates himself from the representatives of larger society. It is obvious that no playground or recreational center which shapes its program around boys and girls who conform to the rules, and that no ordinary youth service or school program designed to meet the needs of the cooperative, well-adjusted child, will successfully catch the disturbed child and help him to reshape his own feelings and reactions to the world about him. And I am sure you recognize as well as I do that the child will not be helped by a social agency which, for a variety of reasons, budgetary and otherwise, waits for him to knock at their door and request service.

Now, in making these statements, I am being rather critical, not only of social agencies, but of parents, teachers, law enforcement agencies, and offices of Federal, State, and local governments. I feel that I can speak frankly to you. You wouldn't need to have this conference if everything were rosy in the child welfare field, and you would not have asked me to talk about juvenile delinquency if all I could do would be to toss a few bouquets in your direction and say we're all doing a fine job. A conference such as this gives us an opportunity to share our information and our experience—it is truly democracy in action.

In the fields of social work, education, recreation, youth services and mental health, I think we are doing only part of the job—an important part, to be sure, but nonetheless one that leaves a large area of necessary service unfilled. Mainly, I think, we have failed in finding effective means of reaching out to the boy and girl who most needs our help. By this I do not mean that we should abandon all of the present methods or basic concepts underlying social welfare services. Rather, what I am suggesting is that we need to find and add new techniques, and it is largely up to you who are professionals in this field to find the ways of augmenting the tools of your trade and thereby enlarging the end results of your work.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have been particularly interested in some of these reaching-out techniques now being tested in various communities. Several cities, notably Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, are successfully carrying on what is known as the detached-worker program. This program seems to me to afford an excellent example of how group work can reach out to boys and girls who fail to find their way into settlement houses and recreation centers, but instead, become part of a gang that expresses and supports their rebellion against society. In an effort to reach these youngsters, these cities have developed a program where the worker makes contact with and, in a sense, identifies himself with a gang. Though he may be regarded with suspicion and rejected at first, the quality of his personal relationship with the gang members has often been such that he has been able to influence gang behavior, direct the activities into more constructive channels, and help the individual members to secure jobs or vocational guidance or other services. The so-called aggressive casework program—which in some ways might better be called persistent than aggressive—is being tried out in New York and offers considerable promise as a means of carrying casework directly into the home of the child who needs help. The school social service and visiting teachers programs are being used in a few of our larger cities, but they need to be adopted much more widely and certainly with more and better trained personnel.

It is the responsibility of social work and social workers, in my opinion, to give enlarged leadership in the field of social engineering. We have made great strides in preventive medicine—but that, again, is dealing with a more exact science. We have not gone nearly so far in preventing social disorders. I maintain that rehabilitation is not the answer. It is necessary, of course, to repair the damage resulting from the rocks and reefs in family and community life, but how much better it would be to remove the obstructions, or to guide a safe course around them before the damage is done.

We know, of course, that not all delinquent youth are emotionally disturbed youngsters. And even the emotionally crippled child may manage to function within the law in a favorable community environment, while unwholesome factors in the community can seriously affect the normal child. Out of my work with the Senate committee, I have become convinced that many of us, including social workers, attach too little importance to demoralizing community influences.

During our hearings in a seemingly average American community, which I shall refer to as Community X, our committee was inquiring into the possible effects upon the children of that community of another community a short distance away—let's call it Community Y—which was a center of every form of vice. The evidence before our committee showed that many youngsters regularly went over to Community Y for their recreation and fun. We questioned the director of a social agency, a well-trained individual, about the possible damaging effects of this situation, and learned that he was not concerned about their proximity. The aim in his community, he told us, is to develop the kind of stable boys and girls who can go to Community Y, and come back unscathed. I, for one, cannot go along with such a thesis. Of course, I don't believe that boys and girls should be insulated completely against the realities of life, but I think we take a foolish and needless risk by exposing them, in their most impressionable years, to vice and crime, in the hope that they will be strong enough to resist it. Sound parent and child relationships, in my opinion, are scarcely enhanced by this kind of unnecessary strain, particularly when the bad community conditions could be controlled. I am not suggesting that crusade for decency is the panacea for juvenile delinquency, but I do believe that its dividends would be great and its cost little.

We expect children to develop a concept of morality and to learn to distinguish between right and wrong, but this is not a concept that comes easily because they are continually surrounded by confusing examples. What is the difference, they may wonder, in terms of moral standards, between the traffic policeman who accepts a $5 bribe, and robbery at the point of a gun? What is the difference between his mother's "white lie" when she invents some nonexistent excuse to avoid an engagement or responsibility and a child's own falsehood when confronted by his parents with some misdemeanor? What possible conclusion can a child draw when we are continually saying to him, in effect, public and private dishonesty is all right in some cases, all wrong in others?

And speaking of examples of crime, vice, and dishonesty, I would like to mention my concern about some of the materials and programs produced today by the so-called mass media of communications. Our committee made an extensive investigation into the subject matter, production, and distribution of the crime and horror comic books. Some of you may be familiar with these publications. Their title is certainly a misnomer, since they are not the simple crime stories or "whodunits" and they are far from comic. Rather, for the price of a thin dime, they offer children vividly illustrated lessons in almost every form of vice and degeneracy in the annals. Following our hearings, publishers of comic books established the Comics Magazine Association of America, adopted a code designed to eliminate objectionable material, and named former New York City Magistrate Charles F. Murphy as administrator. It is too early to determine whether the publishers' efforts to clean their own house will be effective, but it is at least a hopeful sign that 24 of the 27 publishers of comic books belong to the association.

Although distinctly superior to the crime comic, I am also concerned about the volume and frequently the kind of crime and violence shows presented on television. In terms of content, these programs do not begin to compare with the horror comic books. I do not believe that an essentially normal child will be transformed into a delinquent by these materials, but even the specialists tell us that they cannot, with confidence, estimate the effect upon either a normal or an emotionally disturbed child of witnessing several murders each evening in his own living room. To illustrate how little agreement there is on this particular point, I might mention that when I was in Europe last summer inspecting a number of penal institutions, I talked with an inspector at Scotland Yard who told me that, in his judgment, television was responsible for a sharp decrease in delinquency because it keeps young people off the street. The nature of the material presented by the BBC, of course, might have something to do with this. However, while I do not believe television as such produces delinquents, neither can I subscribe to the theory that these programs are harmless, provided that law and order prevails in the end. We recognize how difficult it is to make any precise measurement of cause and effect in this area. Yet, the testimony of psychiatrists and other experts in this field makes it clear that sensational presentations of materials, programs that invest crime and depravity with glamour, may well stimulate the gang or the individually hostile child to the point where his potential delinquency is "triggered" as a result.

Recently I had a most interesting letter from a man who was greatly concerned with the content of some television programs. He wrote: "It happens that I drive a school bus and I am constantly amazed at the conversations of some of the 10 and 12 year olds. Every morning they rehearse the programs of the previous night, complete with all the details of crime, vice, immorality and brutality." I think it is clear, therefore, that particularly where these programs are directed toward audiences of children and young people, we are taking, at minimum, a calculated risk that we can ill afford where human welfare is at stake.

There are other well-known delinquency-breeding conditions in our communities which are subject to control, providing we have both the wisdom and the determination to dedicate enough of ourselves and our resources to the task.

We have available to us, for example, studies of slum areas going back for more than half a century that reveal a consistently disproportionate rate of delinquency and crime on the part of slum inhabitants. This is not to say that delinquency is the result only of poor housing or lack of sanitation or outdoor plumbing, or that outstanding citizens cannot emerge from these conditions. Slums do, however, have a two-fold effect: on the one hand, they have a demoralizing effect on the quality and character of home life; on the other hand, they systematically expose young people from earliest childhood to every form of vice and crime. Indeed, in many slum areas, the neighborhood hoodlum or racketeer represents to the children the only known example of a local boy who made good.

I have referred to the major role which could be played by our schools in the fight against juvenile delinquency. I firmly believe that in this day and age, with our way of life seriously challenged in many parts of the world, we cannot afford, from any point of view, the overcrowded and understaffed schools that are the rule today in almost every American community, and which must inevitably shunt the problem child into a back seat in the classroom because there are no facilities for helping him. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation—which I hope will be passed by this session of Congress—making Federal funds available to assist State and local communities to build additional school facilities. I am sure you know as well as I do that there has been no little opposition to the school construction bill. One of the loudest and most persistent arguments is that Federal funds inevitably mean Federal control. This, my friends, is nonsense. We have long made Federal funds available for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, and the Federal Government does not control the hospitals. We have made Federal funds available to school districts in federally impacted areas, and it has not meant Federal control. This is just a strawman, set up with the aid and encouragement of Secretary Hobby, to avoid doing anything about the problem, in the interest—at least so it is claimed—of economy. The fact remains that the child who has problems now will not be helped by additional school facilities or teachers or services that will not become available for another 10 or 15 years—if then.

Now you may say—and rightly so—all of these things will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel just with good intentions. And my answer is, of course, they cost money—so does crime. The crime bill of our Nation is staggering. For the year 1954, my friends, it was no less than $20 billion. This was the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress on the Department of Justice budget. Just think how many schools we could build for $20 billion, how many families we could move out of deplorable slum areas into decent homes, how many people we could train and employ in preventive services. Of course, these things cost money, but that $20 billion will soon grow to 25, 30, and even more—all annually recurring expenses of adult crime—unless we strike at the roots of the problem and strike now.

With two of my colleagues on our committee, Senators KEFAUVER and LANGER, I have introduced legislation aimed at achieving just this end. Our bill, known as S. 728, or the Delinquent Children's Act of 1955, and presently pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would, for a temporary period, make Federal funds available to the States for three purposes. First, it would make funds available for the organization of a representative body within each State to assess the needs of that State and assign priorities in developing a program of action to meet those needs. Second, funds would be available to enable agencies involved in the fight against juvenile delinquency to undertake new and extended services on a project basis—the projects to be approved by a coordinating body. And third, it would make funds available both to States and universities for the development of a real program for training personnel in the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency. We certainly do not feel that this proposed measure represents a total answer to the increasing problem of youthful crime, but we do believe that it is an indispensable step in the right direction.

The problem, of course, demands the coordinated effort of national, public and private organizations. A few months ago, at the request of our committee, representatives of 18 of the leading organizations in the field—of which the Child Welfare League was one—gathered to give the committee the benefit of their advice and counsel. Incredible as it may seem, this was the first time that all these organizations had met together. It is hard to understand why no such meeting had ever been held before, because the opportunity for the interchange of ideas and information is invaluable. The question now is, will such meetings continue as a basis for sharing ideas and for joint planning.

As representatives of a profession, and of agencies dedicated to the advancement of human welfare, I know that you most emphatically believe that it is both your duty and your privilege to provide leadership in the fight to conserve the greatest of our human resources, our youth. It is part of your job to needle the public conscience—and to keep on and on, without concern sometimes, for the easily ruffled feelings of the smug and complacent—and to keep the country's view fixed upon the whole of the problem, rather than upon small fragments of it.

Some years ago, a distinguished pioneer in the field of child welfare, Emma Lundberg, wrote a book entitled "To the Least of These." The least of these are, of course, those children in our midst who, for one reason or another, are deprived of the kind and quality of family and community life which they so urgently need if they are to have a fair chance in life. In the last analysis, the real test of our humility and humanity—even of our civilization itself—is not how we treat, nor the honors we extend to our well-known and distinguished citizens. Quite to the contrary. The real test is how, and how well, we meet the needs of the least of these.

Labor, Politics, and the Gompers Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I submit the address delivered on May 9, 1955, by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable

DON HAYWORTH, the Representative from the Sixth District of Michigan, at a State convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, held in Detroit, Mich.

Because of the able way in which he has dealt with the problem of the place of labor in the formation of the policies of our Government, I believe that his remarks are of general interest and are well worthy of consideration.

The address follows:

In this group I feel I'm a member of the family, not merely because I'm a brother member of the teachers' local at Michigan State University, but because I've been working hand in hand with many right in this room—both in campaigns and in legislation. The postal pay increase, for example, an extremely delicate series of negotiations, was piloted through the Senate, the House, and the conference committee with little, I think, to regret. The postal workers are to be complimented on having in Washington a level-headed, hard-working group of legislative representatives.

I'd like to tell you something connected so closely with the organization which brings us together today, that I think it's highly appropriate.

I was raised a farm boy out in Iowa, and two things were almost as rare in Mahaska County as Eskimos on the Sahara. One was a labor leader and the other a Democrat. If either one of those rare specimens had been found in my township we'd have locked him up and charged people to see him.

Well, I grew up, went to college, and became a teacher of public speaking. It happened that certain ambitious teachers in this field were working together on the biographies of outstanding American speakers. Their idea was to go into every field, like preaching, business, and law, and pick out the most outstanding speakers, whom they would then write up in this biographical series. In looking over their list of speakers I thought they'd overlooked a number of fields. I suspected, for example, that undoubtedly some effective speaking had been done in building the labor movement. Even in the twenties the labor movement was something to be respected. This led me to study the life of Samuel Gompers. I read not only his two-volume autobiography, but everything else about him I could lay my hands on. So I wrote an article about Gompers' speaking ability which apparently caused his biography to be included in the series.

I mention this experience because it was my first contact with the labor movement. It was a good first contact. I caught the idealism, the selflessness of America's first great labor leader—architect of the organization that brought us here today.

Another thing I learned from my study of Gompers was the fallacy of the idea that the American Federation of Labor has never been and should not be interested in politics. All though the administration of Samuel Gompers from 1886 to 1924, the A. F. of L. lived and breathed politics. From headline and housetop they shouted, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," and that applied to parties as well as individuals. In 1908, Samuel Gompers presented both great political parties with the kind of labor plank the Federation thought was right. The Republicans turned them down, but at the Democratic convention, according to Gompers' own words, "we were received and the plank was placed in the Democratic platform." At that time, in 1908, 47 years ago, Gompers went on to say, "The Democratic Party showed us that it was our friend, and that is why we are in this campaign working for the success of the Democratic ticket."

The A. F. of L, officially endorsed William Jennings Bryan and right down the line through Woodrow Wilson in both 1912 and 1916, James Cox in 1920, and then, which wasn't a bad idea, supported LaFollette in 1924.

The Federation wasn't active in politics for a number of years, but George Meany said recently, "It took the harsh lessons of the 80th Congress elected in 1946 to shock the A. F. of L. convention into forming Labor's League for Political Education. We now have returned to the policy of Gompers."

And don't think for a moment this was against the wishes of William Green. In William Green's last years I heard him give a ringing denunciation of those enemies of labor who framed Taft-Hartley. He called for labor again to get into politics and meet reaction head on. He stated in no uncertain terms that a new situation had developed and that the only way of preserving the life of organized labor was through the ballot. Those of us who heard that speech felt we had witnessed one of the landmarks of labor history—perhaps of national history.

Here we may well say something that needs to be said about the leadership we have in the labor movement. In the last 30 years we've seen some divisive influences in labor. We've seen brother fight against brother. And when you get that sort of thing started it's always easier to keep on fighting than to sit down together in generous and broad-minded cooperation. But in the last year the wholesome and unusual thing has happened. The A. F. of L. and the CIO did get together toward making the workingmen of America full brothers instead of half brothers. That would never have happened unless the leadership of both organizations had been broadminded men—willing to submerge personal ambition to common good. I've never had the privilege of meeting George Meany. But I've seen him on television, read his speeches, and watched his action over the years on the national and world stage. And he serves well the fine tradition laid down by Gompers.

On the other side of the picture it happens that I have many times been close to the Reuther brothers—have talked with one or more of them personally and at length. All labor can be proud of them. They have the devotion to the cause that Gompers had. They have the intelligence to meet on equal terms the best that management or government can put down at the table across from them. They have a willingness to set aside personal interest for the common welfare. If they did not have that breadth of vision, we would not have seen at this time a united labor movement. In the midst of the primary campaign for United States Senator from Michigan we saw both great labor groups of Michigan swing into action together. Only because they did this was it possible for this State to give the Nation a great, liberal, dedicated public servant, the Honorable PATRICK V. MCNAMARA.

If we're going to have a strong America we need both forward-looking industrial leadership in management, and also forward-looking leaders in labor. Strong men don't always have to struggle against each other. They can team up and work together for great purposes.

In America today, both labor and management have two great purposes. In the first place, much needs to be done to give our people a better life. We're proud of America, but, oh, how we fall short of what could be done. How many millions are afflicted needlessly from disease; how cruelly other millions suffer for the simple reason they aren't getting enough income to buy decent food, clothing and shelter. Responsible men of labor and responsible men of management should work together to give us and our children a life of abundance—a life of economic and social justice.

But, for the immediate present, something even more important demands that labor and management get together. We need to make America strong—strong enough to meet the greatest menace this civilization has ever faced. Across the ocean we have a powerful enemy—an enemy, incidentally, that doesn't have free, democratic labor unions. If we waste our strength, if we get careless, we could lose this battle with communism so fast we wouldn't know what had happened to us.

Some people are afraid labor will be too powerful in one big, national movement. But those people don't really know how labor feels. I, myself, never cease to be surprised at the broadmindedness of organized labor. Take this matter of minimum wage. Now, actually, there's no immediate reason why the carpenters or the plumbers or any other members of the A. F. of L. should concern themselves with a minimum wage. No minimum wage will raise their pay checks. But labor leaders have enough industrial statesmanship to see that we can't have a strong Nation unless there's widespread and universal well-being. They realize that if carpenters are to be busy the masses should be building houses. One thing's sure, nobody's going to build a house on the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. Too many industrial leaders shortsightedly believe that if they can saw lumber, and make nails and turn out roofing with low-priced labor then they'll be able to sell at a big profit and make a lot of money. They forget somebody has to buy that lumber, nails and roofing. Big sales are only achieved as a result of high purchasing power.

One fundamental fact the Democrats revealed way back in the thirties, but which the Republican Party has never quite understood, is that when the common people have purchasing power they use it. Of course, I like to look at a higher minimum wage as giving boys and girls better food, providing them with better shelter, guarding their health. But, even those not interested in the human side, should realize that a minimum wage is one of the obvious ways of stimulating our national economy.

This brings me to one of my favorite complaints. That's the tremendous effort, made by all the apologists for things-as-they-are, to convince the Nation everything's all right with the economy. They don't compare economic activity of today with that of 1953. We're down today on almost all counts. They take great pains to show we're doing better than we did in the slump year of 1954. But still we're losing ground. We have five million more people than we had in 1953, but we're not producing or consuming as much as we did then. The productivity of the American worker is going up nearly 2½ percent a year. On that basis alone we should be producing 20 billions more than we did in 1953. But we actually are producing several billions less.

Here we are, face to face with an appalling Communist menace, and yet our defeatist industrial and political leadership is trying to make the country satisfied when it's falling billions upon billions of dollars short of what we could and should be producing. When organized labor is big enough to see, that for the good of all, unorganized labor needs a higher minimum wage they demonstrate that they have in mind the welfare of all the Nation—not merely of their own wage contracts.

The labor movement of this country has a magnificent heritage in such men as Gompers. You can be proud of leaders like George Meany and Walter Reuther. And I know, because I have mingled with them, that over this country from local to local are devoted men and women who measure up toward the national leadership.

But let's face the fact that, although many have tried, and much has been done, still labor hasn't done the political job it should. Throughout Michigan I know all labor hasn't been as close to liberal candidates as it should have been. And the precinct work generally over the State has been lamentable. In at least three-fourths of the

precincts and townships of my district are many members of the A. F. of L. As members of this, the greatest labor organization in the world, they will serve well their common cause if they work steadily through the year, and especially during a campaign, to see that voters understand the issues involved. This ought not to be done merely for the issues involved in congressional legislation, but for local and State issues.

This picture I spread before you in outline form can't be painted in with depth of color and true perspective by a few resolutions in this convention. Although it's important to formulate your organization's policies and program, by resolutions, here in convention, you must carry out their meaning and intent by hard work. If you start the job right now and work at it every day until the opening of the campaign next year, and even if you have consecrated efforts in all your locals, still you won't achieve the goals that could be reached. We need to do more than whip or shame people into going to the polls. The soundest method of political effort is first to build good citizenship.

Those of us assembled here today couldn't have the glory of pioneering the American Federation of Labor. But the idealism of those early days is something we ought never forget. When the office of president of the federation was created, it was decided to allow the president a fulltime salary of a thousand dollars a year. Samuel Gompers didn't want it. He disliked taking money for a job that he considered a sacred responsibility. They offered it to another who didn't think a thousand dollars was enough. Then they came back to Gompers and he took it. In going from one city to another organizing unions he stayed in the cheapest hotels and traveled in cabooses with friendly conductors. No one expects that kind of self-denial today. But every member of every local and every city federation has a right to expect you to put your soul into your job. Your responsibility goes far beyond the bargaining table. The A. F. of L. membership should be proud of their craftmanship and should continue to develop their skills, thereby deserving the high wages you help them to get. You need to see that they and their unions take responsible places in the community. You need to deal wisely and honorably with other labor groups so that we have real team work. And, being in Government, I think especially of your obligation to help develop a more responsible citizenship.

Some time in the near future the two great labor organizations will be joined from top to bottom. My closing suggestion is that for the purposes of political activity in 1956 you join hands right now. It takes time and experience to deal effectively in politics. You can hear an occasional local group and some individuals here and there talk loudly about their achievements. But, if you look into the facts you'll find all this activity has been lamentably spotty and ineffective. There've been a dozen misses for every bull's-eye.

Unfortunately there hasn't been any moving force in the political field to bring all labor together in a well-knit, cooperative, fighting force. They have had some meeting of the leadership. But it never got to the place where any group sat down and said, "Now here's the second ward, precinct K. What can we do about it?" Nobody went that far, nobody tried to locate a person in every block—someone who commanded respect in the neighborhood, who could win over the wavering, and on election day get out to the polls those who knew the story.

I'm not dealing in generalities. I'm laying before you a program of specific action. It's a program I know you believe in. The problem is to take the first step. Only by organized political action at the precinct level, we can carry to success those great ambitions that Gompers had, not only for the bargaining table, but also for the ballot box.

Social Security's Retirement Test Should Be Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been protesting against that section of our Social Security Act which penalizes people for working. I refer, of course, to the so-called "retirement test" which cancels benefits when outside earnings exceed a given amount. All of us know of the effect on our senior citizens of the substantial increase in the cost of living of the past decade. We know, as well, that millions of these people are struggling along on a meager income. The average old-age benefit under social security is only $59 per month. But if they manage to find a job—and this is no easy matter if they are over 65 years of age—and then if they can manage to earn enough to bring that $59 monthly payment up to enough to provide a decent living, they lose the right to the social-security benefit.

I am aware of the fact that changes were made in this retirement test in connection with the 1954 amendments of the Social Security Act. These changes raised the amount of earnings allowed and removed the requirement entirely for people aged 72 and over. But this liberalization of the retirement test has, in many respects, only further complicated the situation, as far as I can see. For the new annual earnings test is exceedingly involved. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued an entire leaflet on this one subject alone, explaining all of its ramifications.

First, it seems, you let the Department know each year whether you expect to earn more than $1,200 in the coming year. If you start working during the year there is another blank to fill out. If you stop work there is another. At the end of the year, if your earnings have been more than $1,200 you fill out another blank—which also shows the months in which you earned $80 or more. All this information goes into the bill and then sometime during the following year—when you may be needing that benefit very desperately because you are not working then—the benefits are canceled in proportion to the amount of earnings in excess of $1,200 which you had in the previous year.

There is another gross inequity in this new retirement test. Until this year it applied only to earnings in covered employment. Now it applies to earnings from any source. Formerly, for example, it was possible to keep on getting your benefit if you had a job which was not covered by social security. Now, no matter where you are working, you lose your benefit. Moreover the law continues the gross inequity which cancels benefits only for earnings, but makes no cancellation whatever if the additional income is from unearned sources such as dividends, interest, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely unable to understand why we continue this reprehensible practice of penalizing people for working. It is a principle which cannot be improved because it is wrong in the first place. The only right and equitable solution is to remove the retirement test entirely.

To accomplish this purpose I am today introducing a bill which would amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder. I believe this is a matter which calls for our immediate action. I urge the support of every Member of this Congress in making this important improvement in our social security system.

Remarks of Hon. Philip J. Philbin at DAV Installation of Officers, Southbridge, Mass., April 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address I delivered on April 17, 1955, at the annual installation of officers of chapter 101, Disabled American Veterans, and its Auxiliary, in Southbridge, Mass.

The material follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator Benoit, Representative Cournoyer, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a great privilege for me as well as a great pleasure to join you here this afternoon because I always enjoy coming to this beautiful town of Southbridge whose faithful people have been so cooperative, helpful, and loyal, and, as you know, I have unbounded admiration for all the members of this great American organization.

There has never been any question concerning the type of Americanism and the type of patriotism which the members of this organization have stood for throughout the years. Not only in war but in peace you have demonstrated in ways very definite, very explicit, and very clear to all your loyalty to the principles of this country and your willingness to serve it faithfully and zealously, however great the sacrifices involved.

I am proud and happy, therefore, on this occasion once again to offer you, your auxiliary and all your members my congratulations and expressions of warm gratitude and appreciation for the magnificent contributions which you have made in behalf of the Nation and in the interest of that exalted kind of citizenship based on unquestioned loyalty and devotion to the country which is so urgently needed in the crisis of the affairs of free men which confronts us today.

We all recognize, I am sure. that we are living in a world that is rapidly changing and that is rapidly taking on new shape and form. In the past decade since the end of World War II our own social and economic institutions have developed at an unprecedented rate. The productivity of our great economy has mounted and mounted until we are in the main and on the whole so

far as the Nation is concerned, not only producing more than ever before of food and fiber, commodities and articles necessary to sustain life in this advanced age, but we have also achieved a standard of living for the rank and file of our people which would have been scarcely imaginable not to many years ago.

Of course, there are gaps, very unhappy gaps, in this fabric of prosperity and well-being that is spread over the country. There are certain areas including some right here in our own district, with which we are so intimately and so deeply concerned, where many of our fellow citizens are not able to obtain full-time employment, or indeed, are unable to find any employment at all. This is a very serious problem which must be attacked at every level and in every way possible, because neither a great democracy nor a great free private-enterprise system like our own can ever tolerate to have people unemployed and unable to find work properly to sustain themselves and their families. It is one of the great social challenges confronting us today speedily to correct these conditions so that the prosperity which the Nation is enjoying as a whole, can be spread into every section and part of the country and to every segment of the American people.

Notwithstanding these dislocations which beset us so grievously in some places, we nevertheless have reason to feel proud of the generally good health and marked strength of our great powerful economic system which has been built up on the basis of freedom as distinguished from the coercion and dictatorship and suppression which exist in other nations of the world.

It must be our purpose always not only to build and expand this great system of free activity to produce still higher standards of living, but it must be our unswerving purpose always and in every circumstance to protect that system and the free institutions that have made it possible from the attacks of those godless, conscienceless forces of communism and radical social reform which are working so tirelessly for the destruction of the values of free enterprise and freedom and the priceless institutions which have made possible the unequaled liberties and the unprecedented prosperity which this country and the American people enjoy in a measure greater than any nation or people in history.

The members of this organization know better perhaps than any other group the bloody sacrifices, the stern discipline, and the unselfish devotion that were required to defend our Nation in past wars, because you have never faltered, you have never hesitated, you have never been found wanting in the defense of freedom. On the other hand, you have realized the urgency of protecting this country against brutal dictatorships and against the vicious enemies of democracy which made unprovoked and unconscionable attacks upon this Nation. And you were willing to serve this great cause with your lives and your blood.

It is said that history repeats itself and this is an all too pitiful fact as we survey the situation that obtains in the world today. Instead of the peace which you and your comrades fought for, which the entire American people unselfishly worked for and sacrificed for, in spite of the bloodshed and suffering, despite all the glorious proclamations and promises and international charters, the world seems to be right back where it was prior to the last great war and is faced once again with a gigantic, widespread powerful conspiracy directed against democracy and freedom and aiming to destroy the free institutions which have been built up throughout the centuries at such great cost in treasure and in blood.

This situation would be extremely difficult and fraught with great danger at any time. But in this atomic and hydrogen age when modern science combining with military skill has produced weapons of such incredible power and destructiveness, it is all the more disturbing to the loyal citizens of America, as it is and must be to human beings everywhere.

But we have not flinched in the past in time of danger and we are not prepared to flinch now. World communism may rant and rave and hurl its invectives against our religious faith, against our democracy, and against our great Government. It may conduct insidious conspiracy throughout the world calculated to weaken and destroy free governments, it may use every means at its disposal, as it is doing, to obstruct and prevent a true world peace. But the people of this Nation will never be discouraged, will never be terrorized, will never cease to defend their freedoms. To the contrary, we will resolve with increasing fervor and determination, come what may, to build up the kind of strength, military, economic, and spiritual, which is needed to preserve the national security and to deter wilful aggressors from carrying out their designs of infiltration, conquest ,and enslavement of the free world. This is no time for useless fears or for appeasement.

We have tremendous resources on our side in the form of the greatest productive system ever wrought by the hand of man, in the form of a most powerful striking military force equipped with all the latest weapons, including atomic and hydrogen substances in much greater quantities and of greater power than any other nation. These are important and necessary to be sure, and they may well give us a sense of security and a sense of confidence that any aggressor or combination of aggressors will be restrained from launching an attack upon this country, or provoking war against the free nations.

But we have other weapons, more powerful weapons, that are not available to the totalitarian dictators. We have the weapons of faith, of understanding, of tolerance, of justice, of unity among all our loyal people regardless of race, class, or creed, and the confidence and determination to sustain the integrity and the principles of this great Nation in any and every contingency that may arise. These are weapons that are not available to the potential enemy because they are based not on material strength alone but on the spiritual values of freedom and they cannot be matched by any Godless Communist state or any ruthless totalitarian dictatorship.

Just as we are pledged to the cause of our magnificent veterans, their dependents, and their families, just as we are devoted to the building of a greater and better Nation, just as we are dedicated to the principles of free enterprise and freedom, we must ever be resolved to defend, preserve, and protect the mighty and noble heritage of political, economic, and spiritual strength which has been the basis for all the things we are and which must be the enduring basis of our liberties in time to come.

Hurricane Warning Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my bill, H. R. 5260, has been effective to the point where the Department of Commerce, and in particular the Weather Bureau, has received additional funds for the operation of a hurricane warning system for the protection of our coastal residents, although the sum adopted by amendment today is an increase, it still is not sufficient, in my estimation. However, I am pleased that my bill and work was not in vain.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments:

From the Chamber of Commerce, Greenwich, Conn.:

The board of directors agree with the proposal outlined in H. R. 5260.

We believe your proposal has real merit.

From the Union Reinsurance Co. of Zurich, Switzerland, the United States branch office:

Anything that will be done to reduce, as far as possible, the loss of our life and property has our wholehearted approval and support.

From the Acushnet Process Co., New Bedford, Mass.:

The city of New Bedford, Mass. was very badly hit in 1938, 1944, and by "Carol" in 1954. In 1938 we had 230 deaths in the greater New Bedford area, and in 1954 we had more than $50 million damage. There were 35 industries in New Bedford which were badly affected by flood and salt water and extremely high winds. Damage to these industries alone amounted to more than $10 million.

Surveys which we have run among the 35 industries indicate that probably one-half of the $10 million damage could have been spared if the plants had ample warning to move material and equipment to higher ground and bulwark their plants against the surge of the salt water flood. We recognize that in the long run it may be possible to get physical protection but we also realize we may be able to get relief from future hurricanes if we are able to get accurate forecasting as to the probable path of the hurricane and as to the time of arrival.

The New Bedford committee on hurricane damage and each of the industries it represents is wholeheartedly in favor of your program and would like to do anything we can to get speedy passage and prompt action.

From the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New Bedford Division, New Bedford, Mass.:

I think the bill is an excellent one. In a survey of the damage sustained it was noted that the direct cost of Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel amounted to over $9 million. This did not include the loss of jobs, profits, and other tangible and intangible costs. In the instance of our own company, Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., we sustained a loss of $1,455,000. If we had had early warning on Hurricane Carol it is estimated that our loss would have been reduced by $300,000 to $500,000. I venture to say that the same is true of our waterfront firms in this area.

Including the industrial loss, New Bedford suffered a total loss of over $50 million in the series of hurricanes last year, a considerable amount of which could have been saved had the area had sufficient warning.

As you pointed out, along with the early warning we could expect a reduction in unnecessary fear and apprehension in the areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes. This is a very important item with industrial plants, and it is best exemplified in this area by the fact that over $350,000 was expended by our 35 industrial firms in getting ready for Hurricanes Edna and Hazel, which did not cause any serious damage.

To sum it up, we are wholly in accord with your bill, H. R. 5260.

From the president of the Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am glad to tell you that I join with Dr. Malone, director of the Travelers Research Center, in endorsing your proposed bill.

From Mr. Thomas F. Malone, director, Travelers Weather Research Center, Travelers Weather Service, Hartford, Conn.:

Your active interest in a matter of deep concern to New England is much appreciated, and, as a meteorologist, I am happy to endorse your proposed bill.

The loss of life and property from hurricanes has been so great that a concerted program of research on this problem seems obviously justified.

From the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I think there is no question but that the east coast is entitled to the additional protection that a better hurricane warning system might provide. I think in these days of needed reduction in budget, one should hesitate to ask for even a modest increase in appropriations, but this is a case where I have no hesitancy in recommending an enlargement of Government facilities.

From the president of the Bankers Fire Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala.:

I think this bill is splendid and very worthwhile work and that it certainly should be approved.

From the vice president of the Northeastern Insurance Company of Hartford, Hardford, Conn.:

Your proposal, H. R. 5260, is to protect the lives and property of 2 million American citizens living in the immediate vicinity of newly menaced coastal zones, and we all here at this company readily concur in your proposal. We wish you complete success in this undertaking.

From the president of the Phoenix Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.:

I am in favor with the purposes of this bill and believe that, if passed, it will perform a very useful service to many millions of citizens and property owners in the Atlantic coastal area from Maine to Texas. The payout on claims by property insurance companies such as ours for the storms in 1954 was a rather devastating experience and naturally resulted in a substantial underwriting loss to our company. Anything that can help people to protect their property by being alerted in advance would be advantageous and interesting to our industry.

The advantages in being alerted to storms can accrue to insurance companies through loss prevention by protecting property when advices of an approaching storm are available. Closing shutters, securing doors, and moving contents, particularly from exposed property on the waterfront, can go a long way in keeping the ravages of wind from doing unnecessary damage.

Rest assured we are in favor of your bill.

From the Committee on American Steamship Lines:

Improved hurricane detection is desirable and your efforts to assure adequate provision for this purpose are very much in the public interest.

From the American Boat Builders & Repairers Association, Inc., 2382 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.:

We know that such a bill will be greatly appreciated by our members and we are accordingly advising them of it and requesting that they support it.

From the New England Council, Statler Building, Boston, Mass.:

In a recent survey of New Englanders' opinions of issues before Congress there seemed to be substantial support for the services proposed in your bill. Unlike many of the other issues on which opinion was solicited where there was a fairly equal division of opinion, the vote was more than 3 to 1 in favor of increasing the appropriation to the United States Weather Bureau for more intensive study and reporting on hurricanes.

Congratulations on your preparation and submission of this bill. The New England Council intends to support it and we wish you the best of luck in gaining its passage in the House.

From the New Orleans Board of Trade, New Orleans, La.:

We are in favor of your proposal that an emergency hurricane warning system be improved to provide better protection.

From the Dixon Sintaloy Inc., Stamford, Conn.:

I am in complete agreement with the need for a satisfactory appropriation for hurricane warning service to the eastern seaboard.

Your bill, H. R. 5260, certainly should serve to provide the means for saving many times over the amount of the appropriation required.

From the PM Industries, Stamford, Conn.:

We support enthusiastically the legislation which you propose and hope that the necessary action will be taken to enact it.

The appropriation under consideration to enable the United States Weather Bureau to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system would be of benefit to the manufacturers in our area, and our company in particular.

From the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn.:

We shall be very happy to go along with you on anything that we can possibly do.

There is no question but what these hurricanes have done a terrific job in Connecticut. No one was prepared for hurricanes which we had not had in quite a number of years, but it is quite evident that we can look for many more of them and we should be better prepared than what we are.

From the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Administration Building, Fish Pier, Boston, Mass.:

What happened in New England during the hurricane which visited us last fall indicated a willful lack of an adequate warning system.

The matter of preserving life and property as much as can be humanly expected should be of immediate concern to our Federal authorities.

The commercial fishing industry of New England is a hazardous occupation at best and a timely and adequate Federal weather forecasting system would aid immeasurably in reducing the perils of fishing during the season in which we are subject to sudden changes in the weather.

From the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.:

Members of this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry, who operate on all of the inland waters of the Nation, suffered severe losses during hurricanes last year and thus, I am sure, will actively support the above-mentioned bill in the hope that much of these losses can be eliminated in the future.

From the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers Council, 308 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.:

The matter of appropriating $5 million, in order that the United States Weather Bureau may be enabled to establish and operate an emergency hurricane warning system, was discussed with a number of manufacturers who are members of the Stamford-Greenwich Manufacturers' Council. This matter was also brought up at our executive committee meeting, and I was authorized to write to you in support of this bill.

I do not need to advise you on the extent of damage done by wind and high water in this area.

Certainly the appropriation you ask, which would serve the entire eastern seaboard, is well justified. We believe that effective and reliable warning service, provided by the United States Weather Bureau, is imperative.

From the president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

I should like to assure you of my personal support for your measure, which would seem to me to be of great advantage to the American merchant marine, as well as to others affected by weather and hurricane conditions.

From the Executive Director, Rhode Island Development Council, Providence, R. I.:

I believe that all New England Congressmen and Senators should use every effort to see that this type of legislation becomes a reality.

From universities.

From the head of the department of meteorology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.:

Since our department is in the forefront of research on the problem of hurricanes, we are keenly aware of the need for action on the part of the Congress.

We are urging our friends to support your bill or a similar proposal to achieve the same end, as well as any well-conceived proposal which will meet the urgent requirement for a hurricane research and development program.

Your active interest in the hurricane problem is a source of gratification to professional meteorologists and a great service not only to your constituents but to all the millions of Americans who live along the Atlantic seaboard and the gulf coast.

From a professor of meteorology at Blue Hill Observatory of Harvard University of Milton, Mass.:

I was much pleased to see a news dispatch that you had filed a $5 million independent appropriation bill to provide greatly expanded forecast facilities up and down the east coast.

A forecast's accuracy depends mostly on the adequacy of the information available. In my opinion, the greatest inadequacy affecting forecasting for New England is the lack of a complete and dependable surface and upper air station in the Atlantic Ocean a few hundred miles offshore.

I think your proposal is definitely worthwhile.

From the chairman of the department of meteorology and oceanography, College of Engineering, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y.:

My colleagues and I in this department are well aware of the importance of this bill

for the welfare of the population in the affected area.

You have in preparing this bill, of course, been in touch with our Weather Bureau and know the excellent work which they are doing with inadequate financial means. Your bill will go far toward remedying this situation. It is very gratifying to know of this support for meteorology in Congress, and to find a realization of the contribution which meteorology can make to the welfare of the Nation.

The effects of this bill will be of great benefit to the people in the regions visited by hurricanes, including the people of New York State.

Your bill will go far toward alleviating the financial difficulties impeding the development of a really adequate warning service.

If ship station Hotel had been available in the fall of 1954 much property damage and many casualties could have been avoided.

From the president, American Meteorological Society, 3 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.:

It is most encouraging to learn that some of our representatives in Congress realize that the weather service in this country deserves more, not less, support. In the long run such support will, I feel sure, result in a net savings to the taxpayers through a more efficient weather service.

I believe the records will show that for last season, involving only Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, insurance companies paid some $276 million in claims (New York Times of December 26, 1954). I know there must have been many additional millions of dollars spent by individuals which do not appear on the record since several members of my own family in Rhode Island suffered uninsured damage as a result of last season's storms. Thus it seems to me that the expenditure of $5 million to improve the storm warning service for the protection of our citizens is a very modest outlay to accomplish the desired objectives.

We in the American Meteorological Society have for some time been concerned about the problem of severe storms of all types. The Council of the American Meteorological Society recently voted that the Council recognize deficiencies in the State of our knowledge of severe storms, particularly tornadoes and hurricanes, and strongly endorse an increased research effort in this area.

That in view of the great losses of life and property suffered by our citizens from the destructive action of tornadoes and hurricanes, the American Meteorological Society recommends that special funds be appropriated to enable the United States Weather Bureau, in cooperation with other public and private agencies, to conduct research projects on tornadoes and on hurricanes, along the lines of the successful thunderstorm project of several years ago.

From the head of the meteorology department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.:

I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this important matter which affects the life and property of so many persons on the eastern and gulf coasts of this country.

You are to be commended for your active interest in these problems and for your realization that the Weather Bureau must have additional funds if real progress is to be achieved.

From the editor of Motor Boating magazine, 572 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.:

We are much interested in your bill which we hope will receive favorable action by Congress.

In addition to the above letters, I have received dozens of letters from Representatives, Senators, and governors of the Eastern States and the States in the Gulf of Mexico area, warmly endorsing my bill, H. R. 5260. They have not only written to me expressing their vital interest in the passage of this bill, but have frequently called me and have offered their support. In addition, I have received letters from private citizens who are not connected with any particular company or organization who have wished me well in my efforts to secure congressional support for increased protection against the loss of life and property from hurricanes.

Some more excerpts from letters received:

From the executive vice president of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

It is known that the various hurricanes which have visited the Northeast section of our country have done a great deal of damage to property insured by our members. Hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel, last fall, were particularly devastating.

The advance warning of approaching storms should give more opportunity for protection of property and possibilities for moving such property to safer locations. Accordingly, the marine insurance underwriters are definitely interested in any provisions and actions leading to adequate and timely warnings of hurricanes and severe windstorms.

We wish to express our appreciation of your foresight in presenting this legislation.

From the general manager of the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.:

Surely, the Weather Bureau services are invaluable to the people of this country. If additional funds are needed in order to make the Bureau more useful, such funds should be made available within proper limits.

We appreciate fully the great damage which many of us suffered at the hands of hurricanes Carol, Edna, and Hazel.

From the executive vice president of the Hartford Chamber of Commerce, Hartford, Conn.:

May I commend your alertness in watching out for the interest of southern New England in this peculiar climatic change which we are undergoing.

General manager of the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex.:

We have on many occasions suffered losses from hurricanes and we would like very much to have the Gulf of Mexico coast included in H. R. 5260.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following:

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED SPECIAL AND IMMEDIATE HURRICANE-WARNING PROGRAM

1. To reduce unnecessary loss of life and property in all coastal States from future hurricanes.

2. To reduce unnecessary interruptions, costly protective action, and time-consuming precautionary measures of thousands of business firms and millions of citizens in fringe areas of expected hurricane paths.

3. To reduce unnecessary fear and apprehension in areas in or close by the expected paths of future hurricanes.

4. To increase the value of hurricane forecasts to the people of 19 coastal States who need better and more precise information as to expected wind speeds, water levels and times of hurricane occurrences.

5. To enable the Weather Bureau:

(a) to provide an improved hurricane-warning service immediately.

(b) to give locations, speeds, directions, and intensities of future hurricanes with more accuracy than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(c) to describe present and expected weather conditions in and surrounding future hurricanes more accurately than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(d) to provide alerts and warnings of future hurricanes 6 to 12 hours farther in advance than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(e) to distribute essential hurricanes reports and warnings with greater speed, efficiency, and certainty than has been possible for past hurricanes.

(f) to give complete and accurate forecasts of high-water levels for all occupied coastal areas subject to inundation.

HOW THE ABOVE OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED

(a) Secure appropriations to carry out a special and immediate hurricane-warning program of the United States Weather Bureau starting June 1, 1955 and as long thereafter as may be necessary to avoid unnecessary loss of life and property from hurricanes.

(b) Secure the above appropriations in addition to the funds contained in the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce Weather Bureau submitted to Congress in January 1955 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

(c) Secure appropriations for both of the above programs, and also for a hurricane research and development program for fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958.

WAYS IN WHICH REQUESTED FUNDS ARE TO BE EXPENDED BY THE WEATHER BUREAU

1. To provide staff sufficient to keep Weather Bureau offices open 24 hours a day in 10 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where existing Weather Bureau offices are now open only part time.

2. To provide technically trained staff sufficient to reopen Weather Bureau offices in 5 coastal cities from Maine to Texas where formerly existing Weather Bureau offices have been closed.

3. To operate special teletypewriter, facsimile, telephone, and radio networks for the prompt relay of meteorological information used in forecasting hurricanes and major storms, and used for instantaneous distribution of hurricane warnings and alerts to all areas and citizens concerned.

4. To provide staff and observing equipment to operate 12 additional rawinsonde stations in the United States east of the 100th Meridian and in other selected land areas adjoining the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean; and to provide staff and supplies at existing rawinsonde stations to take required upper air observations at 6-hourly intervals instead of at 12-hourly intervals during the hurricane season.

5. To provide additional weather observations during storm periods from merchant ships traversing the western Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico.

6. To provide additional forecasters, additional meteorological chartmen, and additional communicators to provide around-the-clock hurricane forecasting watches at each of the following six hurricane forecast centers: Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

7. To establish an improved high water warning service to inform coastal areas of approaching high storm tides, damaging waves, and other coastal inundations from abnormal water levels and floods associated with hurricanes and heavy coastal rainstorms.

8. To provide meteorological staff and facilities for emergency hurricane warning

centers and for mobile storm-warning squads to supplement the local Weather Bureau staffs during the intense activity accompanying the approach and passage of hurricanes and major storms; and afterward to survey and review (a) the quantity and quality of hurricane reports, alerts, and forecasts, (b) the times, places, and amounts of hurricane information distributed by all news media, (c) the protective action taken by all concerned, (d) and the types and amounts of hurricane damage incurred.

9. To reestablish the ocean weather ship station formerly located halfway between New York and Bermuda and maintained there by the United States Coast Guard for 12 years prior to its removal in June 1954.

10. To carry out a cooperative private and governmental Public Information Program involving important aspects of hurricane alerts, hurricane warnings, the changing characteristics of moving hurricanes, and the precautions that should be taken by citizens in the forecast path of future hurricanes to save lives and property.

Shall We Continue To Penalize Widowed Mothers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest American traditions is the concern which we have always shown for widows and children in the community. Yet our social-security law, through its principle of canceling benefits for outside earnings above a given amount, continues to work a terrific hardship on many of the widowed working mothers in our land. I, therefore, am today introducing a bill which would remove this penalty clause with regard to the benefits received by widows having dependent children in their care. I am convinced that this so-called retirement test is a gross inequity as it applies to any social-security benefit, and I have introduced a bill to remove it entirely. But it seems to me to be an especially grievous penalty as it applies to working mothers who have been widowed.

We know that the working mother incurs additional expense because she must make some provision for the care of the children during her working hours. Yet if she earns more than a given amount existing law will deduct the benefit awarded to her, thus further reducing her income. The average mother's benefit today is only $38 a month. Surely, in this great and productive country of ours it is not necessary to pinch pennies in this respect. Surely it is not wise public policy to exact a penalty which is concerned with a widow's mite.

The costs to the social security system of making this change would be relatively minor. Currently the number of widowed mothers receiving social security benefits is around 270,000. As I have said, the average benefit they receive is only $38 per month. Can we, in good conscience, believe that we cannot make the change in our social-security system because of the amount of money which is involved? The answer is obvious.

But to the 270,000 mothers involved the regular monthly benefit is a very important item, even though its amount is so small. None of us need be told of what an additional $38 per month can mean in meeting the needs of a growing family. This amount may represent the difference between good medical care and inadequate care in some families. In others it could represent the difference between good nourishing food and just enough food.

Early this year, hundreds of mothers working for the Federal Government learned how important these benefits were to the family budget. For beginning January 1, 1955, the effect of the retirement test was extended to cover all earnings from any source. Previously mothers working in the Federal Government had received full benefits without penalty because they were not working in employment covered by social security. They are still not covered by social security, but they have lost the right to the "mother's benefit." My bill would restore to them the benefit which they formerly received, and extend the same privilege to other widowed mothers in similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must consider the circumstances of these working mothers. At the death of their husbands too many of them are practically forced to go to work to provide adequately for their children. The very act of getting a job adds to their expense, for adequate care for the children must be provided, and this costs money. On their shoulders rests the full family responsibility for providing for the children's future. Is this the kind of situation in which we should be exacting penalties?

I believe that it is not. The Congress has recognized the particular problem of widowed working mothers, by providing tax relief for them because of their added expenses for child care. I believe this Congress should act, on the same grounds, to remove the existing penalty against these same mothers as it applies to social-security benefits.

I urge your support for my bill, which would amend the Social Security Act to provide that no deduction on account of outside earnings shall be made in the case of widows having dependent children in their care.

Civilian or Military Leadership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, May 21, 1955:

So many military men are being sent on special diplomatic missions and are serving in other civil positions in Government that we begin to wonder if they are not gaining too much influence in the determination of our foreign policy, and in their impact on American life.

If this trend continues, we could find ourselves living in a garrison state, even though we are not engaged in actual war.

This raises the question as to whether in checking the spread of communism we are relying too heavily upon military and economic factors.

Of course we need armed strength, because that alone prevents the Communists from conquering the world by force.

But it does not prevent Communist infiltration, and it does not win the allegiance of wavering nations who look for more positive and constructive signs of leadership.

Make no mistake about it, we have very competent military leaders who are unsurpassed in their field. God knows we need them. If we did not have a strong Military Establishment, led by skilled and experienced professionals for whom the Communists have a realistic respect, our situation would be desperate.

It is not my purpose to suggest that our military leaders are seeking supremacy over the civilian authorities. I simply raise the question: "Are we not taking the lazy and dangerous way of expecting too much from them? Are we not inviting military control and direction by failing to think out and decide upon other factors in the shaping of our foreign policy?"

Up until 1917 we had little to do with the rest of the world, busy as we were with the development of our own country. Yet even under these circumstances, and from the time the first settlers stepped ashore in the New World, we were determined that civilians should guide the destiny of the American people.

This principle assumes greater importance, now that we have become the champion of freedom versus communism. The tired nations of Europe that have been weakened by wars, and the young nations of Asia that still remember and resent the white man's domination of them, backed by military force, will not cooperate with us if we insist on material power to conquer all problems.

Our own Declaration of Independence, in registering its protests against the tyrannous acts of George III, pointed out that, and I quote: "He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislature. He has affected to render the military independent of, and superior to, the civil power." The Bill of Rights incorporated in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 echoed the now familiar refrain that "as, in time of peace, armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without the consent of the legislature; and the military power shall always be held in an exact subordination to the civil authority and be governed by it."

As a result of the victories in the Revolution and in succeeding wars, in nearly all of which militiamen and volunteers bore the brunt of the initial fighting, the conviction of the American people that a formidable Regular Army was not a necessity became progressively stronger. It has only been in recent years as our responsibilities became worldwide that our traditional military policy has undergone public reexamination.

On the other hand, a gross slighting of defense forces can prove a tragically expensive luxury. Gen. Emory Upton, in his famed analysis of America's military policy from the Revolution through the first 2 years of the Civil War, observed that, and I quote: "Twenty thousand regular troops at Bull Run would have routed the insurgents, settled the question of military resistance and relieved us of the pain and expense of 4 years of war."

It is here that we must separate militarism, which dominated Germany under the Kaisers, which overthrows governments in South America today, and reaches for supreme power in Red Russia and Red China, from the military way with which democracies must defend themselves from actual or would-be aggressors.

Every war is fought and every army is maintained in a military way and in a militaristic way. The distinction is fundamental and fateful, according to Alfred Vagts. The military way is marked by a primary concentration of men and materials on winning specific objectives of power with the utmost efficiency, that is, with the least expenditure of blood and treasure. It is limited in scope, confined to one function, and scientific in its essential qualities. Militarism, on the other hand, presents a vast array of customs, interests, prestige, actions, and thought associated with armies and wars and yet transcending true military purposes. Indeed, militarism is so constituted that it may hamper and defeat the purposes of the military way. Its influence is unlimited in scope. It may permeate all society and become dominant over all industry and arts. Rejecting the scientific character of the military way, militarism displays the qualities of caste and cult, authority and belief.

Elihu Root, onetime Secretary of War, statesman and sage, in a testimonial to his country's men at arms, delivered in 1899, declared that:

"No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a political agent. No one ever knew of the American Army seeking to make itself a Pretorian guard to set up a president or an emperor. Whenever the enlarged Army of the United States finds the duty of the hour accomplished it melts back into the mass of the people unnoticed. When the Civil War was over, the million men under Grant's command took their way to their homes. The greatest military power which to that day had ever existed, never dreamed for a moment of threatening the institutions of our free Government."

After World War II, I might add, we also demobilized suddenly, this time with unfortunate consequences, leaving a vacuum into which communism moved.

Since the start of World War II the armed services have not only pervaded the public consciousness as never before but have also exercised an unprecedented influence on educational, economic, and political affairs.

Fully cognizant of their newly won power and prestige, military leaders have not hesitated to venture into other fields beyond their accustomed purview.

The censorship imposed in recent years by the services has been almost limitless. A great deal of information which probably should have become public property has been labeled "secret" and buried from civilian view. It is not the democratic way to misuse security requirements for the purpose of concealing blunders, waste, or political maneuvers.

The prominence in world affairs, political as well as military, attained by America's top military figures since the advent of World War II, and the high incidence of succession by our generals and admirals to major civil responsibility, have constituted one of the most important public developments of the postwar period. It would appear to Arthur Krock, keen editorial writer of the New York Times, that "If the world remains an armed camp, possibly aspirants to public life should investigate the curricula of (American) service academies."

Or as Quincy Wright observed as a result of the second global war that enlisted the active services of more Americans than ever before:

"It has left the American people with a greater disposition than at any previous time to trust professional military opinion and to employ the military method in foreign policy. It is clear that if armies increase in size, and if military experience extends to a larger and larger proportion of the population, the military mind is more likely to become characteristic of the national mind."

Objections to the use of the military in civil positions are impressive. The career soldier may be dictatorial and uncompromising, a natural result of lifelong discipline. He tends to ignore public opinion and, sometimes, even to slight civilian rights, and military methods of organization have been known to make for inefficiency when applied to civilian projects.

It has been urged in some quarters that soldiers be barred from doubling as diplomats, if only because the use of the military in key civil posts, especially in the Foreign Service, has led friendly observers abroad to wonder whether the United States has become imperialist-minded.

Most of us are certain that this is not so, but we cannot ignore this reaction among other people.

I am not going to mention the long list of professional officers who have served and are serving in sensitive civilian posts and as officials of our Government both here and abroad.

I refrain from doing this out of grateful respect for their military services.

However, in view of our Nation's traditional belief in the civil supremacy over the military, and in view of the disturbing trend toward the employment of military personnel in civilian posts, I believe that the American people should think hard about this contradiction and of the effects it may have upon American life and upon foreign policy if this emphasis gains strength.

I reiterate that under present world conditions we must have a modern and competent Military Establishment.

But the extension of that power and influence throughout the whole fabric and functioning of American life poses the serious question of the protector gradually assuming the role of master.

Unintentionally, perhaps, but pervasive.

The pressures of the cold war may test us for many years to come.

This is no excuse, however, for subordinating other strengths and value to a dependence upon economic and military factors.

The concentration on things military, and the selection of military men for civil positions in Government is a disturbing development.

Many Americans are dismayed by the successive retreats in our foreign policy regarding Asia. The "keep 'em guessing" strategy of the administration seems to be working on its authors. There is no other way to excuse the day-to-day confusion resulting from bold pronouncements, followed by ill-concealed diplomatic appeasements. Somewhere the rudder has been lost.

While this indicates lack of intellectual courage and moral stamina on the part of some civilian leaders, it is no reason why we should delegate all responsibility to the military mind.

From the great resources of the American people, their faith in God, their sense of justice, and their passion for freedom, we should draw the balanced strength to do what is right.

In the long run, that is our surest guide.

Statesmen and generals must never forget that they are servants of the American people and are duty bound to represent the best in our traditions.

Neither arrogant militarism nor cowardly compromises will see us through.

Instead of a manic-depressive foreign policy, we should build one that includes all the constructive values that are summed up in the basic integrity of a well-informed, generous, and courageous public opinion.

It is we the people who must lead.

The National Townsend Convention, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of Americans who, in my estimation, could properly be classed as the veterans of a half-century of productive output in America which is almost beyond belief. On May 2 of this year, representatives of this "veteran's" group met in St. Petersburg, Fla., where they had the opportunity of honoring their great patriarch, Dr. Francis Townsend. Since that day in September 1933, when this retired country doctor sat down and wrote a letter to a Long Beach newspaper, he has been carrying forward his great fight for security in declining years.

In the depths of a deep depression, Dr. Townsend dared to say two very important things. He demonstrated his faith in the American people by declaring that the way out of want and despair in years of retirement lay in increasing our productive power as a nation. Secondly, he dared to say that the aged members of our national community are entitled to a decent retirement income which will assure them of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rather than a mere pittance which barely keeps them alive.

The passing years have demonstrated that his faith in our country and its productive power was justified. His concept that assured retirement income, with no questions asked, is the right of American workers, was incorporated into the Social Security Act of 1935. In the years which followed the Townsend organization has been in the forefront of every movement for the improvement and extension of the social security system. They have continued to perform the function—so vital in a democracy—of keeping us all informed as to the weaknesses and inequities in the structure of our economy, which form the dangerous hazards on the road of our continuing quest for a better life for all Americans.

On the occasion of the recent Townsend Convention, I forwarded the following message to St. Petersburg:

On the occasion of the 15th national convention of your fine organization, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for your outstanding progress in the past and, I'm sure, for the tenacious and optimistic program which you have planned for the future. Since my first day in office as Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District, I have been a stanch advocate of your commendable plan, one which most certainly should receive further consideration from the Congress of the United States. Your organization very definitely can count on me to assist you in your future endeavor to alleviate the chronic problems of old age. Again, permit me to extend my congraulations to you at this time and I trust that your program is a successful one. I will have the occasion of your national convention duly noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

From all over the land Americans assembled to mark the gains which the organization has made so far and to stake out goals for the future. The nature of these goals speak of the spirit of the Townsend movement. For today Townsendites are engaged in communities throughout the land in a crusade against the lien laws, which require recipients of old-age assistance in many States to sign over their homes before they can receive a penny of relief. They are campaigning against the shame lists which make the names of old-age assistance recipients in many States a matter of public record subject to inspection. They are appropriately concerned with the residence requirements which deny any relief at all to too many of our senior citizens.

The Townsend movement is broad in its scope and great in its goals. Its program is built upon a concept of the rights of Americans—the right to freedom from want; the right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources; the right to decent housing; the right to the respect of the community based on service to the community; and the right to live with dignity as a free human being. I salute the spirit and purpose of the members of this great organization for the breadth of their vision and the courage and humanity in their hearts.

Merry-Go-Round on the Niagara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Buffalo Evening News carries the headline "MILLER Calls Democratic Bills on Falls Power Socialistic," and the article which follows goes on to explain how my colleague, Congressman MILLER, of Lockport, feels that two Democratic-sponsored measures for development of power at Niagara Falls by the New York State Power Authority are "varying degrees of socialism." On the very next page of the same issue appears another interesting headline on the same subject "Private Power Couldn't Profit in St. Lawrence," Moses says, and below that in subheadline type, "That's Why Five Concerns Gave Up on That Project and Now Seek Falls Development. He Charges." In the article which follows, Chairman Robert Moses, of State power authority, fires a return salvo at the sponsors of private-power development. But examining still another and earlier issue of the News, we see that even the "two Democratic-sponsored measures are not in agreement," as we read the headline "LEHMAN Denounces Niagara Power Bill—Will Submit His Own." In other words, the Senator from New York State is displeased, to say the least, with the bill sponsored by the New York State Power Authority.

We see three different viewpoints, each one sincere, each one has its points, and all are in complete disagreement. But there is one thing they all say together, as one man, even though you have to read between the lines to see it. They say, "Here is concrete evidence that the stalemate on Niagara power which has now continued for 5 long years, at a cost of $300 million in lost power, will continue for some time yet." They reflect the fact that with a Republican administration in Washington and a Democratic Congress, and a Republican New York State Legislature, and a Democratic Governor, it would be little short of a miracle if the controversy which has raged over the Niagara for 5 long years were settled overnight.

All of this controversy points up more eloquently than anything I could say, the need for immediate passage of H. R. 5377 which I introduced last March 30. It simply calls for immediate construction of power development works on the Niagara by a nonpartisan, nonpolitical construction agency, so that construction can proceed while these divergent interests are settling their differences. In that way, the project will be finished and not just beginning when those differences are settled, as they some day must be.

A recent editorial in the Buffalo Evening News accurately captures the spirit in which I introduced this bill. It recognizes the disastrous stalemate which has imposed a stranglehold on this essential project for 5 years, and which threatens to continue indefintely into the future. It realistically appraises the chances of complete settlement of the whole Niagara problem at this session of Congress, and it finds them not very good. It observes the nonpartisan character of my bill for immediate construction, and the fact that it is not inconsistent with any final solution which is ultimately adopted, whether now, or 4 or 5 years from now, because construction started today, will not be completed for that length of time. It notes that Canada, which can use our share of the power until we are in position to use it, has now completed its project, not 1 year ahead of us, as originally feared, but 5 years ahead of us if we started today. It recognizes that passage of the Radwan bill would itself act as a spur to the setlement of the differences which plague the Niagara, and that other pending bills are natural extensions of my bill for immediate, nonpartisan construction, and not inconsistent with it. It repeats the sober statistics that the value of the American share of this power, which has flowed over the falls since the 1950 treaty authorized us to develop it, is $300 million; that if we started today, $300 million worth would run over the falls before we finished.

Almost $10 million worth of power has run over the falls since I introduced my bill, and while it has languished in committee. Meanwhile, Buffalo and the Niagara frontier are denied power which they need for their industries, and to attract new industries; and the State and the Nation are denied their full power potential at a time when we need all we can get to meet the growing power behind the Iron Curtain. A recent editorial in the Washington Evening Star points out that the need for more electrical power in this country is doubled every 10 years.

As I stated to the chairman of the Public Works Committee in a recent letter urging him to report out this bill, I have no pride of authorship in it. If anyone has any ideas which will improve it and speed its passage, I will be pleased to consider its amendment, so long as I can preserve its basic intent. But who can, in good conscience, oppose its basic intent? This is one situation where we can only lose, not gain, by the passage of time.

Rock Island Arsenal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the defense appropriation bill for 1956 was recently presented it contained a provision that—

> No part of the funds appropriated in the act could be used for the disposal or transfer by contract or otherwise of work traditionally performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless it has been justified before the appropriate committees of Congress that the disposal is economically sound and that the related services can be performed by a contractor without danger to national security.

The object of the provision was to protect the work performed by civilian personnel in the Defense Department from being given to private contractors unless such disposal or transfer could be justified before the appropriate committees of Congress. In other words, it was designed to protect the continuation of work done in our arsenals, navy yards, and so forth.

An attempt was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to strike this provision out of the bill.

I have consistently supported various proposals to get the Government out of business as I felt the Government should not compete with private business when the work can be done just as economically outside. I believe the Government should not take over functions which can properly be justified by private industry; and if it has done so, I believe it should withdraw and not be a competitor of free enterprise.

On the other hand, proper functions of the Government should be retained by the Government. I believe the work at our arsenals is such a proper function and should not be turned over to private industry. The arsenal at Rock Island is such an example. Besides repair work on arms and other ammunition of war as laid out by Congress in 1862, it carries on research development for the Ordnance Corps, manufactures and assembles material as required for the effective accomplishment of assigned missions, and performs functions of maintenance and supply.

There are hundreds of skilled workers who have been especially trained for these jobs. Some families have devoted themselves to these skills for generations. The arsenal at Rock Island has as fine or finer machine tools than any private manufacturing plant I know of. To turn this work over to private industry is not in the best interest of economy.

I voted against the Vinson amendment because I did not want to take any chances of eliminating the work at the Rock Island Arsenal by having it assigned to private industry in other parts of the country. Not only have I tried in this instance to protect the fine work being done at this arsenal but I have made every attempt to get additional work allocated there in an effort to increase the workload and avoid unemployment.

The American Exporter and the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at the 56th annual meeting of the Rice Millers Association held in Washington on May 12 and 13, my colleague, the Honorable T. A. THOMPSON of Louisiana, delivered a significant address which is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress.

He and I have much in common besides the fact that we both bear the same name. We represent districts which are tremendous producers of rice. We also have deep-sea ports with their attendant problems of ocean shipping. Mr. THOMPSON is on the Merchant Marine Committee, where I served with a great deal of satisfaction for a number of years. I still retain my deep interest in our American Merchant Marine—a vital component of our national defense, and a mighty force in maintaining peaceful commerce in the world of civilized nations.

I commend to each Member of Congress the address of Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana, which I insert in the RECORD herewith.

THE AMERICAN EXPORTER AND THE MERCHANT MARINE

(Address of Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, 56th annual meeting, the Rice Millers' Association, May 13, 1955)

Mr. Reid, members of the Rice Millers' Association, and distinguished guests, when your president, Mr. William M. Reid, asked me to address this group today, he requested that I talk on a topic that would be related to my committee work in Congress as well as to the interests of the rice marketing trade. He suggested that perhaps my work with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee might provide a great deal of information of interest to rice millers and other segments of the rice industry, all of whom engage in or are affected by export business.

There are times when it takes a tremendous stretch of the imagination for a congressional speaker to relate his committee work to the particular interests of the group which he is called upon to address. That is certainly not so with me here today, and I am very happy to have this opportunity to talk with you briefly about two subjects which mean a great deal to me: the American merchant marine and the rice industry, both of which are of prime importance to the economy of my home State, Louisiana.

Prior to going into a discussion of current day rice problems and the merchant marine consideration in connection therewith, I would like to express at this time my sincere appreciation to the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, chairman of the Rice Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, the members of the subcommittee, and all of my colleagues in the rice-growing areas for their extremely generous and active help in matters so important to us in Louisiana. If the remarks I have prepared for this meeting are repetitious in any manner, I only hope that they are not too far different from those stated by my cousin from Texas, as I feel sure that any statement made by him can be considered as authoritative.

I am sure the major problem confronting this convention is that of high rice production in the United States which, based on a report of the Department of Agriculture in December 1954, was expected to reach a total for 1954–55 of 50,106,000 hundredweight (rough basis). Of this amount, plus a 7.6 million hundredweight carryover from the 1953–54 crop, about 27 million hundredweight, it was estimated, would be domestic consumption and 26 million hundredweight exported, leaving a carryover of about 14 million hundredweight. However, because of political policies followed by the administration (unless the State Department changes its policy of interferring), our exports this year will amount to only about 20 million hundredweight, which will leave us with a carryover probably in excess of 20 million hundredweight. According to the Department of Agriculture, this carryover is an all-time record as compared with the 1948–52 average of 2.8 million hundredweight. We, therefore, find ourselves in a very unusual position when it is borne in mind that prior to World War II average rice exports were about 2¼ million hundredweight (milled) as against the average for the past 3 years of 16½ million hundredweight (milled rice). Thus, where export production prior to World War II was only 17.6 percent of the rice milled in the United States, now well over one-half of our production, or 55.7 percent, is dependent upon export markets.

Most of this increase has come about through the loss of production in the Asiatic countries in the chaotic period following the war, with a special upsurge of demand during and following hostilities in Korea. Today, however, there is beginning to be a return to high production in the Far East, with a consequent downward trend in the price of rice from the record levels of 1952–53. From recent reports which I have had an opportunity to examine, the subject is a very complicated one with many ramified economic aspects. Various proposals have been made, such as a two-price marketing plan, to enable the American industry to retain its present high level of production and efficiency, and yet compete in the world market, maintain or increase domestic consumption, and avoid the building up of wasteful surpluses.

In this connection several years ago representatives of the fishing industry of northeastern United States appeared before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to tell of their problems with regard to world competition. One witness, complaining of competition in the domestic market from foreign imports, indicated that the industry would be in sound condition if domestic consumption of New England fish could be increased. The suggestion was made by a committee member that perhaps this problem could be met if Lent could only be made a little longer. To date that suggestion has not been successfully put into effect. Similarly, talking off the top of my head, I might try to help by suggesting that increase in domestic rice consumption could be brought about by governmental action designed to encourage a greater number of marriages each year as a stimulus to the sale of rice supplies.

However, I believe I realize my limitations well enough to leave that problem to your domestic marketing experts who make a full time job of selling rice to the American consumer. I will confine my remarks to a matter I have given a great deal of thought during the past few years.

I think it is safe to say that during this past Congress the most important legislation considered by the Merchant Marine Committee was the proposal which, when enacted into law, became the Cargo Preference Act. This act, Public Law 664, provides, among other things, that at least 50 percent of all cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States flag vessels, to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for United States flag commercial vessels. The Cargo Preference Act enacted into general law the principle which has been spelled out in every individual foreign-aid program since the war. It conforms with the spirit and intent of our national maritime policy which recognizes the need for an American merchant marine sufficient to transport a substantial portion of our waterborne commerce and to serve as military or naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency. We hoped, with the enactment of this legislation, that Congress would not be confronted with irrelevant speechmaking in opposition to the 50–50 principle, diverting attention from the main issue every time proposals are brought up for consideration involving the disposal of surplus commodities to our friends and allies elsewhere in the free world. We thought, and I am convinced, that the provisions of this act are eminently fair and reasonable and, in fact, necessary in the national interest so long as vast Government-aid programs substitute for a large portion of our normal foreign trade. So did a majority of both Houses and the President, as attested by the approval of the Cargo Preference Act on August 26, 1954.

Notwithstanding the action of the Congress and the President on this legislation, the enemies of an American merchant marine and those of our own citizens who believed that the simple and obvious answer to the most economical transportation of our foreign trade is to withdraw all Government support and turn the business over to the merchant marines of other nations are still at work trying to undermine the Cargo Preference Act. No sooner had the 84th Congress convened than stories began appearing in the American press that the administration's program for sale of farm surpluses overseas is "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in Public Law 664." These stories would have had you believe that the law makes it mandatory that 50 percent of agricultural products must be shipped in American vessels, irrespective of the availability of tonnage or the reasonableness of rates. They would have had you believe that greedy American shipowners were using the law to gouge the American farmer and the American Government. The stories made no reference to the fact that under this law if American-flag vessels are not available at reasonable rates, then foreign-flag vessels may be freely used.

Our committee, which has made a close study of this problem in relation to the needs of the American merchant marine for

a number of years, was very much disturbed at the untrue and unfair charges leveled at the Cargo Preference Act. It was even more disturbing and very significant to find that coincident with the publicity in the American press similar attacks were being made in the shipping journals of Europe.

In the course of hearings held on the administration of the Cargo Preference Act in February 1955, it seemed clear that much of the opposition to the act came from the efforts, direct or indirect, of foreign nationals to undermine the legislation. No matter how the opposition would state it, it is obvious that their goal is to compel the reduction of the American merchant marine so they may increase transportation for their own shipping at the same time they are saying it is discriminatory and wrong for us to want only 50 percent of the business which we are giving away.

To the best of my recollection, I have received no complaints from members of the rice industry in my area about the operations of our 50–50 policy in foreign-aid programs or any charges that the American merchant marine is an unnecessary burden on the taxpayer. Nevertheless, I feel that it is timely to raise the subject before you, because it has been the agricultural interests of the Nation which have been the misguided opponents to this important bulwark of our national transportation policy.

Perhaps I know why I have had no complaints from my gulf coast friends and constituents. They have seen and enjoyed the prosperity which has come to the gulf coincident with—and I believe attributable to—the upbuilding of modern American-flag ocean shipping services sailing from our ports. The American gulf coast now lined by flourishing port cities served by several leading American-flag cargo lines, with service to all parts of the world, was once wholly dependent for its export-import trade upon foreign-flag carriers which furnished a sporadic service or withdrew altogether except during the seasonal peak cargo movements of cotton, rice, and other products.

The danger of placing reliance upon imprudent or shortsighted policies of dependence on foreign-flag shipping was graphically emphasized by Mr. Solon B. Turman, president of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., when, in an appearance before the southeastern area transportation conference of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in New Orleans on February 3, he discussed the predicament in which the American shipping industry found itself only 40 years ago. Mr. Turman said:

"This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine just before World War I that our ships were carrying only 9 percent of our export-import trade. When war broke in Europe we were still a neutral Nation and found ourselves without ships even for our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed. Goods and materials piled up on the docks. As an example, in August 1913, we exported 257,000 bales of cotton. In August 1914, only a year later, this dropped to 21,000 bales. And because we did not have the ships to make deliveries, the price of cotton dropped from $62.50 a bale in July 1914, to $36.25 in December of the same year."

During that period much of the foreign-flag shipping, upon which we had been relying, was withdrawn because of the European hostilities. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions and due to the absence of sufficient American ships, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. When the war got going full blast, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent. Contrast this with our experience in World War II, when we had providentially developed at least the beginning of a modern American flag merchant marine. Despite the vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent. Therefore, I must agree with Mr. Turman when he said, "It seems incredible that the need for an American flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate." Yet there are, even today, many Americans, including some in high quarters, who have yet to learn that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than our first line of defense. It is our advance line of action. It is our protection against the enemy on the economic front long before our first line of military defense is called into action.

Our experience in World War I should provide example enough to all Americans that our domestic economy cannot depend on foreign flag merchant marines to carry our export and import trade. But, lest anyone feel that things have changed in the past 35 or 40 years, let me refer to a clipping from a recent issue of the Financial Post, published at Toronto, Canada, which provides a current dramatic example of the effect of too few national flag merchant ships on a nation's economy. Within the past few years our good neighbor, Canada, decided it could not support an adequate merchant marine, with the result that most of its merchant fleet left the Canadian flag. Let me read briefly from this story:

"Swiftly climbing ship charter rates are causing a serious vessel shortage at both Canadian coasts, which is interfering with export orders.

"Because of a worldwide lack of available bottoms, shippers are having to pay almost 100 percent more for cargo space in Vancouver and about 60 percent more in Halifax than last summer. * * *

"With the high world demand for merchant ships, foreign-flag vessels have been diverted from servicing Canadian ports to the more profitable trans-Pacific and Mediterranean runs.

" 'This,' W. J. Fisher, general manager of the Canadian Shipowners Association, told the Post 'is one of the disadvantages of not having an adequate Canadian flag merchant fleet. Canadian ships must come home, because they have Canadian crews. A Canadian flag fleet would go a long way in eliminating the current shipping shortage.' "

Let me cite just one more example of our need for an American merchant marine supported by our Government and supported by our exporters and importers. I do not believe it is generally realized that better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea during the recent war was supplied by American ships. So, let's look at rice export statistics. For the period 1950–51, 271,000 bags of American rice were shipped to Korea; in 1951–52 shipments totaled 2,821,000 bags; and, in 1952–53 American rice exports to Korea consisted of 4,631,000 bags. I think it is fair to consider that wartime devastation and postwar rehabilitation were largely responsible for such heavy imports by a rice-producing nation. But, my point is that during their period of great need the American rice industry was able to supply the demand with almost full dependence upon American-flag shipping.

Naturally we cannot depend, nor do we have any desire to depend upon the misery and domestic dislocations of our friends abroad for the creation of our export markets. But, we can depend upon a strong American flag merchant marine to create new international trade through the operations of their trade development and promotion departments. Our home-based shipping industry is eager to assist American businessmen to develop new sales markets abroad.

American steamship companies have trade development offices located in every State in the Union, manned with trained specialists to work with industrialists, businessmen and financial people in developing new markets or locating new sources of supply. As a result of these combined trade development activities of American flag lines, over 2,000 domestic and foreign firms are personally contacted every working day of the year and offered the assistance of this vast international network of trade promotional facilities. Fifteen subsidized American steamship lines operate 113 domestic promotion offices, 143 foreign offices, and employ 900 foreign and domestic freight agencies. Through their membership in shipping conferences it costs no more to ship via an American cargo liner than aboard a foreign liner.

Let me mention 2 leading American shipping companies with their home port in New Orleans, and with operations of frequent, regular and dependable service all over the world. I refer to Mississippi Shipping Co. (Delta Line), and Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. The strength of the economy of the Gulf States means more to them than anything else in the world. They are dedicated to giving the gulf area rice exporters unfailing service. They are dedicated to giving that service to all American exporters and importers and to do everything within their power to increase the flow of trade through the gulf area. Their services will be available when foreign flag shipping disappears for whatever reason. The same, of course, is true of all of the companies in our American merchant marine but I could not resist an opportunity to put in a plug for these 2 great companies from home.

With the vastly higher standards of living in the United States as compared with those of competitive maritime nations, our merchant marine is naturally at a disadvantage because of the big spread between United States and foreign costs of ship construction and operation. The wage differential alone demonstrates the problem of operating American ships in competition with our foreign friends. The average monthly wage cost of operating an American-flag cargo vessel in 1952 was $24,500, as against $4,100 under Japanese registry, $5,100 under German registry, and $6,500 under British registry. Therefore, we must offset that differential in some way if we are to maintain the merchant marine which our commerce and security require. Our Government meets this problem by the granting of subsidies only sufficient to place the American-ship operator on a cost parity with his foreign competitor. In return, the operator agrees to have available at all times the equipment and the know-how to provide frequent, regular, and dependable service to the American businessmen and the vital logistic support required in times of war and national emergency.

The opportunity which has come to me during my 2½ years of service in the Congress and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has given me the unshakable conviction that support of a strong American merchant marine is one of the cheapest forms of insurance which this Nation can have, and provides the greatest assurance that our foreign trade will develop and prosper. Your voluntary patronage of the American merchant marine will go a long way toward increasing your selling power in the markets of the world.

Who Should Blush Over Echo Park?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a recent incident emphasizes how deeply felt is the Echo Park issue involved in the up-

per Colorado River storage project. So intense is the feeling, so deeply has the issue of invading the National Park System touched the conscience of the American people, that a great newspaper has gone out of its way to attack an innocent action of conservationists who are defending Echo Park against spoliation.

So touchy has this Echo Park subject become that an innocent letter of invitation to membership in the Wilderness Society, in which no mention is made of Echo Park, has been interpreted by the Denver Post, in an editorial entitled "They Should Blush," as a sinister attack on the upper Colorado River storage project.

Psychologists tell us that when we are insecure about our beliefs, we do irrational things. Can it be that the Denver Post, for which I have the utmost respect, is not very secure in its position that Echo Park Dam should be built and thus forever ruin the Dinosaur National Monument and pave the way also to other invasions of our National Park System?

Can it be that the Denver Post's tortured misreading of the conservationists' simple little letter or invitation to membership is an indication that those who are pressing for the proposed Echo Park Dam need the solace of believing that those who are opposing it are dishonest and sinister and that therefore the proponents' position—however uneasy—is justified?

It requires a very touchy conscience indeed to read into the straightforward general invitation to membership sent out by the Wilderness Society, a highly respected conservation organization, the kind of meaning which led the Denver Post to say editorially that conservationists "should blush" to send out such material.

It needs a very touchy conscience indeed to say of the photograph printed with this membership invitation that "it looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington." As a matter of fact, the photograph is of Mount Adams in the Mount Adams wild area, in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in Washington, chosen for no other reason than that it is an unusually fine picture of a wilderness area, illustrating all in one photograph: water, forests, and mountains.

Why should the Denver Post think the mere publication of a photograph—whether of Mount Rainier or of Mount Adams—is "suspicious"? I can think of only one reason: The Denver Post was implying that the Wilderness Society was trying to mislead people into thinking the photograph represented the Dinosaur National Monument.

If so, how foolish can people get? Only an uneasy conscience would suggest that an organization which knows the parks, monuments, and wilderness areas in the way that the Wilderness Society does, would be witless enough to try to pass off a photograph of Mount Adams—or Mount Rainier—for a photograph of Dinosaur or its Echo Park—areas so unlike each other that any novice can recognize the difference.

The Wilderness Society has answered the Denver Post's attack and has pointed out that the conservationists' opposition to Echo Park Dam is on the record in statements fully explaining their position and made in the deepest sincerity.

Says the society's executive secretary, Mr. Howard Zahniser, addressing the Denver Post:

> However you or others may differ from us as to conclusions, it seems to us that a full understanding of our position and our statements must lead to a respect for our sincerity and for our competence. We have based our recommendations on first-hand observations in the area involved, and on a searching examination of the principles with which we are concerned and the policies involved, and we feel that we have arrived at conclusions that are in the public interest from a national point of view and that also are considerate of the interest of our fellow citizens in the region most immediately concerned with the proposed upper Colorado River storage project.

Far from blushing over their stanch and earnest insistence that the Echo Park Dam is unnecessary to the upper Colorado River storage project and over their presentation of evidence that such a dam would not only ruin the Dinosaur National Monument but would be also the entering wedge for the invasion of other national parks and monuments, the conservation organizations should, in my opinion, be proud.

They deserve the plaudits of the American people for their efforts to prevent the exploitation of our parks and monuments for the purposes contrary to those for which they were established.

With facts and figures, carefully worked out and presented to congressional committees, the conservation organizations have shown that the water needed by the upper Colorado States can be supplied without destroying the Dinosaur National Monument.

The conservation organizations have stood four-square—and continue to stand—as the bulwark against the invasion of our national parks and monuments. They represent the public conscience on conservation questions. They grind no personal axes.

Attacks on their integrity are without foundation in truth and will not turn them from their honorable purpose of protecting the public interest.

The editorial entitled "They Should Blush" from the Denver Post for May 2, 1955, is as follows:

> We have discovered recently, with more sorrow than anger, that some of our best people are not above using trickery and exaggeration in their campaign to stop the Echo Park project.
>
> We refer to the members of various organizations devoted to protecting nature from nasty human beings who are constantly in search of more water to drink and more water to put on crops.
>
> We knew these people would not approve of Echo Park Dam which would drown out a couple of canyons in a semiarid region which may look prettier to them than to the rest of us, but we expected them to keep their opposition within the realm of the factual. We were fooled.
>
> Suddenly more nature-protecting societies than we ever heard of have sprung into the battle with reckless propaganda which would make an old-time circus press agent blush.
>
> There is, for example, the recent pamphlet put out by the Wilderness Society. Its front cover is a picture of a mountain lake, a dense forest and a snow-covered peak in the background. (It looks suspiciously like Mount Rainier in Washington.)
>
> Opening the pamphlet the words that first strike your eye at the top of page 3 say, "Here they propose a dam which would substitute a 'millpond' for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest."
>
> Of course, there is no direct statement that the scene on the cover is the one that would be despoiled by Echo Park Dam. But we believe any reader not acquainted with the site of the proposed dam would get the impression that calamity was about to befall an area comparable to Mount Rainier.
>
> Then there is another pamphlet just received from the Emergency Conservation Committee. This pamphlet has an actual Colorado River scene on its cover. But it outdoes the California opponents of Echo Park in its scare technique.
>
> Californians are shouting the upper basin storage project, of which Echo Park is a key part, would cost $4 billion. The Emergency Conservation Committee has raised the cost to $15 billion. We won't be surprised if the next pamphlet to come in will say $50 billion.
>
> According to the emergency committee, "Not one teacupful of water from the dam at Echo Park would reach the water-impoverished people." That argument, of course, is pure chicanery and we are sorry to see our best people using it. Such tactics can do a lot of harm to the cause of legitimate nature protection in the long run.

The pamphlet referred to is a "Dear Friend" letter from the Wildernes Society, 2144 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., signed by its president, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, as follows:

> DEAR FRIEND: If you are like most Americans, you have imagined—or even experienced—the wilderness; lofty mountains, vast carpets of forest which cover their slopes and valleys between them, white water of rushing streams and waterfalls, placid lakes, and ponds—all of these untouched, unmolested by man.
>
> Some people are fortunate enough to experience it, to walk its rough trails, climb its mountains, and paddle its lakes; to feel its noonday heat, hear the night breeze sighing in the treetops overhead, and absorb the peace and serenity of the stars.
>
> Some of us have just to imagine it, or relive past experiences in it, or hope that one day we shall have such opportunities, or that our children will have them.
>
> But all of us can take satisfaction in knowing that some wilderness is still to be found in America, even after three and a half centuries of exploitation. And we hope that we shall continue to have some of it—some samples of our original America, where forests remain uncut, streams undammed and unpolluted, the earth free of the pockmarks of mining, the mountain meadows ungrazed except by wild animals native to them.
>
> We hope, but we are not too sure.
>
> Shortsighted, practical men are threatening the diminishing areas of our original heritage, even those which have been set aside for preservation.
>
> Here they propose a dam which would substitute a millpond for the waters which now plunge between walls of glorious canyons. There they would substitute stumps for our already pitifully small remnant of virgin forest, the growth of centuries, which other, more farsighted, men have struggled to hold inviolate.
>
> Nowhere, unless we can defend it sturdily and persistently, can we be sure of handing on to our children, and to their children, any part of the wilderness. It needs a spokesman.

The Wilderness Society exists so that all of us may work together, effectively, to protect these wild lands. The society is a defender of the national parks and the wilderness areas of the national forests and of all lands dedicated to the preservation of wilderness and the natural scene.

Will you not play a part in this effort by joining the Wilderness Society? Your membership will contribute to the welfare of future generations; it will be an investment from which, we are sure, you will profit in profound and lasting satisfaction.

Incidentally, your membership will entitle you to receive the society's beautiful quarterly magazine, The Living Wilderness.

Sincerely yours,

OLAUS J. MURIE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, is there trickery in this letter, or exaggeration? After all, I wonder just who should be blushing over this Echo Park incident?

Government Pursuant to the Constitution or Government by Treaty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress who is interested in the question of law by treaty, a statement by the Honorable George A. Finch, a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association. Mr. Finch presented this statement to the Senate subcommittee which is considering Senate Joint Resolution 1, called the Bricker amendment.

In this statement, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Finch answers many objections that the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 have raised. The statement follows:

GOVERNMENT PURSUANT TO THE CONSTITUTION OR GOVERNMENT BY TREATY?

(Statement by George A. Finch, member of the bar of the District of Columbia; vice chairman of the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association, May 11, 1955)

The title I have given to this statement poses the question that this committee and the Senate of the United States are called upon to decide in considering Senate Joint Resolution 1. I am appearing in support of the resolution. I reject the argument that government by treaty is government pursuant to the Constitution. According to the Supreme Court, the Constitution does not require that treaties be made pursuant thereto. (*Missouri* v. *Holland*, 1920 (252 U. S. 416).)

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TREATIES

Everybody admits that no treaty has ever been declared unconstitutional. In my opinion no treaty will ever be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because of its repeated holdings that the conduct of foreign relations is committed to the political departments of the Government "and the propriety of what may be done in the exercise of this political power is not subject to judicial inquiry or decision." (*Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co.* (1918 (246 U. S. 297), and the earlier cases cited in Senate Report No. 412 made by the Senate Judiciary Committee on S. J. Res. 1 during the last session of Congress.) Accordingly, all statements by the Supreme Court that it is now the law that treaties may not violate the Constitution or do what it forbids have only the value of dicta. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will require the Supreme Court in future cases to give judicial sanction to what it has said on this point in the past.

In 1928, the then Chief Justice of the United States, Hon. Harlan F. Stone, warned the American Bar Association of the striking extension of Federal police power during the last 30 years through the exercise of the treatymaking power. (Address of Chief Justice Stone, report of the American Bar Association, 1928, vol. 53, p. 259.) This process had received great impetus from the decision of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland, supra.*

In the following year, former Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, and a future Chief Justice of the United States, speaking before the American Society of International Law as its president, referred to the "new line of activity" which "may in the future give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treatymaking power." (Proceedings of the American Society of International Law, 1929, pp. 194–196.)

APPROPRIATE SUBJECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

There seems to be general acceptance of the view that treaties should only deal "with an appropriate subject of international agreement" (Report of the committee on amendments to the Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, signed by the late lamented Hon. John W. Davis, former Solicitor General of the United States, and the Honorable William D. Mitchell, former Attorney General of the United States), and to subjects "which pertain to our external relations" (Mr. Hughes cited supra.)

The report of the New York State Bar Association conceded that if a treaty dealt with a subject not "appropriate for international agreement" then "the rule announced in *Missouri* v. *Holland* would operate to give the Congress power to implement the treaty by legislation which it could not enact in the absence of treaty and thus enter a field heretofore reserved to the States." Mr. Davis, before his death, opposed Senate Joint Resolution 1. The only suggestion his committee made to limit government by treaty and restore government pursuant to the Constitution was that "Treaties outside the normal field of international agreements and which can be used as a device to enlarge the powers of the Federal Government and diminish those of the States should be opposed as not within the treaty power." This is the position taken by Secretary of State Dulles on May 2 during the present hearings. That is to say, every time a President of the United States decides that treaties of the character deplored by Mr. Davis' committee and Secretary Dulles should be a part of our foreign policy, you Senators will be required to choose between the Constitution and the administration for the time being in power. Senate Joint Resolution 1 is designed and intended to safeguard the fate of the Constitution from the vicissitudes of partisan politics.

Mr. Hughes did not live to take part in the present debate; but he left the following indication of his views:

"If we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdictions of the States * * * there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treatymaking power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treatymaking power." (Cited supra.)

At the same time Mr. Hughes pointed out that the power to make treaties "is a power that has no express limitations attached to it," and he refused to "voice any opinion as to an implied limitation." He added: "The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such." Senate Joint Resolution 1 would resolve that doubt.

TREATIES AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

It is apparent from the foregoing that the crux of the problem involved in the present proposal for a constitutional amendment is the delimitation of a recognizable and acceptable line in treatymaking between subjects that are properly within the exercise of that power and subjects that are not. In the language of international and constitutional law the problem is expressed by the difference between matters regarded as "domestic" or "foreign," "internal" or "external," "interior" or "exterior." The difference is indicated in other countries by the official designations of their government departments charged with the conduct of international relations. There are departments of foreign affairs, departments of external affairs, and departments of exterior affairs. In the United States the ambiguous term Department of State is used.

The committee of the American Bar Association of which I am a member approached the drafting of a constitutional amendment by seeking a phraseology that would delimit the respective areas of domestic and foreign affairs in terms of the subject matter of treaties. That task is difficult because according to international law a domestic matter becomes foreign whenever a treaty is concluded on any subject. (Opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague in the Tunis-Morocco Nationality Question, 1923, Hudson, World Court Reports, vol. 1, p. 143.) That was the position taken by the Department of State during the last administration in justification of its participation in a series of treaties which would bypass the reservation embodied in the Charter of the United Nations that "Nothing contained in it shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state" (art. 2, par. 7). Our committee concluded that it would be futile to continue to seek distinction between domestic and foreign affairs in the subject matter of treaties, especially when we were confronted with an official publication of the Department of State, with a foreword by President Truman, which opened with the assertion "There is no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." (State Department Publication 3972, released September 1950.)

DOMESTIC MATTERS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Our committee then sought a delimitation, not in international law, but in the constitutional law of the United States. In our research we found that abuse of the treaty-making power, to which Mr. John Foster Dulles so forcefully called our attention in his address before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association at Louisville, Ky., on April 12, 1952 (see his speech quoted in S. Rept. No. 412, supra, p. 5), was among the sources of objections to the ratification of the Constitution of 1787. "To allay fears that the new National Government might seek to exercise powers not granted, and that the States might not be able to exercise freely their reserved powers," the tenth amendment was adopted. (*United States* v. *Darby*, 1941 (312 U. S. 100)). Thomas Jefferson,

leading advocate of the Bill of Rights, held the view that if the treatymaking power were unlimited "then we have no Constitution." After the Constitution was ratified and the Bill of Rights adopted he wrote as follows in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice:

"By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those objects which are usually regulated by treaty, and cannot be otherwise regulated. It must have meant to except out all those rights reserved to the States; for surely the President and Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way."

This interpretation of Jefferson, shared by two former Chief Justices of the Supreme Court in the present century, was adopted by the Committee on Peace and Law of the American Bar Association as containing an appropriate line of demarcation between domestic and foreign matters for the purposes of the exercise of the treatymaking power under the Constitution of the United States. That view prevailed during the infant years of the Nation and for many years into more modern times. In 1836 the Supreme Court held that "Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the Federal jurisdiction nor can it be enlarged under the treaty-making power." (*New Orleans* v. *United States* (10 Peters 662, 736).) This holding was reversed by the Supreme Court in 1920 in the decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*. Senate Joint Resolution 1 seeks to restore the treatymaking power to its rightful place in our Federal system.

In his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, Mr. Justice Holmes stated that "The case before us must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago." As a supporter of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I would bring Mr. Justice Holmes up to date and counter with the suggestion that the merits of that resolution should not be considered in the light of what Mr. Justice Holmes said 35 years ago.

RESERVATION OF DOMESTIC MATTERS BY THE SENATE

The interpretation of the Constiution by Jefferson has been confirmed by a long series of reservations appended to many treaties by the Senate before their approval by that body. For example, when the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the Charter of the Organization of American States on August 28, 1950, it did so subject to the reservation that "none of its provision shall be considered as enlarging the powers of the Federal Government of the United States or limiting the powers of the several States of the Federal Union with respect to any matters recognized under the Constitution as being within the reserved powers of the several States." (S. Doc. No. 87, 83d Con., 2d sess., p. 177.)

U. N. CHARTER AND DOMESTIC QUESTIONS

No reservation was attached to the Charter of the United Nations because it had embodied in it the reservation of domestic matters I have already quoted. Without that integral reservation it is doubtful that the charter would have received the advice and consent of the Senate by the requisite two-thirds vote; but, as I have indicated, the two preceding Executives sought to bypass the reservation in the manner described. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will restore the true meaning and effect of article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter in the sense that its original sponsors intended.

A comparable provision in the League of Nations Covenant was a limitation only on the powers of the League Council, but at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco the sponsoring governments transferred the paragraph in revised form to its present position in the charter as "a governing principle for the whole organization and its members." The official explanation of this change was given to the Conference by Mr. John Foster Dulles, of the United States delegation, who said that it was required by the broadening of the scope of the organization's functions, particularly in respect to economic, social, and cultural matters. It was intended, in partciular, he said, to require the organization in carrying out its economic and social objectives to deal with governments, instead of allowing the organization to "penetrate directly into the domestic life and social economy of the member states." (U. N. Conference on International Organization, Documents, vol. VI, pp. 507–508.)

Friendly commentators on the charter of the United Nations have this to say on the meaning of paragraph 7 of article 2:

"There can be little question of the importance of the paragraph. It establishes the principle that certain matters are to be excluded from the competence of the United Nations to act, in much the same way that the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States together with the other provisions of the Constitution limit the sphere of action of the Federal Government." (Charter of the United Nations, by Prof. Leland M. Goodrich, of Brown University, then director of the World Peace Foundation, and Edvard Hambro, then registrar of the International Court of Justice of The Hague.)

Those authors proceeded in their interpretation as follows:

"The practice of the United Nations makes it clear, as indeed does the phraseology of article 2 (7), that the word 'intervention' as used in the paragraph is not to be given a narrow technical interpretation. While discussion does not amount to intervention, the creation of a commission of inquiry, the making of a recommendation of a procedural or substantive nature, or the taking of a binding decision constitutes intervention under the terms of this paragraph." (Ibid., p. 120.)

BYPASSING ARTICLE 2, PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE U. N. CHARTER

Compare this analysis of the true intent and meaning of this reservation of domestic affairs from the jurisdiction of the United Nations, with the actual program of the Economic and Social Council as described by the Director of the United Nations Division of Human Rights:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals, and therefore a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of States. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supranational supervision in this relationship between the state and its citizens." (Mr. John P. Humphrey, in Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, January 1948.)

The reason for a large segment of opposition to the proposed amendment was stated by the New York Times in an editorial of April 8, 1953, as follows:

"The resolution is dangerous because it forbids any treaty that would allow any foreign power or any international organization (meaning the U. N. or one of its agencies) to control the constitutional rights of American citizens within the United States 'or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States'."

At this point it will be enlightening to insert the opinion of another leading opponent of Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the constitutional position of the United States in the United Nations. I refer to Dr. Edward S. Corwin who maintains that—

"The question whether the United States should enter an international organization for the promotion of peace and of what pledges it should give with respect to the use of its constitutional powers to the same end, is one which the appropriate agencies of the National Government are free to decide on grounds of national interest, substantially unfettered by Constitutional Limitations of any kind." (The Constitution and World Organization, 1944, p. 30.)

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE TREATYMAKING POWER

When it was first proposed to substitute a treaty for constitutional amendment to enlarge the power of Congress for the protection of migratory birds, voices were raised in Congress against the future risks involved to our Constitution. On February 7, 1913, the Honorable Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, in opposing the first Federal Migratory Bird Act, said in the House of Representatives:

"Mr. Chairman, we live in the midst of revolution—revolution proposed and revolution threatened. It is true there are few open avowals of revolutionary intent; no armed forces hostile to our form of Government and to our institutions thunder at our gates or threaten our liberties. On the contrary, the forces of revolution, though they have among their leaders many supremely selfish and inordinately ambitious and some thoroughly irresponsible and consciousless men, are in the main composed of entirely well-meaning people, who, carried away by their enthusiasm or by the claims and sophistries of others, fail utterly to realize that they are the advocates and supporters of a revolutionary cause.

"This is a Government we are sworn to uphold. The portion of the sovereignty of the people which they have surrendered, or, rather, agreed to exercise jointly under a National Government, is set out in the Constitution in language reasonably clear and explicit; and that is the instrument we are sworn to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic, which includes well-meaning enemies as well as willfully wicked ones." (Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 11, 1954, p. 1578.)

Today, with Western civilization in a struggle for survival with atheistic communism, the risks predicted by Mr. Mondell exist to a greater degree and extent than when he spoke some 30 years ago.

Prior to the establishment of the United Nations, treaty stipulations with respect to individuals were limited in scope to the rights of aliens, in consideration of mutual concessions of similar treatment of citizens residing or doing business abroad. After the United States became a member of that organization representatives appointed by the President actively participated in United Nations programs to expand the area of international negotiation beyond the rights of aliens so as to include as matters of international concern the rights of citizens vis-a-vis their own governments and within their own countries. (See, for example, the Genocide Convention signed and sent to the Senate for approval, and the Covenants on Human Rights awaiting final action.)

That program, so candidly described as revolutionary by the United Nations Director of Human Rights (Mr. Humphrey, previously quoted), was lauded by President Truman and his State Department as "one of the great revolutionary enterprises." (State Department Publication 3972, previously cited.)

We do not dissent from the official admissions of the revolutionary character of those United Nations activities. The extraordinary parallelism between the United Nations Covenants on Human Rights and the Soviet Constitution has been shown in some detail by Dr. Felix Morley, who asserts: "Actually, a large part of the Soviet Constitution was almost textually embodied in these U. N. Covenants." (Treaty Law and the Constitution, New York, pp. 36–37.)

Senate Joint Resolution 1 has been drafted and is being supported by those who are

opposed to that kind of a revolution. We do not agree with Mr. Dulles that the raising and discussion of the question has reversed the dangerous trend in our ideological thinking and that no action need now be taken. We urge that this Trojan horse in our constitutional bulwarks be now removed against the time when the revolutionists will return to power and be in positions of authority to continue where they left off. The President and Secretary of State are not permanent officials of the Government. A constitutional amendment has been adopted to limit the President's tenure of office.

ATTEMPTED SEIZURE OF THE STEEL MILLS

An example of what Mr. Dulles meant when he said at Louisville that treaties might take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President was President Truman's attempt to seize the steel mills. His Executive order of April 8, 1952, was issued 4 days before Mr. Dulles made that statement. The President directed the seizure of that private property without due process of law, among other reasons "to fulfill our responsibilities in the efforts being made throughout the United Nations and otherwise to bring about a lasting peace," and because "American fighting men and fighting men of other nations of the United Nations are now engaged in deadly combat with the forces of aggression in Korea, and forces of the United States are stationed elsewhere overseas for the purpose of participating in the defense of the Atlantic community against aggression" (16 Federal Register, p. 3503). In other words, President Truman claimed and exercised this implied Executive power as flowing from the United Nations Charter, the NATO Treaty, and the war power, the last-mentioned being vested solely in Congress by the Constitution. The Supreme Court in a divided opinion on June 2, 1952, held 6 to 3, that the seizure was unconstitutional and without authority of law. (*Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. et al* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579).) A change of 2 votes in favor of the President's action would have reversed the Court's decision and made that Truman doctrine the law of the land.

Apologists for the minority opinion in the Steel Mills case deny that the case involved the treaties referred to. If that denial be true, why did the late Mr. Justice Jackson in his majority concurring opinion find it necessary to answer the President's foreign policy justification of his act, as follows:

"I cannot foresee all that might entail if the Court should endorse this argument. Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than that declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress. Of course a state of war may in fact exist without a formal declaration. But no doctrine that the Court could promulgate could seem to be more sinister and alarming than that a President whose conduct of foreign affairs is so largely uncontrolled, and often even unknown, can vastly enlarge his mastery over the internal affairs of the country by his own commitment of the Nation's Armed Forces to some foreign venture" (343 U. S., p. 642).

It is the purpose of the constitutional amendment now pending to remove the danger that a future Supreme Court will uphold a President's unconstitutional views of Executive power under treaties.

IN PURSUANCE OF THE CONSTITUTION—MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND

The facts of this notorious case are so well known as not to require repetition. Mr. Justice Holmes' decision was doubtless in the mind of Mr. Dulles when he warned the American Bar Association at Louisville 4 years ago that treaties were liable to override the Constitution. Compare his statement with what Mr. Justice Holmes said: "No doubt the great body of private relations fall within the control of the State, but a treaty can override its power."

It was in *Missouri* v. *Holland* that Mr. Justice Holmes also relied upon the phraseology of the supremacy clause of article VI of the Constitution to distinguish between acts of Congress which "are the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are declared to be so when made under the authority of the United States." This subcommittee is in possession of a letter, which I hope will be printed in full in the record of these hearings, containing the explanation of this variance in those descriptive words in article VI. The letter, dated April 27, 1955, is from Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, of Evanston, Ill., who, I believe, was formerly a Member of Congress.

Mr. Pettengill calls attention to a rare law book entitled "A View of the Constitution of the United States," written by Mr. William Rawle, a distinguished lawyer of Philadelphia, and published in that city in 1829. Mr. Rawle explains that at the time of adopting the Constitution certain treaties existed which had been made by Congress under the Confederacy, and that the words "under the authority of the United States" were considered as extending equally to those previously made and to those which should subsequently be effected. But, Mr. Rawle continued, although the former could not be considered as made pursuant to a Constitution which was not then in existence, the latter would not be "under the authority of the United States," unless they are conformable to its Constitution. In short, since the ratification of the Constitution, the words "under the authority" and "in pursuance" mean the same things so far as treaties are concerned. As Mr. Pettengill says in his letter, "This point seems to have been completely overlooked by Justice Holmes when he wrote his opinion in the migratory bird case." Senate Joint Resolution 1 will remedy the learned Justice's oversight.

As stated by the Attorney General before this subcommittee on May 5, the "in pursuance" language was introduced into Senate Joint Resolution 1 in an amendment proposed by former Senator Homer Ferguson in the 83d Congress. When he introduced the present revised version of the resolution, Senator BRICKER stated that he desired to retain Senator Ferguson's language. In debate Senator Ferguson denied that the "in pursuance" clause was intended as a substitute for the so-called which clause. Since I agree with Senator Ferguson on that point, I am supporting the retention of the "which" clause as contained in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, now under consideration, but with an amendment I shall shortly suggest.

DEFINITION OF "TREATY"

Opponents have raised the question of the meaning of "internal law" as used in section 2. In his statement of May 2 before this subcommittee, Secretary Dulles said: "It might be construed to mean affecting the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings." I shall be glad to answer that argument, but, first, I think it is more important to define the meaning of the word "treaty" as used in the Constitution, as well as in section 2.

In international usage, the word "treaty" is generically applied to a formal agreement between sovereign states. Other words are often used synonymously, as "convention," "agreement," "pact," "covenant," "protocol," "charter," and even "statute." The use of the word "treaty" is not confined exclusively to public-law transactions. In private law "treaty" signifies the discussion of terms which immediately precedes the conclusion of a contract or other transaction (Black's Law Dictionary).

No doubt exists as to the meaning of the word "treaty" as used by the framers of the Constitution. In defending the treaty-making power against objections to the ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist (No. 75) that treaties "are contracts with foreign nations" and "agreements between sovereign and sovereign." He stated explicitly that "the power of making treaties relates neither to the execution of subsisting laws nor to the enaction of new ones." The legal force of treaties, he added, is derived "from the obligations of good faith; they are not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject."

Hamilton's explanation removes what would otherwise be a conflict between two provisions of the Constitution relating to the exercise of the legislative power. Article I, section 1, provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." No residuum of legislative power accordingly remains to be exercised by the President and Senate under their treatymaking power. The provision of article VI that treaties shall be the supreme law of the land must mean that treaties in their contractual sense are binding upon the States and enforceable in their courts.

In his testimony before this committee on May 2, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles repeated certain statements he made 2 years ago which are so strikingly similar to Hamilton's concept that I beg leave to quote him again in juxtaposition with Hamilton's statement in the Federalist. Mr. Dulles said:

"This administration is committed to the exercise of the treatymaking power only within traditional limits. By 'traditional' I do not mean to imply that the boundary between domestic and international concerns is rigid and fixed for all time. I do mean that treaties are contracts with foreign governments designed to promote the interests of our Nation by securing action by others in a way deemed advantageous to us. I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

Mr. Dulles confirmed and reenforced his previous statement by adding:

"I believe that it reflects a pattern which will be followed by the executive branch of Government and enforced, if need be, by judicial determination that, under our system, treaties are contracts between nations in their corporate capacity, and not means for writing domestic law."

The Constitution denies to the States the power to enter into any agreement or compact with a foreign power without the consent of Congress (art. I, last paragraph). The power to make treaties, under the authority of the United States, in the nature of contracts as explained by Hamilton, and now accepted by Secretary Dulles, is an essential counterpart of the denial of that power to the States. As stated by Mr. Rawle, the treaty clause was never intended to validate treaties or agreements not made in pursuance of the Constitution. The President and Senate when making treaties, or the President alone when making other international agreements, are acting as the agents of the people and Government of the United States. Their powers as agents are stated in the Constitution. They have no more authority to exceed or violate those powers than has an agent to disregard the powers conferred upon him by his principal in the making of a private contract.

THE MEANING OF "INTERNAL LAW"

The expression "internal law" is used in contradistinction to "international law." The two terms denote the distribution of the supreme power, called sovereignty, by which a state is governed, and which may be exercised either internally or externally. According to Henry Wheaton:

"Internal sovereignty is that which is inherent in the people of any State, or vested

in its ruler, by its municipal constitution or fundamental laws. This is the object of what has been called internal public law, droit public interne, but which may more properly be termed constitutional law." (Elements of International Law, 1836, Dana's ed. 1866, sec. 20.)

To complete the comparison with international law, I also quote Wheaton's explanation of the meaning of that term:

"External sovereignty consists in the independence of one political society, in respect to all other political societies. It is by the exercise of this branch of sovereignty that the international relations of one political society are maintained, in peace and in war, with all other political societies. The law by which it is regulated has, therefore, been called external public law, droit public externe, but may more properly be termed international law."

Henry Wheaton's Elements of International Law was the first complete treatise on international law written by an American. He was an eminent authority on that subject because of his ripe experience with the law of nations and in diplomacy. He was also well versed in our constitutional law, as for many years (1816–27) he was reporter of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. His Elements went through many English and American editions. It was translated and published in a number of foreign languages, including French, Italian, and Chinese.

MISSOURI *v.* HOLLAND RECONSIDERED

The Supreme Court in the case of *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, 1890 (133 U. S. 258), declared "that the treaty power in the United States extends to all proper subjects of negotiations between our Government and the governments of other nations." No one supporting Senate Joint Resolution 1 denies the validity of that basic principle of both constitutional and international law.

Reviewing the migratory bird case in the light of what has been said regarding the meaning of the terms "in pursuance of," "under the authority of the United States," "treaty," and "internal law," and of the extent of the treaty power to include all proper subjects of negotiation with foreign governments, subject to the limitations indicated by Messrs. Hamilton and Dulles, I submit that the same decision in that case might have been reached without striking down the 10th amendment and thus opening a Pandora's box of abuses nowhere better described than by Mr. Dulles at Louisville.[1]

In the Migratory Bird Case, Mr. Justice Holmes found that "here a national interest of very nearly the first magnitude is involved. It can be protected only by national action in concert with another power." That finding was adequate to bring the subject-matter within the first requirement of treaty making. Had he then forgotten his obsession as to the difference in meaning of the qualifying phrases "in pursuance of the Constitution," and "under the authority of the United States," and applied the correct concept of the meaning of the word "treaty" in the Constitution as in the nature of contract and not of legislation, the migratory birds would still be migrating and propagating without let or hindrance from the American Bar Association, Senator BRICKER, or any other supporters of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Since the determination of issues in judicial or administrative proceedings does not fall within the category of legislative law, Mr. Dulles fears as to the effect of section 2 on such determinations are unfounded. The same assurance can be made concerning the fears expressed by opponents that section 2 would interfere with the daily conduct of the Government's minutiae of administration which do not rise to the dignity or importance of legislation under the Constitution. The validity of such transactions should be tested by the applicable laws of Congress enacted for that purpose.

The retention of section 2 of the resolution is now necessary if the Constitution is to be safeguarded in the future against the destructiveness of the Holmes principles foisted into that document by his decision in *Missouri* v. *Holland*.

OBJECTIONS TO SECTION 2 OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1—48 STATES' APPROVAL

Opponents have persistently circulated the propaganda that this section, if adopted, would require that all treaties be approved by the legislatures of all 48 States of the Union and thus return the Nation to its status under the Articles of Confederation. This propaganda is wholly untrue. The section would not require the approval of the legislature of any State of the Union to any treaty before it becomes effective. To put an end to this unjustified criticism, I now suggest that the text be amended by inserting the words "by Congress" between the words "legislation" and "valid" in line 6 of page 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1. These words were in the text approved by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on February 26, 1952. (See report of the committee on peace and law through United Nations, Feb. 1, 1952, p. 3.)

THE WHICH CLAUSE

The insertion of the suggested amendment would make it imperative that the final clause of section 2, "valid in the absence of international agreement," be retained. Otherwise the amendment would confirm the worst feature of the Holmes principle in *Missouri* v. *Holland*, that is, that by a treaty the Government of the United States can confer upon itself legislative power which it does not have otherwise under the Constitution. If we substitute the word "contract" for the word "treaty" in the Holmes decision its real significance as a legal paradox becomes obvious.

The which clause has met with the most violent opposition on the ground that its adoption would cripple the President's powers in international negotiations and require the approval of all 48 States of the Union to future treaties. If opponents argument is sound, then we must conclude that the framers of our Constitution left this Nation in the position where it is dependent upon a foreign nation or nations by treaty to confer power upon Congress to legislate upon matters of vital concern to our citizens and Government. That is an utterly absurd dogma in either constitutional or international law. That ridiculous position of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 was demolished years ago by the Supreme Court when it upheld the power of Congress to abrogate a treaty by law. The power of abrogation by Congress could not be derived from the power to make treaties vested in the President and Senate. Would opponents contend that Congress does not have the power to abrogate treaties since it is not among the expressly delegated powers? Here is the answer to that question given by the Supreme Court itself:

"The National Government is vested with power over the foreign relations of the country, war, peace, and negotiations and intercourse with foreign nations, all of which are forbidden to the State governments. It has jurisdiction of all those general subjects of legislation and sovereignty which affect the interests of the whole people, equally and alike, and which require uniformity of regulation and laws." (*Chinese Exclusion* case 1889, 130 U. S. 581.)

Opponents of the which clause who contend that its adoption would return our international negotiations and treatymaking to the days of the Articles of Confederation completely ignore the powers of the National Government in external affairs in the absence of treaty; although they contend that the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution are inadequate without the additional powers they claim may be conferred upon Congress by treaties, they seldom mention the text of the Constitution delegating legislative powers to Congress. I therefore ask that the complete text of Article I, section 8, be inserted as a part of my argument.

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish post offices and post roads;

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in

[1] The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional bill of rights. (Address at Louisville, Ky., Apr. 12, 1952, before the regional meeting of the American Bar Association.)

which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings;—and

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

COMMERCIAL TREATIES

To those who contend that the adoption of the which clause would make it impossible for the Government to conclude commercial treaties without the approval of all 48 States of the Union, I answer that all the powers of the Continental Congress over commerce with foreign nations were transferred to the Congress of the United States by the power granted in section 8 of the Constitution "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." Treaties approved by the Continental Congress included the grant of reciprocal rights to aliens to inherit real property, to carry on business, to appoint consuls, and to do many other things,[2] all of which opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 contend that the United States Congress would be powerless to do in the absence of treaty. We deny that the treaty is a source of power—it is but a contract stipulating for reciprocal concessions. The question involved is one of power, not the means for exercising the power.

At the conclusion of his testimony here on May 2, Secretary of State Dulles laid before the subcommittee a list of hundreds of commercial treaties which he said would be impossible under the which clause, because they would not be valid in the absence of treaty. In my testimony on Senate Joint Resolution 1 last year I called attention to the series of revised treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation which the President had submitted to the Senate for approval. At the same time I quoted a statement by a representative of the State Department to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in which he said: "Where the subject matter covers fields in which the States have a paramount interest, such as the formation and regulation of corporations and the ownership of property, the treaty provisions have been worked out with the same careful regard for the States' prerogatives and policies that has traditionally characterized agreements of this type." (Department of State Bulletin, vol. XXVI, No. 675, June 2, 1952, pp. 881–883; hearings on S. J. Res. 1, 1953, p. 1125.)

Which of these two conflicting statements of the policy of the State Department are we to rely upon? The policy declared in the statement of 1952 is exemplified in a number of treaties which make the reciprocal concessions to aliens on the part of the United States conformable to State laws, such as the Consular Convention with France of 1853, the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with China of 1946, the similar treaty with Italy of 1948, and 5 of the commercial treaties approved by the Senate in 1953, with Denmark, Ethiopia, Greece, Israel, and Japan. Types of such treaty provisions were inserted in my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1124–1125). Conflicts between treaties and State laws would never arise if such a policy were consistently followed, and all the untenable propaganda on this score against the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would vanish in thin air.

[2] (See the Treaty of Amity and Commerce with France, Feb. 6, 1778; and Consular Convention with France Nov. 14, 1788; Commercial Treaty with the Netherlands, Oct. 8, 1782, and Treaty of Amity and Commerce with Sweden, Apr. 3, 1783. The texts of these treaties are published in Malloy, Treaties, etc., vol. 1, pp. 479, 490, 1233, and 1725.)

The argument that the adoption of the "which" clause might cause foreign nations to refuse to make commercial treaties with us is too absurd to merit serious consideration. The fact that many nations have already made with us treaties conformable to the "which" clause refutes the argument. Opponents have failed to meet the challenge to show that any of practically all the other nations of the world whose constitutional systems embody the principles of the "which" clause have any difficulty in concluding treaties for that reason; and, finally, the argument was brushed aside nearly a century ago by the Supreme Court when it stated "If the people of the United States were to repeal so much of their Constitution as makes treaties their municipal law, no foreign government with whom a treaty exists could justly complain, for it is not a matter with which he has any concern." The court did not deny the fundamental principle of international law that treaties are made to be observed—pacta sunt servanda, for it continued:

"The foreign sovereign between whom and the United States a treaty has been made has a right to expect and require its stipulations to be kept with scrupulous good faith; but through what internal arrangements this shall be done is exclusively for the consideration of the United States. Whether the treaty shall itself be the rule of action of the people as well as the government, whether the power to enforce and apply it shall reside in one department or another, neither the treaty itself nor any implication drawn from it gives him any right to inquire." (*Taylor* v. *Morton*, 1858 (2 Curtis 454, affirmed by the Supreme Court, 2 Black 481).)

EXTRADITION TREATIES

Time will permit only a brief refutation of some of the many other specious arguments that have been advanced against the adoption of this clause.

In my testimony in 1953 I gave a summary history of the practice of international extradition by the United States. (See S. Rept. 412, 83d Cong., 1st sess., reporting favorably on S. J. Res. 1 of that year.) The essence of my testimony is that extradition in this country is regulated either by treaty or congressional legislation. I cited the leading authority on the subject, John Bassett Moore, and several Supreme Court decisions, all of which have been distorted or ignored by opponents of the amendment.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The minority views on Senate Joint Resolution 1 of 1953 stated that "the proposed amendment would block our own Baruch plan for controlling atomic energy" (S. Doc. No. 412, p. 46). As I have pointed out previously, the Congress of the United States has already legislated on this subject without benefit of any treaty to vest it with additional power. That part of the Baruch plan that depended upon the exclusive ownership by an international authority of source materials, control of facilities for development, monopoly of the know-how, etc., has been abandoned in favor of the nationally safer plans of President Eisenhower. Should any attempt be made to revive those features of the Baruch plan dangerous to our security, they would run afoul of the Constitution in the absence of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The power of the Federal Government to enter into any agreement on this subject is derived from the power of Congress to provide for the common defense. That power in turn is controlled by the provision of section 8 of the Constitution vesting in Congress the exercise of exclusive legislation and authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. If that provision can now be violated by some "invisible radiation," to use Mr. Justice Holmes' words regarding the 10th amendment, from the President's power under treaties or other international agreements, then Senate Joint Resolution 1 with the "which" clause is needed to maintain the Constitution as it was written.

DISARMAMENT

It seems incredible that any high official of the Government should argue that the Congress of the United States lacks the power, in the absence of treaty, to provide for the limitation of armaments or to participate in a world arrangement on that subject. Is not that power included within the power to provide for the common defense, or to raise and support armies, or to provide and maintain a navy or to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces? Without any treaty obligation to do so, Congress passed a joint resolution which the President approved on August 31, 1935, establishing a permanent National Munitions Control Board to regulate, by a licensing system the import and export of arms and munitions of war in the interest of the peace and security of the United States. How can the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 take away a power of Congress it has already exercised in the absence of treaty?

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

It is suggested that Senate Joint Resolution 1 might interfere with the President's powers under NATO. That could happen only if the President claimed the power to make war in defense of foreign countries without authorization by the Congress. The same observation applies to all other mutual defense treaties cited by opponents as potential victims of Senate Joint Resolution 1. The inclusion in such treaties of the common phrase that they shall be ratified and their provisions carried out by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" (NATO, art. 11)[3] should not be open to the interpretation that the treaties have taken the war power away from Congress and given it to the President or to some international body, as Mr. Dulles said at Louisville treaties might do. Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make certain that such abuse of the treatymaking power will not occur in the future.

In the statement read to this subcommittee on May 5, the Attorney General enumerated certain multilateral treaties dealing with the respective rights and duties of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which treaties, the statement alleges it would have been impossible to conclude if Senate Joint Resolution 1 had been in effect, becauses they involve subjects on which Congress lacks the power of legislation in the absence of treaty. On the status of forces agreement I testified in 1953 in re-

[3] During the course of the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty in the Senate on Feb. 7, 1952, Senator GEORGE said: "When we were writing the North Atlantic Treaty, it was upon my insistence as a member of the committee, that article 11 was inserted.

"The Secretary of State who was the spokesman for the administration interpreted the words 'constitutional processes' to mean congressional approval insofar as the declaration of war or employment of our troops in any foreign country was concerned, and that language was designedly inserted in the treaty. The only difficulty has arisen because of the failure of the Executive to follow a straightforward course and to act in accordance with the power delegated to him by the Congress or, in this case, by the Senate."

(See the colloquy between Senator WATKINS and Secretary Dulles in the 1953 hearings, pp. 875–881.)

ply to canards circulated then and repeated this year by representatives of the bar of the association of the city of New York. Their testimony was to the effect that foreign forces in this country upon invitation would, under Senate Joint Resolution 1, be hampered in their operations by local, State, and Federal ordinances and laws, and that for the same reason Gen. George Washington would have been unable to make agreements with our French allies at Yorktown during the War of the Revolution. I pointed out that such fantastic results would be impossible under the rules of international law expounded by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Exchange* v. *McFaddon* (1812, 7 Cranch 116) which grants immunity to foreign troops in such cases from all territorial law, local, State, and Federal. I refer to my testimony in 1953 (hearings, pp. 1144–1145) in response to the revival of that criticism of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Nations may, by treaty or other international agreement, in their national interest attach conditions to their permission for the entry of foreign troops and thus consent to the modification of their rights under international law. In the United States, to Congress is delegated the power "To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." The power extends to those forces wherever they may be located. Should it be necessary for the defense of the United States to station foreign troops in this country, Congress undoubtedly has the power to legislate on this phase under its power to provide for the common defense. If the Status of Forces Treaty conflicts with existing congressional legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 1 would require additional implementation by Congress, not in conflict with any other provisions of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights. The argument that the resolution would have made impossible the conclusion of the treaty because Congress would have lacked the power to legislate on the subject is untenable.

The statement read by the Attorney General on May 5 lists the Agreement Relating to the Status of NATO, signed September 20, 1951, and the Protocol on the Status of International Military Headquarters of NATO, signed August 28, 1952. In reply to this criticism, attention is respectfully invited to the statute extending privileges, exemptions and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, enacted by Congress and approved by the President on December 29, 1945 (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.). That statute legislates on substantially all matters dealt with in the two treaties referred to. The act applies by its terms to any "public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided." Two important international organizations in which the United States now participates under authority of an act of Congress are the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization. According to the Attorney General's reasoning on the NATO treaties, our participation in the ILO and WHO in the absence of treaty is unconstitutional, or did he overlook the statute of Congress of December 29, 1945, when he made his argument that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would have made impossible the conclusion of the NATO treaties?

CONTROL OF NARCOTICS

The argument is repeated this year that the which clause would make it impossible to conclude treaties for narcotic control because Congress is said to lack power to pass legislation for the domestic control of the production and distribution of narcotic drugs in the absence of treaty. As I stated in my testimony in 1953, an act was passed by Congress in 1942 to discharge not only the international obligations of the Nation, but to "promote the public health and general welfare, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in opium poppies, and to safeguard the revenue derived from taxation of opium and opium products" (56 Stat. 1045). By the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the act of 1941 (52 Stat. 31), Congress had previously exercised authority to control the domestic production and distribution of wheat, and that act was held constitutional notwithstanding it regulates production even when not intended for commerce but wholly for consumption on the producer's farm. (*Wickard* v. *Filburn* (1942, 317 U. S. 111).) This legislation, upheld by the courts, effectively negates opponent's objection to the which clause on the ground that it would make it impossible to participate in the international control of narcotics due to lack of congressional power in internal law.

COLLECTION OF DEBTS

The objection that the which clause would prevent the United States from collecting foreign debts was also disposed of by citing the previous laws passed by Congress to collect such debts without resort to treaties (hearings, 1953, p. 1142).

The argument is now advanced that the which clause would make it impossible to carry out in the United States the provisions of the agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the validation of German dollar bonds signed at Bonn on April 1, 1953. That agreement provides that the two governments establish jointly in New York City a Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States. The United States Government "consents to the said Board's conducting its operations within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States." From an explanatory discussion of the arrangements worked out by the two governments the reason for the agreement seems to have been the disappearance of uncancelled German bearer bonds from Berlin after that city was captured by the Soviet forces. This situation impeded "the free and open trading in the United States of all German dollar bonds," and the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, to prevent the Soviet Government from introducing unlawfully held bonds into our security markets, requested the securities exchanges in this country to suspend dealings in listed securities of German origin.

The Government of the United States recognizes in the agreement that the policy of Germany embodied in its validation law is in conformity with the policy of the United States, and that the procedure of validation prescribed in the German law is in the interest of an orderly and appropriate determination of the validity of claims of the United States and its nationals against German debtors.

The agreement provides that the holders of German dollar bonds that have not been duly validated cannot resort to courts in the United States for the purpose of enforcing their rights under such bonds. No reason has been advanced as to how Senate Joint Resolution 1 would interfere with the carrying out of the agreement in this country. If the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission had power to take action to prevent trading in the bonds, which it is assumed it had, the subject obviously falls within Federal and not State jurisdiction. It is, therefore, not clear how any court would hold the agreement unconstitutional under Senate Joint Resolution 1 due to lack of power in Congress to implement, if necessary, the policy of the Government expressed in regulations of the Commission as well as in the treaty. The necessary and proper clause of section 8 of the Constitution applies to all delegated powers of Congress as well as to the treatymaking power.

THE SENATE AND TREATYMAKING

It is urged that Senate Joint Resolution 1 is unnecessary because of the constitutional requirement that treaties be made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that Senators should be relied upon to refuse their approval of treaties that violate the Constitution. It is said that Senators when acting upon treaties are the representatives of their States and are thus in position to safeguard any State's rights that may be imperiled by the approval of treaties.

I yield to no one in my admiration of the abilities, industry, and patriotism of the Members of the United States Senate; but I would not place upon them responsibilities they are not in a position to fulfill. Most modern treaties are long, complicated documents. No Senator should be expected to read through one of them and then and there determine whether or not any of its provisions are in conflict with his State's constitution or laws. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations does not refer treaties to the constitutional authorities of the States for information of this kind. The Association of Attorneys General of the States has approved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as have many State legislatures.

Many treaties become the object of intense propaganda by groups throughout the Nation with special interests such as the organized propaganda to force the Genocide Convention through the Senate before there was time to have it examined and analyzed by competent legal critics. Only the intervention of the American Bar Association acting through the committee of which I am a member, gained the time necessary for the proper consideration of that convention, resulting in its nonapproval up to the present time. The treaty has not, however, been withdrawn from the Senate, and it may be approved whenever its advocates gain sufficient control of the Senate.

PRESIDENT WILSON AND THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

Senate Joint Resolution 1 is directed not only to treaties submitted to the Senate, but to forbid the bypassing of the Senate whenever the President doubts his ability to command the necessary votes in that body. Such an attempt was made by President Wilson at Paris in 1919. Here is that story as told in the diary of one of the President's principal legal advisers on the American Commission to Negotiate Peace:

"We [Dr. James Brown Scott and Mr. David Hunter Miller] went in to see Mr. Lansing and he said that the President had advanced the idea that afternoon (March 17, 1919) that the preliminary peace treaty need not be ratified by the Senate, and that he, Mr. Lansing, had been shocked at the idea and told him that it was impossible, and that the President had said to consult the legal advisers.

"Mr. Lansing asked me my opinion, and I said that I did not think that it was debatable; that the status of war could not be changed into the status of peace, as far as the United States was concerned, except by a treaty ratified by the Senate. Dr. Scott was entirely of the same opinion and cited several cases to that effect, including one in the war between Great Britain and us in 1813, one after the Mexican War, and one after the Spanish War.

"Mr. Lansing was in accord with these views and instructed Dr. Scott and myself to prepare a short opinion on the matter, which, after we went out, I asked Dr. Scott

to write." (Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. 1, p. 73.)

I was one of the assistant legal advisers of the American Commission at Paris and was assigned to assist Dr. Scott. After the interview with Mr. Lansing by Messrs. Miller and Scott, as related in the former's diary, Dr. Scott called me into his office and told the incident to me. He added some details not given by Mr. Miller, namely, that President Wilson had first suggested his idea at the meeting of the Council of Four representing the Big Powers at the conference; that the President thought he could arrange terms of peace in accordance with his ideas without consulting the Senate, have the peace established according to those terms, and at some future date when the heat of political discussion had cooled off, have the status quo established by the preliminary peace treaty formally confirmed by a treaty quietly put through the Senate. Dr. Scott told me that the President's position was challenged by Mr. Lloyd-George, the British Premier, and it was he who had suggested to President Wilson that he consult his legal advisers. Since the opinion rendered by the legal advisers under those circumstances may have some bearing upon the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am attaching a copy of it to this statement.

The original draft of the opinion was prepared by me at Dr. Scott's request. It pointed out that as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States the President had the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the situation may seem to him to require, but that the President had no power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate. Following this opinion, President Wilson abandoned his plan and submitted the Treaty of Versailles to the Senate, with the results that are now well known in history.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT AND THE YALTA AGREEMENT

President Roosevelt was more successful at Yalta in avoiding the Senate's prerogatives of advising and consenting to treaties. I have stated elsewhere that the Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history. The reasons why I think so are given in an article entitled "How a President Made Law" published in the February 1955 issue of the National Republic, pages 5–6. I have produced this article for inclusion in the appendix of these hearings.

Secretary of State Dulles testified before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1953 (hearings, pp. 873–874) that the President could not properly make the agreements at Yalta which had any long-range permanent effect unless and until they had been ratified by the Senate as treaties. His statement is in accordance with the rule of international law incorporated as part of our constitutional law by Chief Justice John Marshall speaking for the Supreme Court in 1828:

"The usage of the world is, if a nation is not entirely subdued, to consider the holding of conquered territory as a mere military occupation until its fate shall be determined at the treaty of peace. If it be ceded by the treaty, the acquisition is confirmed and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession or on such as its new master shall impose." (*American Insurance Co.* v. *Canter* (1 Peters, 611).)

The text of the Yalta agreement makes no mention of the necessity of ratification, but President Roosevelt stated that he intended to submit it to the Senate in the prepared text of his report to the joint session of Congress after his return from the Yalta Conference on March 1, 1945. (Department of State Bulletin, vol. 12, No. 297, p. 324.) For some unexplained reason, that sentence was omitted from the President's report as delivered. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 2, p. 1620.) The complete text of the secret Yalta agreement was not made public until nearly a year later, after President Roosevelt's death. When releasing the text on January 26, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes stated that President Roosevelt always held the view that as to the cessions of territory at Yalta "it was a matter that had to be settled in the peace treaty." (Department of State Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1946, pp. 189–190.)

I do not maintain that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 will make it possible for a private citizen or even a Government official to go into court to compel a future President to submit his agreements to the Senate. The courts would probably decline to entertain such an action for various good and sufficient reasons. Senate Joint Resolution 1 would, however, make plain what is now lacking in the Constitution, namely, that the President does not have the power in his discretion to make executive agreements in lieu of treaties; and that an international agreement made without the advice and consent of the Senate does not have equal supremacy with treaties "from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government." (Mr. Justice Douglas in the Pink case.)

THE PINK CASE

The facts and legal arguments which show that this decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property (Dr. Jessup in the American Journal of International Law, vol. 36, 1942, p. 282) have been set forth many times by proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1. We shall confine our statement now to pointing out some confusions in the minds of those who disagree with our conclusions.

It is contended that because the claims of no American citizens were involved in the fund held by the State of New York and seized by the Government of the United States in reliance upon the Litvinoff assignment, the fifth amendment did not apply. This argument ignores a previous holding of the Supreme Court in another Russian case, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, that "the petitioner was an alien friend, and as such was entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment of the Federal Constitution" (*Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *United States*, 1931 (282 U. S. 481), and numerous cases there cited). In his opinion in the Pink case, Mr. Justice Douglas dismissed this aspect of the constitutional law question by stating "There is no constitutional reason why this Government need act as the collection agent for nationals of other countries when it takes steps to protect itself or its nationals on external debts." To which a commentator in the American Journal of International Law replied. "Whatever the United States constitutional question, most countries, contrary to the United States policy, allowed foreign creditors to have their share in the local Russian assets, and our creditors had the benefit of others acting as collecting agents for all creditors—incidentally the policy to which we adhere in bankruptcy" (Kurt H. Nadelmann, vol. 46, 1952, pp. 530–531, and authorities there cited).

To our charge that the Pink case is authority for the principle that the President may make law in the United States without reference to the prerogatives of the Senate in treatymaking or to the exclusive legislative powers of Congress, it is asserted that the joint resolution adopted August 4, 1939, authorizing the President to appoint a Commissioner to adjudicate the claims of American nationals against the U. S. S. R. (53 Stat. 1119), constituted a congressional ratification of his executive agreement known as the Litvinoff Assignment. A reading of the joint resolution fails to establish such a purpose. In law, there is no warrant for imputing such intention to Congress. "Acts of Congress are to be construed and applied in harmony with and not to thwart the purpose of the Constitution." (*Phelps* v. *United States* (274 U. S. 341), cited in *Russian Volunteer Fleet* v. *U. S., supra.*) Whether the aliens whose property was taken without due process of law and just compensation were personally present in New York, I do not know; but it appears from the decision that they had invoked the protection of the courts of New York by attachment proceedings, and thus were in this country at least by attorney.

It should be remembered that in the Pink case the Supreme Court was not dealing with enemy private property—we were not at war with Russia—but with the property of friends who had fled their country to avoid the confiscation of their property by their Communist masters. The effect of this aspect of the decision was illustrated shortly after it was rendered, as follows, by Dr. Jessup:

"The effect of the decision may be illustrated by imagining—a most improbable case—that in the settlement of the present war after the defeat of the Axis, the United States by executive agreement might take an assignment from the German Government of that Government's claim to the confiscated properties of their Jewish citizens and of the citizens of the occupied countries, including all choses in action in the United States and fines imposed upon persons physically present in this country. The purpose of the United States, let us assume, would be to provide a fund for pensions of disabled soldiers and sailors or merely to avoid the international disruption likely to follow the imposition of huge 'reparations' payments. Under the rationale of the Pink decision, the United States could, under such an assignment, take to itself all such private properties and no American court could protect the owners." (Ibid.)

RETROACTIVE EFFECT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

In the course of these debates it has been argued that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as part of the Constitution might have such retroactive effect as to disturb the stability of law settled since the beginning of our national existence. The sponsors of the resolution certainly have no such intention and would not oppose an amendment of the resolution that would make that clear. To meet that objection I would suggest that a new section be added reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The provisions of section 1 and section 2 hereof shall apply only to treaties and other international agreements made after the approval of the charter of the United Nations by the Senate on July 28, 1945."

The amendment would thus restore to the charter the understanding of its provisions which was inherent in the Senate's approval of it. It would revive and maintain in full force and effect the reservation of domestic affairs from the operations of the United Nations embodied in article 2, paragraph 7. It would nullify any further efforts to declare judicially that articles 55 and 56 are self-executing and the supreme law of the land without legislative action, and make it impossible to contend that these articles have transferred power to the Federal Congress to legislate on all the subjects enumerated in them. The unlimited extent to which such Federal legislation might be enacted to regulate substantially every aspect of our daily lives has been explained in these hearings by

Mr. Carl B. Rix, a former president of the American Bar Association and a former member of this committee of the association.

TREATIES FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF WAR AND THE PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

In reply to the specious allegations of opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that its approval would prevent the United States Government from concluding treaties of this character, I repeat the answer I gave when these same objections were previously made. (Hearings, 1953, p. 174.)

Beginning with the Jay Treaty of 1794, the United States has occupied a position of leadership in promoting the substitution of law for force in the conduct of international relations. Of the many Congressional declarations of policy to that end, I shall mention only the Concurrent Resolution of 1890 which requested the President "to invite negotiations with any government with which the United States has or may have diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency may be referred to arbitration and be peacefully adjusted by such means." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 21, pt. 3, p. 2986.)

Secretary of State John Hay proposed a plan for a permanent international tribunal to the First Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899. In his instructions to the American Delegation he used the following inspiring language:

"Nothing can secure for human government and for the authority of law which it represents so deep a respect and so firm a loyalty as the spectacle of sovereign and independent States, whose duty it is to prescribe the rules of justice and impose penalties upon the lawless, bowing with reverence before the august supremacy of those principles of right which give to law its eternal foundation."

I regard the continuance of that policy by our Government as vital to the maintenance of our civilization. I would like to see the present International Court of Justice at The Hague, established as one of the principal organs of the United Nations, given a place of increasing importance in the settlement of international disputes.

There is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 1 that can have any effect upon the negotiation and ratification by the United States of treaties for the establishment of mixed claims commission, arbitral tribunals, conciliation commissions, boundary commissions, or international courts for the adjudication of disputes with foreign nations. Such international questions are not within the domestic jursdiction and cannot be regulated by internal law. The Supreme Court in denying any power in the States to deal with foreign nations over matters in dispute, expressly pointed to such power in the National Government:

"The National Government, by virtue of its control of our foreign relations, is entitled to employ the resources of diplomatic negotiations and to effect such an international settlement as may be found to be appropriate, through treaty, agreement, or arbitration, or otherwise." (Chief Justice Hughes in *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 1934 (292 U. S. 313).)

The power and duty of the Federal Government to enter into treaties for the submission of international controversies of all kinds to peaceful solution in lieu of resort to armed force should not be confused with the conclusion of treaties and agreements which would impose criminal and civil liability upon persons within the United States, or that would be destructive of the existing division of authority between the States and the Federal Government.

Witnesses have testified against Senate Joint Resolution 1 on the ground that it is being put forward as part of a campaign against the United Nations and to deter the United States from participation in all forms of international cooperation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is to restore the charter of the United Nations to its original meaning, and thus enable all our citizens to unite in confidence with whole-hearted support. I believe that the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 1 is more vital to the continuance of American support of the United Nations than anything that might be accomplished in the proposed revision or review conference on the charter.

CONCLUSION

1. Following years of intensive study, examination of different texts, and critical analyses of the highest order in the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and in debates in the Senate, the committee on peace and law through United Nations of the American Bar Association has recommended a constitutional amendment which will safeguard the Constitution from the liability to the abuses of the treaty-making power of which the present Secretary of State gave us warning 4 years ago.

2. Although the Constitution does not require that the amendment meet with the approval of the President, we have gone as far as we should, without sacrificing fundamental principles, to meet his objections and those of his principal legal advisers, that the amendment might interfere with his Executive powers and impair his power to conduct the foreign relations of the Government.

3. The amendment obviates any sensible reason for the repetition of the untenable criticism that its adoption would require the approval of treaties by all the 48 States of the Union.

4. The amendment meets the criticism that its adoption might play havoc with the settled constitutional law of treaties.

5. The amendment would be a stop sign to any future overambitious President who might attempt, by avoiding constitutional processes, to take us down the road that leads to one-man government.

6. The amendment would strengthen our participation in the work for peace of the United Nations by assuring us that the charter means what its framers intended it to mean, and cannot be used as a Trojan horse by those who would continue the social and economic revolution in this country through extraconstitutional means.

7. The amendment would assure us that the United Nations will not be used as a stepping-stone toward any form of world government, as was suggested in the pamphlet published by the State Department, with the endorsement of President Truman, in September 1950. The purpose of that pamphlet was stated in it to be to explain to the American people that, although they began life with "a Declaration of Independence * * * today the foreign policy of the United States is a declaration of interdependence of men and nations" (p. 99). The pamphlet continued: "Where the experiment" of an international community which is "in fact, the substance of our foreign policy" will lead "nobody can predict. * * * It may lead eventually to a form of world government" (pp. 17–18).

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 use the same arguments that Alexander Hamilton used to prevent the adoption of the Bill of Rights, namely, that it is unnecessary and dangerous. The amendment is in the nature of a new bill of rights against the liability to abuse of the treatymaking power. To those who question its need and urge us to have confidence that future administrations will not abuse the power, we reply in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

DOCUMENT No. 526

(David Hunter Miller, My Diary at the Conference of Paris, vol. VI)

OPINION RE SENATE AND PRELIMINARY PEACE TREATIES

From David Hunter Miller and Maj. James Brown Scott.

To The Commissioners Plenipotentiary.

The question submitted to the technical advisers for their opinion is whether a preliminary treaty of peace negotiated by the President would bind the Government of the United States from the date of its signature or whether it would require the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, and only bind the Government upon and from the latter date.

In providing that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties" (art. 2, sec. 2), the Constitution makes no distinction between classes of treaties which are subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, and in determining whether an instrument is or is not a treaty within the constitutional provision the name given to it is not essential; it must be construed according to its purposes and objects.

As Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, the President has the authority to conclude an armistice and incorporate therein such terms of a military nature as the exigencies of the situation may seem to him to require. Of such a nature was the "Protocol of agreement embodying the terms of a basis for the establishment of peace" between the United States and Spain signed on August 12, 1898, which was not submitted to the advice and consent of the Senate. This protocol suspended hostilities upon its signature, embodied a promise on the part of Spain to relinquish her sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico and certain other islands to the United States, and made provision for their evacuation by the Spanish troops. It provided for the occupation of Manila by American forces "pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace," and for the appointment of "commissioners to treat of peace."

In the case of a preliminary treaty of peace between France and Germany signed at Versailles on February 26, 1871, ratification by both parties, namely, the Emperor of Germany and the French National Assembly, was expressly stipulated (art. X). The same is true of a number of other important preliminary peace treaties. (See Phillipson, Termination of War and Treaties of Peace, p. 99.)

The declaration of war by the United States Congress on April 6, 1917, created a status of war which may only be terminated by a treaty of peace equally as valid as the law of the land with the declaration of April 6, 1917, and "as in the case of other treaties, a treaty of peace is not definitely binding until the exchange of ratifications; and a state of war in the technical sense continues until the date of the exchange." (Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, p. 352, citing several decisions of the Supreme Court.)

The legal effect of the protocol between the United States and Spain of August 12, 1898, was judicially passed upon in the case of Hijo *v.* United States, in which the United States district court held that "the protocol and proclamation did not end the war. The protocol worked a mere truce. The President has not the power to terminate the war by treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States." In confirming this decision, Mr. Justice Har-

lan, speaking for the Supreme Court, declared that "a state of war did not in law cease until the ratification in April 1899, of the treaty of peace." (194 U. S., pp. 317, 323.)

It is therefore submitted that a preliminary agreement signed by the President, but not ratified by the Senate, can have no legal effect, so far as ending the war is concerned, and can operate only as a truce; and that if it is desired in the preliminary agreement, by whatever name it may be called, to effectuate the transition from the state of war to a state of peace, this may only be accomplished by submitting it to the Senate for its advice and consent according to the constitutional provision.

JAMES BROWN SCOTT,
DAVID HUNTER MILLER,
Technical Advisers,
American Commission To Negotiate Peace.
MARCH 18, 1919.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father, who hath made and preserved us a nation, our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. In Thee we trust. Thou hast taught us to love truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice and free from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. Lift us, we pray Thee, above the mud and scum of mere things into the holiness of Thy beauty, so that even the common task and the trivial round may be edged with crimson and gold. Enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years shall not find us bankrupt in the things that matter the most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. In these desperate and dangerous days, when the precious things we hold nearest to our hearts are threatened by sinister forces without pity and without conscience, help us to give the best that is in us against the wrong that needs resistance, and for the right that needs assistance, and to the future in the distance, and the good that we may do.

We ask it in the name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 24, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Morton S. Howell, to be postmaster at Broadway, N. J., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

TRANSFER, FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES, OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in St. Croix, V. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT, RELATING TO LOANS TO LOW-INCOME AND PART-TIME FARMERS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide more adequate credit for low-income farmers, including part-time farmers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 83, 83D CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT, RELATING TO TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the liquidation of the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REASONABLE NOTICE OF APPLICATION TO COURTS OF APPEAL IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reasonable notice to the agency of applications to the courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Atomic Energy Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter 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.

ABBREVIATION OF RECORD ON REVIEW OR ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES BY COURTS OF APPEAL

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review or enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of E. Vlasoff, and sundry other citizens of the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for admission into the United States of escapees from communism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Holy Name Society, Church of St. Christopher, Baldwin, and the Holy Name Society, Saint Mary, Mother of Jesus Church, Brooklyn, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, from Matthew A. Liotta M. D., New York, N. Y., relating to the Rating Board's activities in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty postmaster nominations.