

cate that the growth and development of Iowa is going forward at a faster rate than the Nation as a whole. With the value of Iowa's manufactured products exceeding the value of her agricultural products, the State has a fine economic balance.

Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I take the floor of the House as Father's Day approaches this year, in support of a joint resolution asking our President to set aside a day as an official tribute to the millions of fathers in America.

This day should stand as a symbol of the important role of the head of the family, not just on Father's Day, but every day throughout the year.

It has often been said that the home is where democracy begins. This is true because the home is not a place where democracy is merely talked about. It is not a mere word. It is a way of life that is practiced day in and day out. If every member of the family is treated with respect and love; if every member of the family honors his responsibilities, shares the burdens as well as the pleasures of family life, then we have built a group of citizens who will have respect for the rights of others and will approach their responsibilities toward their fellow citizens and their obligations in a democratic society with a cooperative spirit and a willing hand.

Since children look to their father as an example for their conduct and a guide to follow over the rough road of growing up, it is his responsibility to set a standard of conduct in his relations with the family that will be worthy of emulation. Fatherhood is the highest fiduciary relationship. It demands that he set aside the time and develop the patience that will make him the kind of father that is always available when his children have a problem, when they feel the need to talk over some little difficulty—no matter how small this problem may be. A small problem to an adult mind may be a huge burden in the mind of a child. It is the father's heavy

obligation to be available to help resolve this problem.

When I read the tragic stories that appear daily in our newspapers of delinquent juveniles I often think to myself, how different this story might have been if there had been an understanding heart and a guiding hand when the early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became evident in his belligerent or perhaps withdrawn conduct.

A child does not turn into a juvenile delinquent overnight. There are many danger signs to the observant father. But the danger signs will go unheeded unless that father is an astute and sensitive observer. So many of us in the hustle and hurry of modern living attempt to compensate for our failure to provide time, companionship, and society by giving our children material gifts and a questionable higher standard of living.

It is almost impossible for a loving father who spends time with his youngsters, who plays with them, who discusses their school problems, their friends, and their daily experiences with them, to fail to observe that something is troubling a child. If his attitude toward his schoolwork, toward his brothers and sisters is an unhealthy one, this is the time to set the course straight again. When the problem is just developing, the solution is fairly obvious and quickly achieved.

Family life is actually the child's first experience in group living, in learning the joys that come from working together as a team, in experiencing the rare pleasure that comes from understanding that it is truly better to give than to receive. Family life is the child's first contact with discipline. It is where he begins to appreciate and understand that you learn to rule by being ruled.

Under the guiding hand of the father and mother working together as a parent team, the child comes face to face with what is expected of him in his relations with the other members of the family and society. Here the child will acquire the spiritual values which will develop into his philosophy of life.

The father's role is not an easy one. With 10½ million married women employed in the new social structure, the amount of time available for supervision and rearing of children of necessity has become limited in a number of homes. Many additional chores of family upbringing have now in the new order fallen to him.

our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain. Teach us to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of inward peace and confidence above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments earth can give.

May the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities be equally impotent to sway us from the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. Along the road of this day, as we face its demanding tasks, and of every day, may we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of

While his obligations to his family are heavy, the rewards are rich indeed. The father who has fulfilled his responsibilities as a loving and understanding parent is truly helping to build a mature and worthwhile adult. He has helped to build a family relationship that is a full and rewarding experience for every member of the family and is the bulwark of a democratic society. He has respected the individuality of every member of that family unit so that together they are a team, and individually they will become democratic adults who can face any decision, or challenge that life will present to them.

For all of these sacrifices fathers make in giving their children emotional security, spiritual guidance, compassion, and understanding of their fellowmen, I propose that we set aside the third Sunday in June of each year as a justly earned tribute to the Nation's fathers.

The Scintilla Division of Bendix Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the village of Sidney, in Delaware County, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, the Scintilla division of Bendix Aviation, is to receive its second star on their civil-defense flag.

We are very proud of the Scintilla Division in Delaware County. Their factory is ideally situated in a beautiful village of 5,000 and their labor-management relations have always been of the best.

Mr. John A. MacLachlan, the publisher of the Sidney Enterprise, in a recent letter to me, has this to say about Scintilla:

Scintilla division of the Bendix Aviation, which as you know is our big Sidney industry (employment about 4,000 people) is to be honored next week by receiving the second star in their civil-defense flag. The presentation is to be made by Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, New York State, director of civil defense.

Scintilla is the first industrial plant in New York State to achieve the honor of being a three-time winner. First the flag, then one star, and now the second.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 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:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply

those who are able to say at the last, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith." In the name of the Master of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator

from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence,

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 13, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

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

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gariella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Calado;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu, and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandez Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research

in the development and utilization of saline waters, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

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

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet on May 18 and 19, during the sessions of the Senate.

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 consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice George Templar, resigned.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Marvin B. Miller, for permanent appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8.

The ACTING 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 nomination today confirmed.

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

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

DEATH OF GEN. CHARLES PELOT SUMMERALL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes in commenting on the life and service of General Summerall, who passed away last Friday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate learned with sorrow last Saturday of the passing of that gallant old soldier, Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall. This afternoon he will be buried with full military honors in Arlington Cemetery.

The famed general had lived a full life of 88 years, studded with many heroic exploits on battlefields stretching from the gates of the Imperial City of Peking, China, in the Boxer Rebellion, to the bitter fighting at Cantigny and Soissons in France, in World War I. On retirement, after 39 years of military service, he was equally effective in civilian life, where for 22 years he served with distinction as president of The Citadel, the Charleston, S. C., military college.

The State of Florida and its citizens deeply cherish the memory of this gallant military leader. He was born near Lake City, Fla., on March 4, 1867. At the age of 12 he moved to the little community of Astatula, in Lake County. He attended the public schools of Lake County, and graduated from Porter Military Academy, Charleston, in 1885.

Returning to Florida, he entered the teaching profession, and taught in Astatula in 1886. At the age of 20, in 1887, he became principal of the Leesburg, Fla., schools.

That same year he stood a competitive examination for the United States Military Academy and received an appointment from Congressman Charles D. Dougherty, of the Second Florida Congressional District.

He entered the Academy June 16, 1888, and graduated June 11, 1892, as first captain of the Cadet Corps.

From then until 34 years later, when he was named Chief of Staff by President Coolidge, General Summerall followed a military career that saw combat service in the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, and the First World

War. He was cited by his own country six times for gallantry in action, and he also received major decorations from France, Belgium, Italy, Montenegro, and Panama.

His feats of valor were numerous, but one has become a legend in the annals of United States Army history. As a young artillery lieutenant in the Boxer Rebellion, Summerall covered the advance of the 14th Infantry storming the Imperial City—Peking. During the assault Summerall and his platoon wheeled 2 field pieces alongside the infantry and blasted open the Imperial City gates of the 4 successive walls and the Forbidden City gate.

In 1918, as commanding general of the famed First Division, Summerall was awarded a DSC for his "great gallantry and utter disregard for his own safety" in leading his troops to victory at the decisive battle of Soissons. A short time later he was promoted to command the Fifth Corps, a post he retained until the close of the war.

In 1919 he was appointed by the Supreme War Council on the Allied Mission to Fiume, and later was attached to the American Mission to negotiate peace in Paris.

From 1921 to 1924 he headed the Hawaiian Department, which, under his devoted leadership, progressed rapidly in military efficiency, equipment, and supplies at a time when that area became one of our most vital and important military commands. Likewise, General Summerall's intelligent and considerate handling of many pressing diplomatic relations contributed immeasurably toward our amicable international associations in the Pacific.

His administration as Chief of Staff of the Army from 1926 to 1930 is remembered particularly for his efforts to improve living conditions of Army personnel, increase the fire power of ground troops, and develop the effectiveness of tanks and armored cars.

In March 1931 General Summerall retired from active service and returned to his native Florida. His sojourn at home, however, was brief, as that same year he accepted the presidency of The Citadel. For over 2 decades he contributed the same peerless leadership to that historic South Carolina institution that he gave to the United States Army.

Our country will never have a more courageous, conscientious, or devoted military leader. Florida joins the Nation in extending our sincere and deep sympathy to the members of General Summerall's family. We fervently hope that their sense of loss will be tempered by the rich heritage of achievement and the splendid record of service to his country left to them by this grand old soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, since we last met on Friday, death has removed from the national scene one of America's most distinguished soldiers and educators, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, of Aiken, S. C., which is also my home town. General Summerall served his country as a soldier with distinction for almost 40 years, capping his Army career by serving as Army Chief of Staff during the period 1926 through 1930.

His brilliant record as a soldier contains many achievements; among them are 15 ribbons for major decorations awarded him for personal bravery, efficiency, and leadership in the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, World War I, and for outstanding service in time of peace as well as war. We in South Carolina, however, remember the beloved general even more for the outstanding role played by him as an educator in our State. After serving his country for approximately 40 years as a soldier, General Summerall then began another distinguished career as president of The Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. Here he served for 22 years, developing The Citadel into one of the Nation's nine distinguished military colleges. While president of The Citadel, General Summerall built up the cadet corps from 600 to more than 1,800. Also, under his presidency, the number of buildings on the campus increased by almost a score. As a soldier, he naturally strengthened the military standards of our great school, but, in addition, he raised the scholastic standards there to a new high.

South Carolina, the Nation, and the entire world will sorely miss this great soldier, educator, and Christian gentleman. I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD, along with my remarks, an editorial from the Aiken Standard and Review, of May 16, entitled "Death Removes a Great Man," and also a news story from the Augusta Chronicle of May 15, entitled "Summerall Last Rites To Be Held at Arlington."

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

[From the Aiken Standard and Review of May 16, 1955]

DEATH REMOVES A GREAT MAN

Death has removed one of the Nation's famous old soldiers and one of Aiken's most beloved and revered citizens—Gen. Charles P. Summerall, Army Chief of Staff during the Coolidge administration.

General Summerall was a soldier whose career was symbolical of the American tradition. The span of his service stretched from the Boxer Rebellion of 1900 through the bloody battles of World War I, and into the trying and pacifistic times of the early 1930's. Capping his career as a military leader was the assignment which marks the peak of an officer's ambition, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

At the age of 64, General Summerall became president of The Citadel, South Carolina's military college. He served at this post for 22 years training Army officers and citizens.

Quoting from the pen of W. D. Workman, Jr., who served as a cadet under General Summerall is the following which shows the place he held in the hearts of the men under him.

"In both roles—as troop commander and as college president—General Summerall manifested those qualities of personality and principle which stamped him as a man apart from the average run. He believed in form, and propriety, and, above all, in moral rectitude. He had no tolerance of laxity, whether of performance or of discipline. There was a right way and a wrong way to meet a situation, and there was no room for compromise between the two.

"It was that determined and inflexible adherence to principle which won for him the

respect—sometimes grudgingly—of those who served with him, or under him. He had little patience with, or understanding of, the frailties of lesser men, and always he held the high moral ground on any field of controversy.

"General Summerall had a deep and abiding love for the college where he spent his declining years. If there were dozens who resented his autocratic methods, there were hundreds who grew to revere his name and who henceforth will cherish his memory. If there be some who felt the sting of his displeasure, there are others who recall and retain the benefit of his stern, fatherly advice.

"And if there be those who remember him as being always the general, there are those who know of his humility of spirit, expressed quietly in such matters as refusing to own automobiles beyond the economic reach of his lowest-paid faculty member.

"His death has drawn into one respectful body all those who ever had association with him. None can deny that the American scene, and in particular, the South Carolina scene, has lost a great figure.

"General Summerall led a life of great moments, and of great decisions. It was not an easy life, for it is not an easy thing either to lead men into battle or—an even harder thing for the truly professional soldier—to send men into battle. Nor is it an easy task to preside over the troubled and sometimes troublesome lives of young men in college. But General Summerall never sought the easy task. He took the hard way as the normal way, and wrapped up into two separate careers a lifetime of public service to State and Nation.

"Four more stars have been added to the firmament of bygone American generals, and they add luster to the lot."

In 1953 when General Summerall retired from The Citadel he came to Aiken to spend the remainder of his life at Whitehall which had been given to The Citadel to be used by the general upon his retirement. The donor was the late Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune who served as a major under the command of General Summerall during World War I. This again showed the esteem in which he was held by those who were associated with him.

We recall the words of General Summerall when he came to Aiken. He said: "This part of the country is home to me. My mother's family, the Pelots, are from Greenwood. They were a French Huguenot family which came to South Carolina in the late 1700's, and moved to Greenwood in 1832."

He loved Whitehall, its spacious rooms where he had on display his many relics of the wars in which he engaged.

He also loved the Aiken Rotary club of which he was made a life member and kept in touch with the activities of the organization during his illness.

Speaking for the citizens of Aiken, we are aware of many hearts full of memories of General Summerall though he was privileged to live here but a short while.

We count it an honor to have known him and to have had him a citizen of Aiken.

May his high standards be carried along by the many men who have come under his influence.

[From the Augusta Chronicle of May 15, 1955]

SUMMERALL LAST RITES TO BE HELD AT ARLINGTON

WASHINGTON, May 14.—Death today overtook another of the Nation's famous old soldiers—Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall of Aiken, S. C., Army Chief of Staff in the Coolidge administration.

The distinguished soldier-educator who tried to wake up America on the preparedness issue long before the sneak attack on

Pearl Harbor died at 11:50 a. m. at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 88.

General Summerall had been a patient at the hospital since last August. A son and daughter-in-law, retired Army Colonel and Mrs. Charles P. Summerall Jr., of Belmont, Mass., were at the bedside.

Other survivors are a grandson, Charles P. Summerall III, a student at Harvard Medical School, and a granddaughter, Mrs. John C. Smith, Rochester, N. Y.

FUNERAL AT ARLINGTON

The Pentagon announced that funeral services will be held at Fort Myer Chapel at Arlington National Cemetery at 2:30 p. m. next Tuesday.

General Summerall was Chief of Staff of the Army in 1926-30. He had been the country's oldest ranking soldier since the death of Gen. Peyton C. March last April 13 at the age of 90. March was Chief of Staff during World War I in which Summerall distinguished himself in France.

When he retired as Chief of Staff, Summerall became president of The Citadel, military college at Charleston, S. C. He made a fine record during his 22 years there before retiring in 1953. Gen. Douglas MacArthur succeeded him as Chief of Staff.

CLARK PAYS TRIBUTE

Gen. Mark Clark, retired, who succeeded Summerall at The Citadel and who is visiting his mother here, said he saw Summerall this morning before his death.

"He not only was a great soldier, but he was a great educator," said Clark. "He will be missed by everyone who felt his influence."

Secretary of the Army Stevens said Summerall was a "brilliant leader" who contributed immeasurably to the Army's progress. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, present Chief of Staff, said the Army and Nation greatly benefited from Summerall's "unstinting devotion to duty" during a career of almost 40 years.

AIKEN RESIDENCE

Summerall moved to Aiken in June 1953, and established residence at Whitehall on Whisky Road.

The house was deeded to The Citadel by Col. Robert R. McCormick, late editor of the Chicago Tribune, with the understanding that it be a retirement home for Summerall. It will now revert to The Citadel.

McCormick served under Summerall during World War I and they became close friends.

The general, always in great demand as an after-dinner speaker, was an honorary member of practically every civic organization in Aiken and Aiken County.

Summerall, for nearly 40 years a distinguished soldier, became an educator when he retired from the Army and distinguished himself anew.

He rounded out his Army career with a 4-year term as Chief of Staff, during which he concentrated upon improving the Nation's general staff and building up housing facilities at posts in all parts of the country.

MANY DECORATIONS

The Florida-born officer retired with the rank of general early in 1931, possessor of at least 15 ribbons for major decorations from many nations, in addition to numerous citations for personal bravery, leadership and efficiency under trying conditions.

Soon afterward he became president of South Carolina's State military college at Charleston, The Citadel, a school that had stressed the military type of education since its founding in 1842.

In the next dozen years, Summerall built up the cadet corps from less than 600 to more than 1,800, and under his presidency the number of buildings on the campus increased by almost a score.

The general took over his educational post at a time when the economic depression had caused drastic cuts in State appropriations. But he plunged into his duties with the same zest and determination that had carried him to the top in the Army, and the school began to grow in spite of the depression.

STRENGTHENED CITADEL

A soldier, he naturally strengthened the military standards of the Citadel, but he strengthened its scholastic standards also.

Long before Pearl Harbor, Summerall made speeches advocating preparedness and deploring what he termed the apathy of Americans to their own national safety.

Sixteen months prior to Japan's attack, he warned that "there's less time than you think" for the United States to get her defenses in order. In an earlier speech he had said:

"Let us no longer delude ourselves with the fetish that the oceans protect us. Unless we control them, they make us more vulnerable."

In the summer of 1941, he told an audience at Gastonia, N. C.:

"For 22 years we have slept as to national security, contemptuous of all warnings by those charged with our defense and blind to the preparations of the dictators for conquest."

In blunt soldier talk, he went on: "Because of our weakness and indifference, we must wait like fat oxen for the butcher with the carving knife."

"The people must awaken to the danger and make war the chief aim of their lives until the future is sealed with victory or defeat. Either is possible now."

Japan's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor came December 7, 1941.

CITED FOR BRAVERY

Summerall began winning citations for bravery as a first lieutenant of artillery in the Philippines in 1899 and 1900. He was mentioned for gallantry six times during the campaigns against the insurrectionists.

In August 1900, he took a prominent part in a battle upon which the eyes of the civilized world were focused. It was the storming of Peking by the China Relief Expedition during the Boxer Rebellion.

Summerall sent his platoon of field guns with the forces attacking the Imperial City. After he had dashed forward under heavy enemy fire to mark the gate with a large white "X," his guns blew open the gates to the four outer walls surrounding the so-called Forbidden City, and then blasted open the gates to the Forbidden City itself. He was twice again cited for gallantry in action.

After America entered World War I, Summerall was assigned to command the artillery brigade of the 42d (Rainbow) Division and went to France with that division, but later was transferred to the First Division as commanding general of artillery.

His brigade went through the Cantigny fighting in May 1918, the first important battle for the American forces, and it was credited with producing artillery results without precedent in United States history.

The next month he was promoted to major general and given command of the division later known throughout the Army as the Fighting First. He led it in the Aisne-Marne, second Marne, and the Meuse-Argonne offensives.

HEADED CORPS

A month before the armistice Summerall took command of the Fifth Corps, which, as usual with his commands, "reached all objectives." After the armistice he commanded the Ninth and later the Fourth Corps.

His leadership and ability in France won for him the United States Distinguished Service Cross, and the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Honor of

France, Belgium's Grand Officer of the Crown, and Italy's Commander of the Order of the Crown.

He received decorations also from Poland, Panama, Montenegro, and Cuba for his achievements with the American Expeditionary Force.

The citation for one of his decorations said that due to his great courage and utter disregard for his own safety, the men of his division were inspired to enormous and heroic efforts.

A staff officer who served with him in France said that, invariably, after a particularly hard day of fighting, the general would order another day of activity. He would argue that the enemy was just as tired and ought not to be given a chance to rest. After the armistice Summerall served as a member of the Allied Mission of Generals sent to Flume and later with the Peace Commission at Paris.

NATIVE OF FLORIDA

He was born near Lake City, Fla., March 4, 1867, the son of Elhanan Bryant Summerall and Margaret Cornelia Pelot, both natives of South Carolina.

He received his early education in the schools of Florida, then attended Porter Military Academy at Charleston, an Episcopal preparatory school for 3 years. After graduating from Porter he taught school for 2 years.

He was graduated from West Point in 1892. His first Army assignment was with the infantry, but after a few months he transferred to the field artillery. He married Laura Mordecai in 1901. Their son, Charles P. Summerall, Jr., served in World War II. As a lieutenant colonel commanding a field artillery battalion, he was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. Summerall was an Episcopalian and a 33d-degree Mason.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have just returned from the funeral of one of America's outstanding figures, a personal friend of mine, the late Gen. Charles P. Summerall.

I served under General Summerall in the First World War. As history would have it, in later years I again knew General Summerall when I was Governor of South Carolina. He was then president of The Citadel, a college which today bears the impress of his reputation for honor and devotion to country.

As chairman of the board of visitors of The Citadel, I came to know General Summerall for the man that he was. His clean living, his high standards of morality, his devotion to religion, and his loyalty to family and country, were and today still are guides for thousands of men in all walks of life.

A man could not know General Summerall without being affected by his striking character. He was a resolute man who placed duty and honor before all else. His life is truly the American story—a youth of small means coming from the bosom of the people to become one of the great military leaders in time of war, and an outstanding educator in time of peace. From cadet at West Point to retired Chief of Staff he served his nation more than well. As educator he went on to teach thousands of young men the meaning of a clean and wholesome life, and to be ready to answer the call to defend the United States, which he loved so dearly.

Mr. President, I have known no one in my lifetime whom I have respected

more for high principles and integrity than the late Charles P. Summerall. The people of my State and the rest of the Nation mourn his passing. He will not be forgotten, for the impact of his character will be felt among us for long years to come.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 43)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the legislative branch, involving an increase of \$844,335, for the fiscal year 1956, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts for research and development had been negotiated during the 6 months from July 1 through December 31, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by the Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contributions made by that Administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

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

FACILITATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO CERTAIN HIGHWAYS AT NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE TO AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk and certain

marine and liability insurance to the American public, as of March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THOMAS W. BEVANS ET AL.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO EMBEZZLEMENT OR THEFT OF CERTAIN INDIAN PROPERTY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the executive secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that society, for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED POLIOMYELITIS IMMUNIZATION ACT OF 1955

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide 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 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to flood control in San Bernardino County, Calif.

"Whereas in 1938 there occurred floods in San Bernardino County, Calif., of such great severity that much damage was done to persons and to property and the city of San Bernardino was isolated from the cities of Colton and Redlands; and

"Whereas since 1938 many fires have destroyed forest lands and denuded valuable watersheds in that area, the most recent fire having added over 2,500 acres in Cable Canyon to such previously denuded forest lands; and

"Whereas the decrease in watershed areas combined with the present lack of flood control facilities render the San Bernardino area dangerously vulnerable to flood damage; and

"Whereas the city of San Bernardino and the adjacent areas have undergone rapid development and expansion in recent years; and

"Whereas unless immediate steps are taken to provide flood control facilities there is a great possibility of a major disaster in the San Bernardino area due to floods; and

"Whereas in order to protect the people of this State from further loss of life and property and to prevent great harm to our national defense facilities in the San Bernardino area, it is essential that flood control facilities in the San Bernardino area be provided immediately: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to appropriate, without delay, such funds as may be necessary to construct adequate flood control facilities for the city of San Bernardino and the adjacent areas in the county of San Bernardino; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution relative to the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material

"Whereas eminent scientists, officers, and agencies of the State of California have called attention to a potential hazard to the public health and safety of the people of the State of California resulting from the peacetime medical, industrial, and scientific use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 establishes responsibility for the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime uses of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and the disposal of radioactive waste materials resulting from that use, with the United States Atomic Energy Commission; and

"Whereas despite the representations of the Atomic Energy Commission that these responsibilities are being fulfilled, eminent scientists have advised the legislature that they continue to believe there is a need for State legislation and for a State agency on radiological services to guard the people of the State of California against the potential hazards resulting from the peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; and

"Whereas there is confusion as to the extent of State jurisdiction to legislate with respect to ionizing radiation and byproduct material due to the assumption of jurisdiction within the field by the Federal Government under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to conduct studies to determine whether or not the Atomic Energy Commission is fulfilling its responsibilities for the protection of the public health and safety against the hazards arising out of the peacetime use of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and the disposal of radioactive waste materials resulting from that use, and to determine the extent it is desirable or necessary for the several States to legislate or to provide

services to protect the public from the hazards arising from the peacetime use of special nuclear material, byproduct material, and ionizing radiation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Joint Resolution 30

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to provide continued reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in Hawaii

"Whereas Public Law 411 of the 82d Congress, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 157), provides that the Surgeon General of the United States shall pay to the board of health of the Territory of Hawaii upon funds being available a sum of money to be computed upon the per diem cost of caring for Hansen's disease patients in facilities operated by the board of health; and

"Whereas the Public Health Service budget includes a request for \$1 million to reimburse the Territory of Hawaii for care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients; and

"Whereas the public services offered in the Territory of Hawaii to persons suffering from Hansen's disease have proved an invaluable service both to the people of the Territory and to all citizens of the United States through the furthering of research in this field: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to approve the budget request of the Public Health Service of the United States which will continue the present Federal aid to the Hansen's disease program of the board of health of the Territory of Hawaii, now provided by Public Law 411, 82d Congress, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 157)."

"Sec. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

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

"Approved this 12th day of May 1955."

*"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a tariff on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish and to devote the proceeds to research

"Whereas the waters of and adjacent to the Territory of Hawaii contain vast quantities of fish capable of supporting a large fishing industry; and

"Whereas the development and success of such an industry is dependent upon protection against the competition of foreign nations; and

"Whereas the development and prosperity of Hawaiian fisheries and fish canning and processing industries in the Territory of Hawaii would be conducive to the prosperity of the Nation as well as the self-sufficiency of the Territory with respect to food supply; and

"Whereas the development of Hawaiian fisheries and fishing industries necessitates

intensive research and investigation: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is requested to enact a tariff imposing tariff rates on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish products sufficiently high as to afford protection against foreign competition to the fishing industries of the United States and those of the Territory of Hawaii in particular."

"Sec. 2. That the Congress be requested to earmark and set aside the proceeds of such tariff for scientific research designed to foster and develop Hawaiian and other American fisheries and fish canning and processing."

"Sec. 3. That duly certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"Sec. 4. That this joint resolution take effect upon its approval."

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955."

*"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

"Joint Resolution 31

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to revise and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended

"Whereas the sugar industry of Hawaii, composed of several thousand growers of sugarcane, is an integral and vitally important part of the economy of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the dynamic progress and technological advancements which have distinguished and do now distinguish the Hawaiian sugar industry from other segments of the domestic sugar industry, require that all domestic sugar-producing areas of the United States shall henceforth share in supplying the continued growth of the sugar market in the United States; and

"Whereas there have been introduced in the Congress of the United States identical bills known as S. 1635 and H. R. 5406, which propose amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and such bills provide for restoring to domestic sugar-producing areas, including Hawaii, their historic right to share in the continued growth of the United States sugar market: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation with provisions identical to those now contained in S. 1635 and H. R. 5406 in the Congress of the United States, amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

"Sec. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii."

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

"Approved this 12th day of May 1955."

*"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."*

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 27

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and all sales of public lands consummated pursuant to said statutes

"Whereas there are many small and scattered remnants of public lands resulting

from the abandonment of roads, railroads, or ditch rights-of-way, or portions thereof, and the taking by the Territory, under its power of eminent domain, of land in excess of that needed for public purposes, because public policies or other justifiable cause necessitates such taking; and

"Whereas these remnants of public lands are usually too small in area or too irregular in shape to be of any use to anyone except abutting landowners; and

"Whereas whenever there is no further public use for these remnants and the same shall be disposed of by the Territory, they should first be offered to the abutting landowners; and

"Whereas the legislature has enacted statutes to provide for such disposal, but these statutes have never been ratified or confirmed by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation ratifying and confirming the provisions of section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes, and to that end the said Congress is hereby requested and urged to adopt a bill in substantially the following form, to wit:

"A bill to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945 is hereby ratified and confirmed.

"Sec. 2. Section 1 (b), act 12, session laws of Hawaii 1951, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

"Sec. 3. All sales of public lands to abutting landowners consummated pursuant to the terms of the foregoing statutes are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall be deemed and held to be perfect and valid as of the date of the sales.

"Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval."

"Sec. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 29

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation permitting the Territory of Hawaii to guarantee or insure disaster loans

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii and its people have been subjected, from time to time, to the action of some of the most destructive forces of nature, such as earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tidal wave, drought, and flood; and

"Whereas it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the people of the Territory of Hawaii to protect their property adequately against such hazards; and

"Whereas it is in the public interest for the government of the Territory of Hawaii to do what it can to make such provision that persons will lend money to those who have suffered damage from the action of these forces of nature: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to pass legislation enabling the Territory of Hawaii to guarantee or insure loans made to persons who are required to borrow as a result of damage caused by some natural force such as earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tidal wave, drought, or flood.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to admit members of the immediate families of resident nationals and permanently resident aliens into the United States, its possessions and Territories, on a nonquota basis

"Whereas there are large numbers of nationals and permanently resident aliens on the continental United States and its possessions and Territories; and

"Whereas presently said nationals and resident aliens are physically separated from their respective families, and in many instances such separations have been for a number of years; and

"Whereas presently these family members may only enter the continental United States, its possessions and Territories, under the quotas assigned for such nations; and

"Whereas these prolonged separations have given rise to undesirable social consequences to the extent of becoming a morals problem, and which undeniably have contributed to crime incidences; but more particularly, these separations have been an attributable cause of the breaking up of family units: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation to admit members of the families of resident nationals and permanently resident aliens into the United States and its possessions and Territories on a nonquota basis: *Provided, however,* That such nationals and resident aliens have been bona fide residents of the United States or its possessions or Territories for no less than 10 years preceding the date of the enactment of such legislation: *And provided further,* That such nationals and resident aliens are gainfully employed at the time of their application for the admission of their family members into the United States or its possessions or territories.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to the Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 11th day of May 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 43

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa

"Whereas the fishing sampan *Shinei Maru*, owned by Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama, a citizen of the United States, was attacked by United States planes on December 8, 1941, resulting in the destruction of the sampan as well as in the loss of the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa, both citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas no reimbursement has been made to Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama for the loss of the sampan or compensation allowed the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa for damages suffered due to their death; and

"Whereas at the time of such loss and for a number of years thereafter no right of legal action lay against the Government of the United States whereby, in situations comparable to this, damages might be obtained; and

"Whereas despite the adoption of Federal enabling legislation, there yet appears to be serious doubt whether action lies or could be successfully prosecuted against the Government of the United States for the recovery of damages suffered through the loss of the sampan and the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and for the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa to compensate them for the loss of the vessel *Shinei Maru* and the lives of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"House Concurrent Resolution 44

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kin of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Ueyehara

"Whereas the fishing sampan *Kiho Maru*, owned by Kiichi Kida, a citizen of the United States, was attacked by United States planes on December 8, 1941, resulting in the destruction of the sampan as well as in the loss of the lives of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Ueyehara, also a citizen of the United States; and

"Whereas no reimbursement or compensation has been made to the next of kin of Kiichi Kida for the loss of his life and of the vessel nor to the next of kin of Kiho Ueyehara for the loss of his life; and

"Whereas at the time of such loss and for a number of years thereafter no right of legal action lay against the Government of the United States whereby in situations comparable to this damages might be obtained; and

"Whereas despite the adoption of Federal enabling legislation there yet appears to be serious doubt whether action now lies or could be successfully prosecuted against the Government of the United States for the recovery of damages suffered through the loss of the lives of Kiichi Kida and of Kiho Ueyehara and the loss of the sampan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the

United States be requested to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kind of Kichii Kida and Kiho Uyehara to compensate them for the loss of their lives and of the vessel *Kiho Maru*; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Cook County Council, the American Legion, Chicago, Ill., relating to illegally held prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting held at the Polish Home in Lackawanna, N. Y., on the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, relating to Polish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Holy Name Society, St. Jerome's Rectory, Brooklyn, N. Y., signed by Louis Einstman, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that society, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., relating to lawmaking by treaty, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mary O'Connell, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill to have the regulation of the so-called field price of natural gas removed from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission; and

"Whereas this bill involves a group of bills which would remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to regulate prices of natural gas at the source and shipped in interstate commerce; and

"Whereas the removal of Federal regulatory jurisdiction would be financially injurious to the many users of natural gas in Massachusetts communities; therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby expresses its opposition to the passage of legislation which would remove the rate-fixing powers from the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RECOGNITION OF EASTERN (GREEK) ORTHODOX CHURCH—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America and the National Council of Eastern-Greek-Orthodox, a letter urgently recommending the official recognition of the Eastern-Greek-Orthodox faith, for the purpose of identifying religious affiliation of United States servicemen, under Senate bill 106, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I strongly favor this bill because I feel that it embodies a basic American principle—the right of religious freedom.

This bill is designed to give official Government recognition to the Eastern-Greek-Orthodox Church and to instruct the Armed Forces to mark the dog tags of servicemen with the initials "E. O." Certainly the 7 million Americans who are members of this faith merit this consideration. In past years members of this faith going into the armed services, have had to register either as Protestants or Catholics, although the Greek Orthodox Church contends that neither designation properly applies. Young men of this faith have gladly laid down their lives in wars this Nation has fought. They are entitled to this small consideration. I cannot see any valid basis for opposition to this bill.

The resolution which I am attaching from the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America, summarizes their stand on this matter most appropriately.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C.

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: The Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America and the National Council of Eastern (Greek) Orthodox, speaking in the interest of 7 million Eastern Greek Orthodox urge you, a member of the Armed Forces Committee of the United States Senate and a staunch supporter of and fighter for the rights and dignities of man, to give due consideration and deliberation to Senate bill 106 of the 84th Congress. After such consideration and deliberation, we are sure you will reach the conclusion that S. 106 should pass.

S. 106 officially recognizes the Eastern Greek Orthodox faith and authorizes the armed services to mark the dog tags of servicemen with the initials "EO." For your consideration and the consideration of the Members of Congress, we submit the following resolution:

"Whereas the Eastern Greek Orthodox faith was founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles with the establishment of churches in Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople; and

"Whereas today there are approximately 250 million followers of the Eastern Orthodox faith throughout the world, 7 million of whom are citizens and residents of the United States of America; and

"Whereas during World War II the members in the Armed Forces of the United

States of the Eastern Orthodox faith were not given a preference of designation as Eastern Orthodox but were required to register as Catholics or Protestants indiscriminately; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America and of the 48 States guarantees freedom of religion and equal rights and privileges, with no one church gaining any preference over the other; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recognized Eastern Greek Orthodox priests to administer the religious services and sacraments to members of the Eastern Orthodox faith in the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States and these priests have an admirable record for services rendered; and

"Whereas during World War II and today there were and are thousands upon thousands of members of the Armed Forces of the Eastern Orthodox faith; and

"Whereas thousands of members of the Eastern Orthodox faith have made the supreme sacrifice in fighting for the democracy of the world, one of which principles is freedom of religion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to vote favorably on Senate bill 106 and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Armed Forces Committee of the Senate of the United States and of the House of Representatives of the United States."

THE VOICE OF GREEK ORTHODOXY
IN AMERICA,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EASTERN
(GREEK) ORTHODOX,

By LA JOY CHUMERIS,
Acting Secretary.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER AND OPERATION OF UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, at the request of the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by that organization relating to Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 relating to the treaty-making power, and to the operation of the United Nations.

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

We Americans of Polish descent, assembled on this 1st day of May 1955, at the Modjeska Hall, Wilmington, Del., to commemorate the signature on May 3, 1791, of the Polish Constitution, one of the world's great documents of freedom, like Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the American Declaration of Independence, have adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas liberty is the most precious possession of mankind. We Americans possessing liberty should exert the eternal vigilance which is necessary to preserve it; and

"Whereas our American Government is founded on the concept of the individuality and the dignity of the human being under God. Underlying this concept is the belief that the human person is important because he was created by God and endowed by Him with inalienable rights which no civil authority may usurp; and

"Whereas we cannot remain silent and indifferent. We have reached a point that we must decide whether our rights and freedoms are truly inalienable or whether they are subject to alienation by a treaty or an international agreement; and

"Whereas unlimited treaty power poses a continuing threat to the Constitution, this threat having been recently augmented by

the fact that four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States actually held that the United Nations Charter—ratified treaty—supersedes our Constitution; and

"Whereas amending the Constitution is a subject in which the President has no legal concern whatsoever. In 1798 the Supreme Court held (3 Dallas, 378) that a proposal by Congress to amend a Constitution is not a legislative subject and therefore not for consideration by the President: Be it

"Resolved, That we, assembled in this commemoration meeting, reaffirm our previous support of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) petitioning our Representatives in the United States Congress to support the adoption of this legislation to be a part of the fundamental law, which would not interfere with the power of the President and the Department of State to negotiate treaties and other international agreements and thus to properly conduct our foreign affairs: It would only prevent treaties from violating the American Constitution and prevent them from becoming internal law within the United States until implemented by appropriate American legislation.

"Whereas, the United Nations is completely ineffective as an instrument of peace, further, the United Nations Charter 'stands as a constant threat and peril to the Constitution and precious liberties and rights of American citizens, the United Nations is clearly demonstrated to be a spawning ground for spies and subversives and has been used as a sounding board by the Russians for propaganda purposes'; and

"Whereas, efforts are being made, through suggested amendments, to convert the United Nations into a world government from which there would be no escape: Be it

"Resolved, That we, assembled at this commemoration meeting, favor that the United Nations should be kept only as a forum for discussion in international disputes, it should be prohibited from any 'evolution into a world state.' It should be outlawed in all its efforts to write domestic laws for member nations such as, for example, the Convention Against Genocide and the Covenant on Human Rights; further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen from Delaware, chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision, and to Senator JOHN W. BRICKER."

JOHN F. KANICKI,
Presiding Officer.

Attest: VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER IN KANSAS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received from Howard Payne, city clerk of the city of Kansas City, Kans., a letter transmitting a resolution adopted by the board of commissioners of that city, favoring the continuance of surveys and planning for the conservation of soil and water in the State of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
May 13, 1955.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith for your consideration a resolution adopted by the

governing body of Kansas City, Kans., in re flood control in Kansas.

Mayor Mitchum had planned to bring the resolution to Washington but was prevented from attending because of a previous commitment for a meeting with the Kansas Turnpike Authority.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

HOWARD PAYNE,
City Clerk.

Resolution 15130

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Kansas City, Kans., this 5th day of May 1955.

HOWARD PAYNE,
City Clerk.

PAUL L. MITCHUM,
Mayor-Commissioner.

EARL B. WARNER,
Commissioner Finance, Health, and Public Property.

JOSEPH P. REGAN,
Commissioner of Streets, Parks, and Boulevards.

GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR NURSES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a statement by deans and directors of graduate educational programs for nurses, setting forth the reasons for requesting special attention to the critical needs for education and research projects in the field of nursing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The statement will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

AREAS OF HIGH PRIORITY NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO NURSING SERVICE AND NURSING EDUCATION

After careful study and assessment of the key barriers to providing the kind, amount and quality of nursing services needed by the people of this country, the deans and directors of graduate educational programs for nurses listed below recommend that priority be given both in the appropriation of Federal funds and in the approval of projects for the following areas of critical need in education and research in nursing.

A. CRITICAL NEED FOR MORE AND BETTER PREPARED NURSING PERSONNEL

1. Nurses to fill key administrative and supervisory positions in hospitals and public health agencies, in order that nursing services may be improved throughout the country.

2. Faculties for schools of nursing, especially nursing faculty for graduate programs, directors of schools and teachers of nursing, so that students graduating from basic nursing programs may be more ready to cope with rapidly changing health needs of the people.

3. Clinical nursing specialists qualified to give expert nursing care and serve as consultants in agencies that render nursing service.

4. Nurses skilled in research to add to the body of knowledge of nursing as a discipline, and to bring to the study of problems of nursing practice, organization and administration of nursing services, and education of nurses, the same scientific approach and methods that have proved successful in the fields of engineering, medicine and the other sciences.

B. URGENT NEED FOR EXPANSION OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES, TO PREPARE THE REQUIRED NURSING PERSONNEL

1. Financial aid to institutions of higher education that offer programs approved for preparation of key nursing personnel. This should include assistance for the development of demonstration units, provision of additional faculty, buildings and other educational facilities and resources.

2. Scholarship and fellowship aid for individual nurses who qualify for admission to approved basic and graduate programs, to make it possible for the required number of nurses to undertake preparation for these key positions in the shortest possible time. Of key importance is financial aid to graduate nurses to prepare for teaching, supervisory, and administrative positions.

C. AREAS IN WHICH THERE IS CRITICAL NEED FOR RESEARCH

1. Function of nursing: Research is needed to further clarify the role and proper functions of the professional nurse and other nursing personnel providing nursing services to individuals and families in light of changing health needs, advances in medical practice and extension of health resources.

2. Application of science to the techniques and art of nursing: Such research should continuously add to the body of knowledge of nursing in a systematic way, replacing the empirical basis for practice with a scientific basis that will insure keeping the practice of nursing in pace with advances in the related physical, biological, social, psychological, medical, and health sciences. The cooperation of specialists in these sciences is needed to advance nursing knowledge.

3. Organization and administration of nursing service: Such research should provide for the application of the science of human engineering to the organization and administration of nursing personnel to make most effective and economical use of their nursing and related skills. The cooperation of specialists in business administration and industrial engineering as well as hospital administration is needed to advance knowledge in this area.

4. Education for nurses: Such research should provide for the application of the science of education to the development of programs preparing the various types of nursing personnel and preparing the teachers of nurses. This should include with respect to educational programs for each type of personnel, research in selecting students, designing curricular patterns, selecting learning experiences, and developing methods and tools of teaching and evaluation.

Miss Marjorie Bartholf, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Texas, Medical Branch, Galveston, Tex.; Miss Elizabeth S. Bixler, Dean, Yale University School of Nursing, New Haven, Conn.; Miss Katherine J. Densford, Director, School of Nursing, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Miss Katharine Faville, Dean, College of Nursing, Wayne University, Detroit, Mich.; Mrs. Lulu Wolf Hassenplug, Dean, School of Nursing, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Miss Julia Hereford, Dean, School of Nursing, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.; Mrs. Ruth Kuehn, Dean, School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Henrietta Adams Loughran, Dean, University of Colorado School of Nursing, Denver, Colo.; Mrs. R. Louise McManus, Director, Division of Nursing Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; Sister M. Olivia, Dean, School of Nursing Education, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; Miss Louise M. Schmidt, Director, Graduate Program, College of Nursing, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Miss Edith H. Smith, Dean, Syracuse University School of Nursing, Syracuse, N. Y.; Miss Martha Ruth Smith, Dean, School of Nursing, Boston University, Boston, Mass.; Miss Frances C. Thielbar, Chairman, Nursing Education, the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Mary S. Tschudin, Acting Dean, School of Nursing, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1805. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 352); and

H. R. 3322. A bill 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; with amendments (Rept. No. 351).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1795. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 353).

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

S. 33. A bill relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 356).

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

S. 51. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin, with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes"; with an amendment (Rept. No. 357).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 358).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4052. A bill 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 354).

GEO. D. EMERY CO.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Geo. D. Emery Co., and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 427) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1981. A bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes; and

S. 1982. 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1983. A bill for the relief of Myra Louise Dew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1984. A bill to provide 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 Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1985. A bill for the relief of the St. Alexius Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Josefa Chacon De Molen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Peter Chou-Yuen Tchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1988. A bill to authorize the issuance of death certificates in the case of members of the Armed Forces who have died while on active duty subsequent to September 16, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1989. A bill to provide 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 Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1990. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to require in certain cases that air carriers provide transportation for additional baggage at airfreight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1991. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to authorize production payments, limit price-supports eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1992. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1993. A bill authorizing the installation of additional elevators in the Senate wing of the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1994. A bill transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.;

S. 1996. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1997. A bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1998. A bill to amend section 70a (5) of the Bankruptcy Act;

S. 1999. A bill to amend section 70d (5) of the Bankruptcy Act; and

S. 2000. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 2001. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2003. A bill to provide for the payment of more adequate compensation to the Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation for land taken from them by the United States in 1942 for military purposes; and

S. 2004. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 2005. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2006. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to stimulate the development and construction of cooperative housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2007. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 2008. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPLETING CONSTRUCTION OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

The bill (S. 1981) to authorize appropriations for completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of late the Congress and the executive departments have indicated their friendship to Latin America—friendship that will bring about good will, better understanding, and economic betterment.

To me, those have been beautiful words; but in order to carry out those

noble sentiments, I believe that something practical should be done to indicate that we mean what we say.

Hence, I am introducing a bill which will authorize appropriations for the construction of the Inter-American Highway. The bill is simple. It authorizes that the amount for 1957, 1958, and 1959, under the 1954 act, be appropriated immediately, and be available until expended; and that an additional sum of \$25,730,000 be authorized and appropriated immediately, for the purposes of, and in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the 1954 act.

If the bill becomes law, it surely will prove to our friends of Latin America that we mean what we say.

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, 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. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement concerning the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

The bill (S. 1982) 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, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill would 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 work incidental thereto. Such a building is needed to replace the Arts and Industries Building, a 75-year-old structure of very cheap construction. The present building is impossibly overcrowded and utterly inadequate for the purposes it should serve, namely, the preservation and exhibition of the priceless collections memorializing our Nation's history and technological development. The purposes of the bill have the approval of the Smithsonian Institution, General Services Administration, the National Capitol Planning Commission, the Commission on Fine Arts, and the Bureau of the Budget.

PROPOSED POLIOMYELITIS IMMUNIZATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immu-

nization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes.

The bill is designed to carry out the recommendations on this subject in the report to the President made on yesterday by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$28 million in Federal grants to the States, to be available until December 31, 1956.

It is my hope that the bill, which represents an integral part of the administration's comprehensive program, as reported, will receive early consideration and approval by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter of transmission from Secretary Hobby to the President of the Senate be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1984) to provide 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, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of assisting States to assure that no child will be denied immunization against poliomyelitis, during the current shortage of the poliomyelitis vaccine, because of inability to pay for the cost thereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$28 million, to remain available until December 31, 1956. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, applications for carrying out the purposes of this act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2, the Secretary shall allot to each State which has an application approved pursuant to section 4 an amount equal to 20 percent of the number of unimmunized children in such State multiplied by the product of (1) the cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine per child and (2) the State's allotment percentage. The amount so computed for each State shall be reduced by the percentage by which such sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 are less than the total of the amounts so computed for all States.

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

STATE APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDS

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

(a) sets forth a statewide program for use of the poliomyelitis vaccine purchased with funds paid to the State under this act, which contains reasonable assurance that no child, or, if (and for so long as) any priority groups are established by the Secretary under this act, no child within such priority group or groups, will be denied vaccination against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the cost thereof: *Provided*, That this shall not prevent a State from providing for the free vaccination against poliomyelitis, without regard to ability to pay, of all unimmunized children, or all such children within any one or more groups determined by the State, but, in such case, the amount paid to such State under this act with respect to the poliomyelitis vaccine for such children may not exceed the allotment percentage for such State multiplied by the cost of the vaccine for 20 percent of such children;

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

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

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

PAYMENTS TO STATES

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

USE OF FUNDS PAID TO STATES

SEC. 6. Funds paid to a State under this act may be used solely for the purchase, prior to December 31, 1956, of the poliomyelitis vaccine for use in carrying out the program set forth in the application of such State approved pursuant to section 4.

FURNISHING OF VACCINE BY SECRETARY

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

PRIORITIES AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 8. Priorities established by the Secretary for purposes of section 4 (a) shall be based on the relative susceptibility of various age groups of children to poliomyelitis. The Secretary is authorized to establish an advisory committee on distribution of the poliomyelitis vaccine to advise and assist him in the establishment of such priorities. Appointed members of such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences or meet-

ings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding \$50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2).

DIVERSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

SEC. 9. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the program included in the application of such State approved under section 4, finds that—

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

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

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

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. For purposes of this act—

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

(b) (1) The term "child" means any individual who has not attained the age of 20 years;

(2) The number of children shall be determined by the Secretary, as of June 30, 1955, on the basis of the latest information furnished by the Department of Commerce;

(3) The number of unimmunized children means the number of such children, reduced by the extent to which any such child has received the vaccinations against poliomyelitis, determined by the Secretary as of such date or dates as he may select for purposes of this act;

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

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

The letter presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

MAY 16, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of a bill (the Poliomyelitis Immunization Assistance Act of 1955), to provide 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.

This bill is designed to carry out the recommendation in my report to the President on this subject. With the cooperation of the States, it would assure, as the President indicated should be done, that no child would be denied immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay for such immunization.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$28 million, to be available until December 31, 1956, for grants to States. This

amount of money is estimated to be sufficient to purchase the vaccine required to vaccinate 22 percent of all children through age 19 who are not vaccinated under the program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

The amounts appropriated pursuant to the bill would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative child population (under age 20) and the State's allotment percentage. The allotment percentages would be varied inversely with relative State per capita income, with the percentage for the average State set at 20 percent. The State with the lowest per capita income would receive an amount sufficient to pay for the vaccine for about 41 percent of its children, while the State with the highest per capita income would receive enough for about 15 percent of its children. Under this formula, sufficient funds would be allotted to provide vaccine for 22 percent of all unimmunized children in the United States, and for substantially greater percentages in States with lower than average per capita income. This should make it possible for each State to provide the kind of assurance which the President recommended.

The allotments would be made to States on the basis of applications setting forth a statewide program, administered or supervised by a single State agency, which would provide reasonable assurance that no child will be denied vaccination because of inability to pay. As priority groups are established by the Secretary for purposes of this bill—because of shortage of the vaccine—the State's assurance would apply, so long as such priorities are in effect, to the children included in the priority group or groups. These priorities would be based on the relative susceptibility of various age groups to the disease. The State could, however, if it wished, provide for free vaccination against poliomyelitis for all children (or all children within any one or more groups determined by the State) not already immunized against the disease. But, in such a case, the amount paid the State could not exceed 20 percent of the cost of the vaccine for such children multiplied by the State's allotment percentage (which increases the 20 percent figure in the case of the low income States, and decreases it for the high income States).

Payments to the States from their allotments would be based on advance estimates with later adjustments to take account of errors. The funds so paid could be used only for purchase, prior to December 31, 1956, of the poliomyelitis vaccine for carrying out the State's program included in its approved application.

Provision is made under the bill for use by the Secretary of all or a portion of a State's allotment to purchase the poliomyelitis vaccine. The vaccine would then be turned over to the State for its program. This use of a State's allotment can only be made at the State's request.

Any priority groups for purposes of the bill would be established by the Secretary with the advice of an advisory committee appointed for this purpose.

If funds paid any State are diverted or there is substantial failure to carry out the State program included in its application, the Secretary would be authorized to withhold further payments to the State. This could be done only after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the enclosed draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to authorize production payments, limit price-support eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1991) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to authorize production payments, limit price-support eligibility, and provide 90-percent price supports for basic family-farm production, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill is aimed at removing some of the criticisms and objections to existing and past price-support programs in regard to the proportion of benefits going to large corporation-type farm operators. Instead, it would channel the price-support benefits where they are needed most—to the average farmer's basic living costs. It introduces a new two-price concept into the support program, with a complete cutoff of support benefits for production exceeding \$50,000 in gross value from any one farm.

Under terms of this bill, farmers would be granted not less than 90 percent of parity price supports on products from any one farm up to a gross value of \$25,000.

For additional farm production with a gross value up to \$50,000, farmers would be eligible for price supports of not less than 75 percent. For production above the \$50,000 gross value limitation, no support would be provided at all.

Nothing in the bill limits the initiative of individual farmers or larger commercial operators, even though its benefits are concentrated upon family farmers. Whatever the size of his operation, a farmer would be entitled to 90-percent support on the first basic \$25,000 value of his production, 75 percent on the next \$25,000 worth of production, and still be free to sell on the open market without support any production beyond \$50,000 in value.

However, I believe it achieves a better balance between economic and social objectives of farm legislation by offering some semblance of protection toward fair prices for the basic production required to meet living expenses of a family farmer, yet removing support incentives for the big corporation farm operator to increase production beyond the point for which there is effective demand in the open market.

Most of our family farms do not exceed the \$25,000 gross value of production. For a typical midwest farm, that \$25,000 gross production would only mean around \$7,000 net income. That is far more than the majority of our farmers ever achieve in net income.

I wish to emphasize that the vast majority of the American farmers have gross incomes which are far below \$25,000, and net incomes away below \$7,000.

My price-support bill would extend support to cover such perishables as hogs, eggs, farm chickens, broilers, turkeys, beef cattle, whole milk and butterfat, but authorizes use of production payments as an alternative means of support for such commodities to avoid full dependence on purchase or storage that takes such commodities from the consumer. Under the terms of the bill, any such payments would be limited to \$2,500 in any 1 year for the products of any 1 farm.

I believe that by so doing we shall meet much of the criticism which relates to the extensive use of price supports in what are called large commercial operations, and I thereby have outlined a proposal which would meet the requirements of maintaining a family farm pattern in the United States, under which the individual farmer must rely upon the production of his commodities for his income and for the sustenance of his family.

The bill calls for supporting soybeans, cottonseed, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and rye at the same levels as the basic commodities, and fixes the support level for grain sorghums, barley, and oats on the basis of their comparative feeding value to corn.

The purpose of this is because some of the commodities I have mentioned, such as sorghums, barley, and oats, are alternative feeds for wheat and corn—particularly corn. Therefore, it is my view that price supports should be tied in with the alternative feeds as related to the feed value of corn, since the price of corn is supported.

I believe this farm bill would be a constructive step in the right direction. It is also a new step, one long overdue, in the direction of effective, constructive price-support mechanism.

That direction is toward equality of economic opportunity for our farm people, and preservation of the historic family farm pattern of agriculture that has meant so much to our country.

Our current fight for agriculture has very properly been an economic one, but it is a social one as well. Most of us have long realized that all progress in rural America really stems from an adequate opportunity for diligent farm people to earn a decent and full living.

Without economic opportunity, little social progress can be made in agriculture. We cannot have adequate rural schools, rural housing, and rural health facilities until farmers themselves get a decent return for their toil and production. We are not going to do the job we should be doing in conserving our heritage of productive soil unless farmers have the opportunity of providing properly for their families without having to mine and exploit the soil.

We are not going to be able to preserve our family pattern of agriculture unless economic opportunity continues to exist for young people to stay on the farm. We need these young people in American agricultural production.

My objectives for family farming in America have never changed. They were summed up in broad terms in an address in 1953 before the Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, as a family farmer's bill of rights. Included as goals to which I declared at that time American agriculture should be entitled were—

First. The right to full equality of economic opportunity.

Second. The right for improved standards of rural living.

Third. The right of reasonable protection against natural hazards.

Fourth. The right to extend agricultural free enterprise through cooperative action.

Fifth. The right to public cooperation and assistance in saving the soil.

Sixth. The right to decent land tenure which would encourage the desirable goal of farm ownership.

Seventh. The right to a democratic voice by farmers in their own farm programs.

Eighth. The right to benefits of an expanding world trade.

Ninth. The right to a long-term program of food storage to encourage abundance.

Tenth. The right to preserve the social and human values of family farming.

They were my goals and objectives before my formalized statement of the farmers' bill of rights, and they have been my goals and objectives ever since. They should be the goals and objectives of this Congress.

Last fall, I looked back upon that 1953 speech and asked myself: Which way have we been moving in the past year?

Closer to those objectives, or drifting away from them? That is the question we should all be asking ourselves today.

My conclusion, I regret to say, was that we were drifting further away, rather than making progress.

It is for that reason I have sponsored legislation seeking to bring our farm program back onto the main track of such objectives.

I believe the bill I am today introducing is a step in that direction.

I have never contended that farm-price supports alone could and would meet all the problems in agriculture. Yet they are a necessary foundation stone to preserving economic opportunity in agriculture. Linked with such economic protection must be more effective means of making production adjustments, such as incentives to divert some of our unneeded cropland into grassland so that its fertility can be conserved in the soil. By such means we can store in the ground the potential production that will eventually be needed to feed our growing population, instead of being worried about storing temporary excesses of food supplies for which there is no immediate market.

I respectfully suggest that in the years to come this Nation will not be faced with the problem of overproduction. It may well be faced with the problem of undersupply. Our population is growing at a rate of not less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ million a year, and the availability of new cropland is very limited. Therefore we must look to the future in terms of fertility

and productivity of this land of ours, which is the only means we have for sustaining a high standard of living.

Other steps in a more effective farm program must include greater attention to increased utilization of our abundance, and stimulation of consumption. We must encourage greater research, particularly into developing new domestic uses and outlets for our abundance, and improved marketing procedures and methods. We must give more thought to such ideas as food-stamp plans to enable our low-income families to become greater consumers. We must reappraise the credit needs of agriculture. We must encourage vocational agricultural education to step up the efficiency of our upcoming generations of farmers. Yet we must provide our new young farmers an opportunity to make use of their training and knowledge by making sure economic opportunities are preserved for them to make a decent livelihood.

We must make greater use of our food abundance as an effective arm of our foreign policy. We must accelerate and promote our foreign trade in agricultural commodities. This is a top priority item on overall agricultural economic policy. We have paid too little attention to the possibilities of finding or creating new markets abroad for our agricultural commodities. Likewise, we should explore some form of international food and fiber reserves or world food bank, to act as an international stabilizing device.

We need greater consideration of the serious economic plight of our more depressed farm areas, of the low-income farmers who are unable to earn more than \$1,000 a year. None of these views are new. They are convictions I have long voiced, as consistently exemplified by my votes in this Chamber.

Many constructive measures have been introduced in this session to make real progress on these objectives. My hope is that we can have the vision to look at the farm situation in the broad perspective, and authorize a sound program that meets all of its needs, not just part of them.

Yet the basis for almost any other approach to higher rural living standards rests on a decent income for the farmer.

We recognize the necessity for adequate research to develop new and more efficient farming methods. Yet the average farmer usually can only take advantage of new ideas to modernize his operations if he is making enough money to invest a bit more in his enterprise.

We realize the imperative necessity for greater attention to sound conservation farming practices; yet history of several decades has shown us that conservation takes a setback when farm income is down, and makes its greatest gains when farmers are making a decent living.

It is not my intention at this time to review the entire critical economic situation in American agriculture. Yet, anyone is blind who does not see and recognize that farmers are in trouble. And anyone is foolishly blind who does not see the relation between present troubles in agriculture and grave future consequences for the rest of the country. We are not in a healthy condition as a na-

tion, when some segments of our economy are enjoying a boom and other segments are in a serious recession. It is time more of us turned our eyes away from soaring stock markets and industrial profits as a barometer of this Nation's economic health, and looked instead at the economic weakness of what should be our basic productive strength—the producers of food and fiber.

I urge careful consideration of the farm price-support bill I have proposed, for I believe it charts an improved course.

By extending some semblance of economic protection to producers of our meat animals, it can open the door to using our abundance of feed supplies instead of just storing them.

By providing a cutoff point for price supports, and level of price supports, it removes any barrier to production adjustments by encouraging those adjustments among the brackets best able to make them, instead of among the smaller farm operators least able to make them.

Mr. President, the direction my measure seeks to take is a direction toward which many thoughtful students of farm problems have recognized we should be aiming.

To the February 5 issue of *America*, the national Catholic weekly review, its economics editor, Father Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., contributed a constructive and thought-provoking article, entitled "Farm Program of Abundance." At that time I wrote to inform him that I concurred most heartily in his views.

Because I believe his article deserves careful consideration, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT 1

FARM PROGRAM FOR ABUNDANCE

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Sometime during the life of the 84th Congress, most probably next year on the eve of the 1956 elections, a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives will challenge the administration's farm price-support program. They will roundly condemn Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson's flexible price supports and demand that basic crops be supported rigidly at 90 percent of parity. On Capitol Hill they will very likely win their fight, but they will lose it in the White House. With the farm bloc in Congress split over the issue, they will be unable to muster the two-thirds majority required to override a Presidential veto. And a Presidential veto is just what a 90-percent-of-parity bill will get.

Though such a struggle will not lack interest or importance, it looks from this vantage point like a fight over the wrong issue at the wrong time. The rival corners are not debating the essentials of our agricultural policy; they are only quarreling over details. They agree that farm prices must be supported artificially. They agree that in order to accomplish this the Government must pay some respect to the law of supply and demand. They agree, therefore, that the other side of the price-support coin is a Government curb on planting and marketing, since without restrictions of some kind huge surpluses will accumulate and eventually wreck the program. They disagree only on a matter of detail; on whether the objective of the program—the assuring of a fair income to farmers—can be better attained by flexible supports or by rigid supports.

Note a very important implication of this controversy. Both sides are fearful of abundance. They are, in fact, opposed to abundance. They do not see how abundance can be reconciled with a just return to the farmer for his productive energies. They point out that the farmer, unlike the businessman, cannot shut down his plant when inventories hang heavy over the market. He cannot tell the cow to stop giving milk, the chickens to cease laying eggs, the wheat and corn to quit growing. He cannot readily shift his product to meet variations in demand. He cannot control his price, as many businessmen can and do control their prices. The more the farmer produces, the less he is apt to receive for his produce.

In time of war, say the advocates of price supports and crop controls, abundance may be a blessing, but in time of peace it is at best a problem and at worst a curse. Remember when farmers killed little pigs with the benediction of the United States Department of Agriculture, and used wheat for fuel in their kitchen stoves?

If all the peoples of the world enjoyed a decent minimum diet, this fear of abundance might make sense. It might even be justified as a guiding motive for agricultural policy. But how can it possibly make sense, not only to a Christian, but to any normal, God-fearing man, when a sizable fraction of the people on the face of the earth don't know what it is to have a square meal, and every night go to bed hungry? How can it make sense when communism is sweeping through Asia on the wings of a promise to give the peasants land and the suffering, nameless masses a better break in life? Fear of abundance? We must be out of our minds.

ABUNDANCE: BLESSING AND RESPONSIBILITY

Though it does not say this in so many words, that is exactly how the National Catholic Rural Life Conference regards our thinking on the farm problem. The delegates who attended its last convention, held in Davenport, Iowa, in October, knew all about the \$7 billion worth of farm surpluses which a harried Government has stored on farms, in elevators, in caves, even in the holds of ships anchored in the Hudson River. They knew all about the cuts in acreage and the curbs on marketing which Secretary Benson has been obliged to impose. Yet, knowing all this, they proceeded to adopt a resolution which begins in this way:

"The NCRLC is deeply grateful to Almighty God for the abundant production of food and fiber during 1954 in the United States. His fruitful blessing has been placed on the difficult and devoted work of our farmers and has brought it to success. This year again there is true cause for thanksgiving."

Jabbing the needle still more deeply into the restrictionists, the delegates noted with warm approval the trend toward increased production both per acre and per person. This, too, though it partially nullified the Government's acreage limitation program, the delegates insisted on regarding as a special gift from God and a source of added wealth to the Nation. Finally, as if to make sure that even the most obtuse got the point, they added this paragraph:

"We regret to hear from many voices in this country a growing chorus of alarm over what is called surplus production. We believe that the concern is misplaced. The real matter for alarm is that the surplus is not recognized as a great blessing and a rare opportunity."

In refusing to swim with the anti-abundance stream, the NCRLC is not acting naively or perversely. Even this lukewarm generation, which has diverged so widely from the paths of its ancestors, should recognize, if somewhat vaguely, that the conference is motivated by Christian principles. To the delegates at Davenport, the obligations of charity do not stop at national

boundary lines. To them it is unthinkable that United States surpluses should be permitted to pile up in bins and barns while millions of people elsewhere are in desperate need of them. The real problem, therefore, is not production. It is distribution. We have surpluses, explains the NCRLC, only because we have forgotten that we are, under God, stewards, not absolute owners, of our rich resources; and that these resources are intended, through our conscientious management, to satisfy the needs of all.

After this criticism of the basic philosophy of the farm price program, the delegates naturally felt obliged to offer an alternative. In rough outline, here is what they proposed.

The NCRLC agrees with the proponents of price-support programs that farmers labor under special handicaps which require governmental intervention. Without help of some kind, they cannot earn a fair share of the national income. Yet, in return for discharging their social duty of producing food and fiber, they have a right to such an income. The Government's efforts to assure them a fair return on their work and investment is merely an exercise of distributive justice. Though the NCRLC appreciates how unfair is some of the criticism of present price-support programs, it also recognizes the shortcomings of these programs. It is ready to concede that present methods of price support have neither satisfied the consumer and the taxpayer nor solved the major problems which beset the farmer. Therefore, a fundamentally new approach is needed.

A NEW APPROACH

Such an approach should be fair to consumers as well as to farmers. It should encourage, not discourage, production. It should be workable, that is, it can attempt to blunt the full effect of the law of supply and demand, but it must not try to repeal it. Is such an approach available? The NCRLC thinks that it is. It recommends, as a more workable solution than price supports, a system of carefully planned direct subsidies to farmers.

The system would work in this way. Farmers would produce anything they liked, and as much as they liked. They would sell their products in an uncontrolled market, where prices were set by supply and demand. Meanwhile, the Government would compute the parity price for each product, the price, that is, which is fair relative to the prices which the farmer pays for labor equipment and living needs. The difference would then be ascertained between the parity price and the price which the farmer obtained for his product when he brought it to market. This difference the Government would pay to the farmer in cash as a direct subsidy.

The NCRLC does not believe, however, that the Government should subsidize the total production of American agriculture. It wants the law to distinguish sharply between small, family-type farms and "factories in the fields." The resolution adopted at Davenport reads: "We feel that no subsidies should be paid on operations which exceed a specified maximum number of units." For anything over this maximum number, farmers would receive for their products no more than the market price. That would do away with the bias toward bigness in the present law, which requires small cotton farmers, for example, to reduce their acreage at the same rate as the owners of huge plantations.

FOR OPEN TRADE CHANNELS

As an essential complement of its direct-subsidy proposal, the NCRLC strongly advocates a liberal foreign-trade program. "We stand," said the delegates at Davenport, "for the gradual and progressive removal of tariff and other obstacles to trade among free nations." The fact is that, regardless of how

reasonable prices might become under a system of direct subsidies, our farmers can produce more food and fiber than we can possibly consume. The NCRLC wants our surplus products to flow freely through world trade channels to people who need them. These people can provide us in return with many articles and services which will enrich American life. Such an exchange would help reverse the anomalous, and dubiously moral, policy of restricting farm production when world population is growing and unnumbered millions are hungry or starving.

Is it too much to hope that the administration and the 84th Congress, instead of fighting over the virtues and defects of flexible and fixed price supports, might give serious consideration to a fresh approach to farm income? Is it beyond all possibility that they can rid themselves of the restrictionist hangover from depression days and see abundance as the blessing it is? If they need an extra nudge to break with the recent past, let them remember that the way of price supports is the way of ever-increasing shackles on the freedom of American farmers. That is not the way of our pioneering forebears.

The NCRLC would be the first to admit that direct subsidies offer no panacea for the problems of agriculture. Perhaps for certain products they offer no answer at all. All the NCRLC says is that direct subsidies, whatever their defects, have notable advantages over the price-support approach. A number of farm authorities, including a former Secretary of Agriculture, Charles Brannan, agree that this is so. At least in one case, so do President Eisenhower, Secretary Benson and a majority in Congress. At any rate, Congress voted last year direct subsidies to the Nation's wool growers and the President signed the bill. If these subsidies are good for wool, why not for corn and wheat, cotton and tobacco, butter and eggs?

On a question of this kind, urban opinion naturally carries little weight. It is probably biased anyway. Under price supports, urbanites pay twice to assure farmers a fair income—once at the grocery store in the form of high prices and again in the form of taxes at the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Since under a program of direct subsidies they would pay only once—in the form of taxes—there seems little doubt about where their sympathies lie. Naturally they are for subsidies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, another provocative, yet constructive, discussion of this problem appeared in the April 11 issue of the New Leader, in an article by E. G. Shinner, entitled "Toward Permanent Farm Prosperity." While Mr. Shinner's recommendations are more extreme than anything my measure proposes, his article emphasizes the need for channeling our support program more directly to the average operator and away from the big mass producer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shinner's article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT 2

TOWARD PERMANENT FARM PROSPERITY (By E. G. Shinner)

America's No. 1 industry—agriculture—has come upon troubled days. Yankee ingenuity in making two blades of grass grow where but one grew before has hoisted us on our own petard. In a sense, we are the victims of our own genius. The use of revolutionary power machinery, the development of hybrid plants with high resistance to weather and disease, the elimination of pests, and the

scientific use of fertilizer have all greatly contributed to raising our per-acre yield to unprecedented heights. As a result, we are possessed of a glut of farm products. The orderly distribution of this farm surplus has become a problem which has baffled the most ingenious and analytical minds.

In producing this surplus, ease of production has been coupled with the inducements offered by the Federal Government in the way of a guaranteed market for unlimited quantities of agricultural products. We are now producing food and fiber clearly beyond the capacity of both the domestic and foreign markets to absorb.

There are other complicating factors in the present dilemma of our farm economy. The development of synthetic fibers and foods (for both human and animal consumption) can no longer be ignored. Such formidable giants as rayon, dacron, nylon, etc. are making tremendous inroads in the use of cotton, wood and other natural fibers. In addition, the use of silicon in the treatment of fabrics is producing fantastic results. The life of natural yarns so treated can be increased, in some instances, as much as 10 times. Public acceptance of new synthetic fabrics is a fait accompli.

Less well known is the successful use of stilbestrol and urea in the feeding of cattle and sheep. Estimates of the savings in grain which result from the use of these miracle drugs range from 10 to 40 percent. One should also mention the increasing use in the human diet of oleomargarine, saccharin, sucaryl, various extracts, etc.; this type of chemical competition with natural farm products will undoubtedly increase as time passes. Also increasing is the national consciousness of the waistline; the persistent recommendation by expert dieticians of the desirability of reducing the intake of sweets, fats and starches establishes an effective roadblock in the way of greatly increased food consumption.

While it is true that there are still several million people in the United States who are undernourished, it is difficult to see how the farm problem can be solved in any permanent way merely by improving their diets. We must rather effect a reasonable balance between production and consumption if we are to have a permanently healthy agricultural economy.

Let there be any question about agriculture's importance, the following figures compare the gross annual output (in millions) of our five leading industries (construction figure for 1954, the rest for 1953):

Agriculture	\$35,430
Construction (plant and residential)	26,100
Oil (est. refined product)	23,000
Automobiles	13,984
Steel	12,433

Not only must we protect and stabilize our leading industry; we must protect and stabilize our huge farm investment, the aggregate of which is over \$150 billion. While farm indebtedness is, percentage-wise, comparatively small (roughly \$18 billion), it is nevertheless true that many farms are mortgaged up to 50 or 75 percent of their current market value; hence, it becomes an elementary economic necessity that, farm values be maintained at or near their present level. Our vital long-term mortgage investment can easily be impaired, or even destroyed, by either deflation or inflation of any significant magnitude.

The importance of a healthy agricultural economy can hardly be overestimated. When agriculture falters, there is no other sector of the economy capable of taking up the slack. Farm recessions, as we have learned by bitter experience over the last 3 decades, quickly infect other sections of our economy. The farm situation today is not healthy.

Per capita income is perhaps the best means of measuring economic health. In

uniform 1953 dollars, per capita nonfarm income was \$1,921 in 1946, \$1,970 in 1953, and \$1,926 last year. For the same 3 years, farm income was \$851, \$709, and \$688, respectively. By the end of 1954, the per capita farm income of \$652 was about a third of nonfarm income; it was about 44 percent just after World War II. Moreover, while nonfarm income now is slightly higher than just after World War II, farm income has shrunk by almost 20 percent.

Notwithstanding this sharp decline, our concern is more for the farmers' future than for their immediate present. If conditions in the industry were stabilized and would not in the foreseeable future grow worse than they are today, there would be comparatively little cause for alarm. Unhappily, the end of the farm decline is not in sight.

The present farm price-support program is both inequitable and ineffective. It falls far short of its major purpose—stabilization of the farm economy. Just a casual glance at the distribution of the money spent for farm support readily reveals the inequity and futility of the present program.

The latest census figures indicate these startling facts:

One and nine-tenths percent of the Nation's farmers received more than 25 percent of the total price-support benefits.

Nine percent received in excess of 50 percent of the benefits.

Ninety-one percent of our farmers received less than half of the price-support payments.

Price-support loans, for example, to the 5 largest cottongrowers in California averaged \$849,335 in 1953; the overall average was \$1,731. The 5 largest wheat loans in Montana and Oregon that year averaged \$175,000 each, against an overall average loan of \$4,000 in Montana and \$6,293 in Oregon. The 5 largest corn loans in Iowa averaged \$98,000 against an overall average of \$2,154.

While it is true that even this inequitable distribution of public support has made some contribution to the farm economy, it is inconceivable that it be continued as permanent Government policy. In common justice, we cannot continue to pay huge sums of money to factory-in-the-field type of operations, and at the same time permit only a dribble to reach the vast majority of our farm population.

Since 1935, the number of farms of 1,000 or more acres has increased 37 percent. These farms now contain a total of 494 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all United States farm land. The trend toward gigantism and the factory-in-the-field type of farm is astonishingly rapid.

When we moved armies of occupation into Italy, Germany, and Japan, among our first acts was to break up the great feudal estates. Right now, we have a Government land expert in Indochina engaged in a similar program. In our eagerness to promote and develop democracy in agriculture abroad, we have seemingly neglected to protect our own agricultural economy against the growth of a kind of creeping feudalism.

My approach to the present farm problem would be to abandon completely our present system of purchasing and/or providing non-recourse loans on farm products. I would substitute for it a system of direct production payments to the individual farmer—in an amount sufficient to give him and his family a reasonable basic income. Furthermore, I would limit the amount of production payments which any individual farmer could receive to a maximum of \$2,000 annually. I would allow the individual farmer full parity on his production up to \$7,000 of gross annual product and stop all payments at that point. Prices of farm products would be permitted to seek their own level in the open market. Production payments would consist of the difference between the parity price and the price the farmer received in the free market.

The total gross income of farmers in the record year of 1951 was \$37 billion. That was, roughly \$7,000 per farm, the figure which I have arbitrarily used as a limit of income on which production payments would be made. The following example will more clearly illustrate my plan:

Farmer A raises 10 bales of cotton (5,000 pounds), which he sells for, say, 25 cents a pound in the open market, realizing \$1,250. The parity price is, say, 35 cents a pound. He would be entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound, the difference between parity and market, or a net total payment of \$500.

Farmer B, a plantation owner, raises 1,000 bales of cotton (500,000 pounds), sells it for 25 cents a pound, for a total of \$125,000. He, too, is entitled to a subsidy payment of 10 cents a pound on the first \$7,000 of gross production (in this case, the first 20,000 pounds), but not more than \$2,000. In this case, the difference between market and parity would exactly equal the \$2,000 maximum.

If certain wealthy individuals and/or corporations wish to engage in farming as a business, let them do so by all means. But they should depend on the open market rather than on the Government for the sale of their product. Vast production of wholly unneeded products for sale to the Government should cease forthwith.

Similar production payments would be made on any and all products which Congress might see fit to include under the price-support system. It would seem feasible, however, to exempt sugar and wool from the above program. The present regulations appear to be getting reasonably satisfactory results on these products.

It has been argued that my figure of \$7,000 is too low; that \$10,000, \$12,000, or even \$15,000 would be more realistic. It has also been suggested that a graduated support system might be established with the payments, lowered by stages, up to a total of \$15,000 of gross annual production. I regard the figure as less important than the principle, but whatever figure may finally be adopted should not be so high as to defeat the objective—to effectively divert price-support benefits away from the wealthy 9 percent who do not need them, to the 91 percent of small farmers whose need is vital.

Such a farm program would simply do for the small farmer what is being done for the worker by labor unions and by the minimum-wage law. It would serve as a floor—an assurance that if the farmer makes the effort, he can get a reasonable return for his labor.

Certain economists have suggested a food-stamp plan as a means of disposing of our unmanageable surpluses. I regard food stamps as un-American in concept, basically a form of charity rather than a fair reward for labor. To be reasonably effective, a stamp plan would involve a gigantic problem of administration—a bureaucracy previously unknown to us in peacetime. Furthermore, it would become a badge of pauperism, publicly displayed throughout the retail markets of the Nation. Our people don't want charity; they want the opportunity to earn the money with which to buy food, and at prices which they can afford. A stamp plan is, at best, only a palliative. It does not attack the roots of the farm problem.

One of the most serious aspects of the farm problem is the constant drift of the farm population into the industrial labor market. Since 1930, the farm population has shrunk by over 8 million, while the overall population of the Nation has gained by 41 million. Over the last 10 years, an average of 77,000 families has made the exodus from farm to city each year. If each family represents approximately 1.5 workers (the actual figure is a bit higher), we are augmenting our city labor force by roughly 115,000 workers every year.

This exodus from the farms means that small towns and villages are suffering a similar fate. The shrinkage of farm population means a comparable shrinkage of the small-town population—professional men, merchants, and a great variety of service tradesmen. It is safe to estimate that our urban labor force is being annually augmented from this source by another 30,000 or 40,000 workers.

All of this should cause labor leaders to take heed, especially in view of the fact that urban production and employment are constantly yielding to technological improvements. Government figures show that in January 1955 the factories of the Nation were employing 400,000 less people than they employed in January 1954, notwithstanding an overall increase in production of some 8 percent. Factory employment in January 1955 was a cool million and a half below that of January 1953. The lesson is clear: Factory production is rising, while employment is steadily on the decline.

Labor groups increasingly pressured by the annual addition of 140,000 to 150,000 displaced rural workers must also face some startling facts about industrial automation. It is reliably reported that the Western Union Telegraph Co., through the adoption of automation, has reduced employment by more than 39,000 persons since 1945 and by some 18,000 since 1952. The advantage the company has gained from this curtailment is apparent; operating costs were reduced some \$4 million for the first 9 months of 1954, compared with the same period in 1953; earnings per share were \$7.50 in 1954, compared with \$6.77 in 1953, \$1.04 in 1952, and \$4.85 per share in 1951.

While estimates of the effects of automation on the Nation at large are, at best, educated guesses, students of the problem believe that insurance and communication companies, public utilities, and similar concerns which have a high degree of repetitive clerical operations will, within the next 2 or 3 years, install much automatic equipment. By so doing, they can easily reduce their working force by literally several hundred thousand persons annually.

A certain group of economists and some businessmen contend that this process will simply release these people for more constructive work elsewhere. (Benjamin Fairless of U. S. Steel expounded this theory in a recent speech before the Johnstown, Pa., Chamber of Commerce.) Apropos of this argument, there is a story that Harlow Curdick, president of General Motors, was displaying the newest automatic machines to CIO President Walter Reuther and asked: "Walter, how are you going to collect union dues from these guys?" Reuther was not at a loss: "How," he asked, "are you going to get them to buy cars?"

Admittedly, automation has created a new industry; but I am unable to find where it has increased employment in any of the so-called basic industries. Automation is here to stay, and a process of intensive study should be directed toward meeting this challenge—without delay. I had a feeling of frustration and deep disappointment when I read the President's 1955 Economic Report and found not a word on this all important subject.

I know no better place to start attacking the problem of automation than on the farm. All the facts of the urban labor situation point to the conclusion that we should seek to improve and conserve rural life by every means possible. We should keep the door of opportunity open not only for the small, family-sized farm but for the business and professional men of the small towns and villages, who depend for their livelihood upon a healthy farm economy.

What are the overall benefits to be derived from a program such as I have outlined? The first is obvious: lower food prices. These

would amount to an automatic wage increase for the entire economy.

Second, the farmer would be free to operate his farm in accordance with his own judgment. He would be freed of the burden of providing storage, conforming to acreage allotments and all of the many regulations to which he is now subjected.

Third, we would once more be in a position to compete in the markets of the world for our just share of foreign trade without fear of ridicule or criticism. We could no longer be charged with dumping by the various nations of the western world whose good will we so earnestly need and seek.

The question of the cost of such a program is, of course, proper. But, in evaluating its cost, let us bear in mind the health of our agricultural economy and its proper priority in relation to other major governmental expenditures. We are currently spending some \$40 billion annually on national defense. It is now proposed that the Federal Government contribute some \$2.5 billion a year to assist in improving our educational facilities, and, in addition, sponsor a highway program to cost \$101 billion over the next 10 years. I submit that, in order to meet the cost of these programs (all of which, for the purpose of this discussion, may be accepted as necessary), a sound and healthy national economy must be maintained. And our economic history is replete with indisputable evidence that the basis of our prosperity depends at all times on the degree of mass purchasing power which we are able to maintain.

Here we have an opportunity to improve the economic status (purchasing power) of some twenty-odd million of our farm population and, to a lesser degree, help the entire population through a reduction in the cost of living which must inevitably follow the restoration of a free market on agricultural products. All of this can be accomplished to the slight disadvantage of only 1.9 percent of our farmers (the group currently getting 25 percent of Government-support benefits).

While it is impossible to state with any positive degree of accuracy exactly what the program might cost, the most intelligent estimate that I have been able to obtain would place the maximum annual cost under \$3 billion; it might run as low as \$750 million a year. But this program would take the Government completely out of the picture insofar as buying, selling, and storing farm products are concerned, and would accordingly permit it to start an orderly process of liquidating the \$8 billion hoard of products now on hand. Therefore, it is conceivable that the money derived from liquidating the present surplus would completely finance the new program for at least 2 or 3 years. During this period, we would gain the necessary experience upon which to predicate a permanent program. It would be presumptuous to suggest that the factor of trial and error can henceforth be completely eliminated.

Administration of such a law should be relatively simple. The Bureau of Internal Revenue could easily amend its tax forms to show what products a farmer had produced and sold, for how much, and the amount of payments due from the Government, settlement to be made annually at the earliest date feasible after filing of the income-tax return. This showing of payments due would permit the farmer to establish immediately the basis for a bank loan of a comparable amount, as his needs may arise.

I am aware that certain economists will declare that this program penalizes efficiency. They will say that factory-in-the-field farms, whether operated by individuals or corporations, are most efficient. Even assuming this is correct, I would like to call attention to the phrase in our Declaration of Independence which speaks of our inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness. And I contend that there is much more happiness on

the farm than there is in the city slums to which many of our displaced farmers must migrate. The pursuit of dollars—efficiency, if you please—is not mentioned in the Declaration or the Constitution.

Since colonial days, the American farmer and the family-sized farm have been the very backbone both of our free-enterprise system and of our political democracy. Our present farm-support program has substituted a high degree of regimentation and an insidious type of creeping feudalism, both of which are utterly distasteful to the rank-and-file of our farmers. Because the present support program is also economically unsound, a new approach to the farm problem seems very much in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long thought it extremely unfair to American farmers for some of our major newspapers—and yes, regretfully, even the present Secretary of Agriculture himself—to criticize American agriculture for producing the abundance it was called upon to produce as part of our war effort.

When industrial readjustments had to be made after World War II and after the Korean war, we did not quibble about the costs to protect the major manufacturers from losses. If they overbuilt to meet wartime needs, they were entitled to compensation. They were protected against loss.

Yet what about agriculture? We called upon them to expand production for wartime needs. They did it—without benefit of contracts protecting them in the future, such as we gave industry. But our moral obligation was the same.

It is certainly regretful now that a Secretary of Agriculture will turn his back on the patriotic response of American agriculture, and ignore the role farmers played in helping win the war. It is regretful that he ignores this basic reason for our surpluses today, and tries to lay the blame entirely upon our price-support measures, which offer the only hope of some economic protection for farmers.

Mr. President, one of the great spokesmen for American agriculture throughout its fight upward from the depression years has been M. W. Thatcher, of St. Paul, general manager of the great Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association serving the Midwest. Mr. Thatcher made a radio address last May 5, on the occasion of his birthday—and the anniversary of passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1933. Because that brief radio talk so effectively tells the real story that needs to be told today, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT 3

Mr. M. W. THATCHER. Even though 22 years have passed, it seems not long ago since I sat in the gallery of the Senate in Washington and watched the final vote on the first important agricultural law to protect the farmers of this Nation. It was an overwhelmingly favorable vote. I am familiar with the background because in those days I served on the committees in Washington that prepared the basic and fundamental laws dealing with agricultural income and agricultural credit. So much has happened during these past 22 years—the great World War II,

the Korean war, and what now is in front of us—and our money being used by the billions in preparation for another war, or for war itself.

But my mind goes back today particularly to the building of the agricultural programs. For 20 years those programs were constantly moved forward and strengthened in the interest of the farmers of this country. And it was so, all through the years, until the beginning of 1953. But the Eisenhower-Benson farm programs are a complete reversal of all of those things that we fought for and for which we made so much gain during 20 years. I follow carefully the views of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson. I read everything they say. I listen to every word they express. I try to understand their philosophy. And I can come to but one conclusion—they believe, as the American Farm Bureau Federation urged them to believe, that there is inefficiency in our farming, there are too many farm families on the land, some 3 million or more are inefficient and ought to get off the land and find some other way of life.

In the city, a man can move from a flat or a house to some other place. But a farm family doesn't move too conveniently. Farm people don't give up their years of work, their aspirations, their hopes, and their plans so easily, because they were not brought up in that way of thinking and planning.

Then my mind moves to the situation in the spring of 1952. That was the year of decision for the people of this country in choosing a president. In that year, we were in a Korean war. It was Secretary Brannan's responsibility to see that we had adequate production of farm supplies to take care of the needs of this country and to aid our allies and others in the world. And I remember his fight for more steel for machinery; his fight with the draft service to keep more boys on the land; and the effort that he made in all respects to get more agricultural production, particularly of cotton, corn, and wheat. I've read the reports of hearings when he was before the committees of Congress—committees of both Republicans and Democrats. He was telling why it was necessary to get the required production, to assure our campaign of victory in the way, and to help take care of the needy people in the world who were short of our supplies. No one challenged those objectives.

The other night, in Washington, when I was speaking at the annual convention banquet of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, in the Mayflower Hotel, we had among our guests 20 United States Senators. Then I repeated what I have just stated to you. Six of the Senators present were members of the Senate Agricultural Committee. I reminded them of what the Department of Agriculture, in the spring of 1952, asked of the Congress—aid and assistance in getting all-out production of wheat, and other crops, and got the backing of Congress. I challenged those six Senators, Republicans and Democrats, sitting behind me, to take the platform and debate with me the truth of the record that I was charging to the Congress and the President and the whole administration. I called for keeping faith with the people from whom they had asked this tremendous production. I called for an end to this condemning farmers for the surplus they produced for this country and the world, at the behest of the administration and the whole Congress of the United States. I charged that, in comparison to the treatment given to labor and industry, farmers had been treated cruelly. Farmers were asked to produce abundantly, and this they did. Then, beginning immediately with the new administration, we began to hear charges that farmers are inefficient, that they have overproduced, that they have produced for the Government. Well, that last

part is true. They did produce for the Government at the request of the Government. But to charge them with producing for the Government as though they were guilty of taking advantage of the Government is most unfair. It puts farmers in position of getting nothing more than a Russian agreement. That's the way Russia operates. Now, with that background, let's consider the wheat situation.

There has been a lot of misinformation and inaccurate information going out to the people of this country about the terrible wheat surpluses and their cost. Let me tell you a few simple facts about wheat.

I got the facts out of the records. Then, yesterday, I called the United States Department of Agriculture for confirmation of my figures. And I got them, right out of the United States Department of Agriculture. They cannot be questioned, unless the Department of Agriculture doesn't know simple arithmetic. The total supply of wheat on hand under Mr. Benson's control and what he is going to get in his hands before the new crop is 1 billion and 10 million bushels. For your figuring, 1 billion. Put it down on a sheet of paper—1 billion. Half of that is not in Mr. Benson's hands at all. It's the 500 million bushel set-aside. It may not be sold in the United States. And it may not be sold in competition in the world markets. It's 500 million set-aside for what may happen, and the Lord only knows. So you take out that 500 million and forget it.

So, we have remaining, therefore, only 500 million bushels of surplus. We are going to talk about that. It's all we have. Based on the Department's figures, the crop we are going to raise this year is less than will be needed for our own consumption and exports. Thus, it'll even cut into the 500 million we've got on hand. Normally, we should have on hand 300 million bushels of wheat. So, we are not talking about anything but 200 million bushels of wheat that ought to be taken care of. That is all. And if Secretary Benson had lived up to the letter of Public Law 480, which Congress passed, that 200 million bushels would long ago have been gone. And you would not now be wondering about your support prices in 1956. They would be at 90 percent of parity. There would be no referendum to talk about. Yes; you are only 200 million bushels away from solving your problems. So don't think of voting out our wheat program after 22 years of hard work. This is the time to get out and fight to preserve our program. Vote "Yes" on the referendum.

I'll be talking to you Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to echo his concluding remarks about the wheat referendum. American agriculture can be thrown into chaos if farmers, upset by this administration's policy of lowering price supports, vote to reject entirely the only vehicle at their command for production adjustment. I am sure most Senators recognize the seriousness of this wheat vote, whether they are in wheat States or not. If this one program collapses, all farm programs will be shaken to their foundations, and farm prices will collapse.

Mr. President, no greater encouragement could be given our farmers to support this referendum and continue their united efforts toward production adjustment than some indication that the Senate was aware of the seriousness of their problem, and determined to do something about it.

That is why I have asked for hearings in our Agricultural Committee on a price-support bill, now, not next spring or next summer.

That is why I hope others will join me in that effort.

Mr. President, because it is typical of the appeals coming out of our great mid-western breadbasket, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald-Review, published by Larry A. Rossman, entitled "The Help the Farmer Needs."

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

THE HELP THE FARMER NEEDS

The agricultural administration at Washington has tried to do two things that seriously affect agriculture. The first was a policy of deflation. That was repetition of the policies which followed the First World War and which helped to lay the foundation for the great depression. The administration seeks to deflate the farmer. But it has done nothing to deflate wages, profits, and prices. Now the proposal is that of a dole for those who have been injured.

The proposals, the weak thinking, and the foolish talk from the National Capital suggests that some million farmers of a so-called "marginal" type be given direct assistance and that many of them be moved from the farm into town or placed on the rolls of industry. No proposal could be more contrary to the desires of the American people and welfare of so many deserving citizens.

First, who is the marginal farmer? There are certainly some farmers who may never succeed too well as tillers of the soil. They may not be suited for farming. They have been raised on the land and know nothing else to do. There are a small proportion of such people who are problems on the farm and will be even a more distressing problem when forced from the land. The farm home may be poor, but not half as bad as the slums to which these people may be consigned by an unsympathetic Government.

There is another group that may be thoughtlessly termed as marginal. These are newer farmers seeking to learn the business, build their herds, and equip their farms. There was a time when agriculture was simple and most farmers were about on the same general basis. Today the investment in land and equipment requires the earnings of a lifetime. Most of this group will succeed, or if the task proves too great, will go into other activities of their own choice without the direction of far-off Government.

Farmers in a new land can possibly never measure up to the ideals of the distant politicians. It is easy to call those who are developing farms marginal or misguided. There was a time when nearly every farmer who was clearing the land or breaking the prairies was poor. But he had faith, industry, and purpose. The reason that so many farmers of the older areas are prosperous is that their parents and grandparents were poor and ambitious. Much of the agriculture in northeastern Minnesota is marginal and can be nothing else except as courage and industry change its character with more land under the plow.

When the administration cut the price of dairy products, when they cut the income of all farmers, they helped to make the best farmers somewhat poorer. They made the farmer who was just getting by with his payments a marginal farmer. They made the marginal and struggling farmer submarginal.

A full and fair parity price for agricultural products is the greatest hope and inspiration to those farmers who are struggling for existence. The farmer wishes no dole. He will be the last man in America to ask for it. Give to those who farm the hope of a fair return for effort and there will be no problems of marginal agriculture for which a handout will ever be a sound and enduring

solution. The best way to treat the problem of marginal farmers is to stop making farming marginal, or more marginal, by unfair and unwise agricultural policies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a number of telegrams I have received on the matter of price support and the wheat referendum, as well as a letter which our distinguished colleague the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, on April 28, 1955.

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

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 16, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received the news of your determination to fight for 90-percent support prices for the basic commodities as the most important domestic news of the day. We are in the midst of a very costly advertising program in addition to our radio to explain to the farmers the calamitous situation that may confront this country if our support programs fall apart in 1956 and 1957. We are very proud of our Senators from these central northwest States. Our continuing farm survey audit discloses the same general character of economic deterioration on the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if our Senators do their utmost that we can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before the wheat referendum of June 25, the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate would, in my judgment, cause irreparable damage to the entire price-support program. The House has approved this legislation, and I now believe that if the Senate approves it, President Eisenhower would not veto it.

Deep appreciation and best regards,
M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union
Grain Terminal Association.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., May 16, 1955.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our members in regular session unanimously request early Senate action on H. R. 12. We cannot afford any further trial of Benson formula. Cost of bread up 3 additional cents last week in Ray, N. Dak. Other retail prices move accordingly. How can we go on with sagging wheat prices?

WHELOCK-MARSHALL
FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
F. B. DANIEL, President.

WHELOCK, N. DAK.

AREGENT, N. DAK., May 16, 1955.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

I urge that you use your influence to bring House bill H. R. 12 to a vote in the Senate as soon as possible.

WALTER BARTHOLOME.

APRIL 28, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish most respectfully to draw your attention to some important questions facing American agriculture.

An adverse vote in the July wheat quota elections could well have far-reaching consequences. Price supports would drop from the present level of 82½ percent to 50 percent of parity. With world surpluses of wheat, including our own, cash prices would drop to near the new support level of \$1.19 a bushel.

Some of the factors which will have a great bearing on the outcome of this election are:

Increasing dissatisfaction among farmers who believe it is unreasonable to have wheat supports reduced, and especially at a time when they are being required to reduce their acreage by more than 30 percent. (USDA April forecasts indicate wheat production will be down one-fourth over previous 10-year average.)

When all provisions of the new flexible price-support program become effective, the minimum support price will be reduced by approximately one-third. The support prices for other basic farm commodities—to-bacco, cotton, rice, and peanuts—remain at 90 percent, and corn is supported at 87 percent.

Proponents of the two-price or certificate-support plan for wheat are much more opposed to the present flexible program than they are to that of 90 percent. A very large percentage of our wheat producers are rightfully concerned about the higher level of supports being provided for the poor quality wheats than is available for top quality baking wheat. Invariably, low quality wheats are much better yielders than top quality wheats and are in far less demand in the market place. This has been a very important factor in the buildup of our present surpluses. A record acreage of low quality feed wheat has been seeded this first year under the flexible-price-support program which you were successful in getting Congress to approve.

Here are some startling figures (source: USDA):

The support price for top quality wheat produced in Montana is \$2.08 a bushel, and the Government is expected to take over only 6 percent of the 1954 crop. The support price in Delaware for its garlicky soft red winter wheat is \$2.44 a bushel. The Government is expected to take title to 51 percent of the total production. The average farm price support for the principal wheat producing State—Kansas—is \$2.27 a bushel, while the support price for wheat in New York State is \$2.39 a bushel.

Durum wheat is produced principally in North Dakota. It is in extremely short supply, selling on the cash market for more than \$4.30 a bushel and with a support price of only \$2.25 a bushel. The CCC is not acquiring any durum wheat. In contrast, Maryland has a support price for its soft red garlicky winter wheat of \$2.42 a bushel and the CCC is expected to take over 42 percent of the 1954 production.

The following figures (USDA) clearly indicate some areas of the United States where the CCC is taking sizable losses in price-support operations on poor quality wheats. The 1954 terminal price support for wheat at Kansas City was \$2.53 a bushel, and the average cash price at Kansas City on April 18, 1955, was \$2.41 a bushel. Comparative figures for other markets are: Minneapolis support price \$2.57, cash price \$2.50; Chicago support price \$2.53, cash price \$2.17; Baltimore support price \$2.62, cash price \$2.29.

From 1942 through 1952, except for a brief period, the demand for wheat was so great that we were able to dispose of our wheat production even though it was of poor quality. As late as July 1, 1952, we had a carryover of only 256 million bushels which was insufficient to meet our then wartime

security requirements. There is a great amount of wheat suitable only for feeding purposes produced in almost every area of the United States. The unwise policy of providing higher supports for poor quality than for top quality wheat came into being long before you became Secretary of Agriculture. You have the authority, and responsibility, however, to make the necessary corrections.

Mr. Secretary, most wheat farmers believe that the present flexible price-support program is your program. They believe that unless you abandon your often stated position of neutrality or indifference to the outcome of the quota vote, and elect to defend your program, which includes quotas, the vote is very apt to be adverse. You are in a key position as Secretary of Agriculture.

May I respectfully request your answers to the following questions:

1. If wheat supports were reduced to 50 percent of parity, would it be feasible to support corn at any appreciably higher level?

2. Isn't it inevitable that the large stocks of feed wheat we are accumulating will sooner or later have to be sold as feed grain? Isn't it inevitable, too, that this feed wheat, together with our increasing accumulations of other surplus feed grains (a large part of which are imported) will be translated into more surpluses of dairy commodities, beef, pork, and poultry?

3. Isn't it a fact that there is little possibility of still lower wheat prices being reflected in lower bread prices to the consumer? For example, in January of 1948 the average farm price for wheat was \$2.81 a bushel and the average price for a loaf of bread was 13.9 cents. By January of 1955 the average farm price for wheat had dropped to \$2.14 a bushel but the price of a loaf of bread had risen to 17.6 cents.

4. Do you not believe that more consideration should be given to reducing farm surpluses by taking several million acres of our poorer land out of production and placing them under soil-building and soil-conserving programs?

Very sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the letter of the Senator from North Dakota to the Secretary points up the imperative necessity for action on the wheat referendum that will bring a favorable response.

Otherwise, Mr. President, the vote may very well lower the price of wheat to \$1.20 or \$1.19 a bushel, which, in turn, will lower the price of every other agricultural commodity. If that happens, I warn my colleagues in the Senate that they will have a major depression on their hands. We cannot permit the development of a situation which will destroy the economic foundation of the producers of food and fiber without bringing down the entire structure of the American economy.

BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills which have been submitted by the Secretary of the Army, and the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these

bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Secretary of the Army, and the Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters accompanying the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1995 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, May 2, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,

President of the Senate,

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill "for the relief of Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr.," which it is recommended be enacted into law. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the payment of \$1,293.65 to Warrant Officer (Jg.) Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., 2036 Monroe Lane, Gary, Ind., for the damages sustained by him on account of the destruction of his household goods and personal effects when the house occupied by him and his family under a private rental agreement at Hayama, Honshu, Japan, was destroyed by fire on November 15, 1953, for which he has not heretofore been fully compensated.

The records of the Department of the Army show that Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., was born at Chicago, Ill., on December 3, 1922; that he was inducted into the Army of the United States on April 15, 1943; that he subsequently enlisted in the Regular Army and advanced in grade; that he was honorably discharged on February 1, 1952, as a master sergeant; and that on February 2, 1952, he entered on active duty as a warrant officer junior grade.

Warrant Officer (Jg.) Pierre, W2151033, completed 10 years service for pay purposes on July 2, 1953, and his pay aggregates \$375.49 per month.

Pursuant to competent orders, Warrant Officer Pierre departed the United States on September 14, 1952, on a foreign-service tour with duty assignment in the Far East Command and, thereafter, he was assigned to the Skego Ammunition Depot, 8152d Army Unit, APO 503. He was joined on October 28, 1953, by his wife and two infant children. Permission was granted by the commanding general to members of the command with dependents to enter into private rental agreements to obtain quarters and, accordingly, Warrant Officer Pierre and his family moved into and occupied a Japanese-style house at Hayama, Honshu, Japan, under a private rental agreement. This private rental house burned to the ground on November 15, 1953.

The circumstances of this incident are explained in a sworn statement of Warrant Officer Pierre as follows:

"On November 15, 1953 (Sunday), the 'private rental agreement' home located at No. 17 Hayama machi, Nagae, Hayama Honshu, Japan, which was occupied by myself and my family (wife and two children) burned to the ground under the circumstances as follows:

"At approximately 1135 hours my wife discovered the area immediately to the rear of our two burner kerosene cooking stove was afire. She immediately called to me and I

came from our bedroom and tried to take steps to extinguish the fire. Upon seeing that the fire was out of control and was spreading rapidly throughout the house, I gathered my wife and children together and took them to a spot outside and away from the house. I then returned to the house in an attempt to save our possessions, but was able only to retrieve one arm load of assorted clothing, 2 footlockers, and 2 suitcases which were in the bedroom.

"At approximately 1205 hours the building was completely burnt out and down and I then proceeded to telephone my unit and report the incident to the officer of the day."

The fire was duly investigated by the military and Japanese authorities and it was concluded that there was "no violation of any statute, ordinance, or regulation by Warrant Officer Pierre with respect to rental of house and subject incident" and "due to there being no existing liability against Warrant Officer (Jg.) Pierre, it is the opinion * * * that he was not in anyway responsible for the occurrence of the fire; also that the losses indicated herein (substantiated list) were not caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of he (him) or his agent."

The loss sustained by the Japanese owner of the house was referred to the Japanese Government in accordance with the terms of the administrative agreement between Japan and the United States.

On September 10, 1954, Warrant Officer Pierre filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of \$4,782.05, for the damages sustained by him on account of the destruction of his personal property by fire while such property was located in quarters not within the continental United States. After a careful consideration of all the evidence in this case, it was found that the total damage caused to the household goods and other personal property destroyed by the fire amounted to the sum of \$3,793.65, and the claimant presently concurs with the Department's careful determination. No part of this damage was covered by insurance. All of the property, for the damage to which this claim was filed, was reasonable, useful, necessary and proper for the claimant to have owned and to have had in his possession.

The only statute under which this claim could be considered by the Department of the Army was the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended by the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 321), which provides, among other things, that the amount which may be paid under such statute in any one case shall be limited to the sum "not in excess of \$2,500." Prior to the enactment of the last-cited act there was no limitation with respect to the amount that might be paid by the Department of the Army to a claimant under the Military Personnel Claims Act for damages on account of the loss of his personal property. In view of the limitation contained in the act of July 3, 1952, supra, the maximum amount in which Warrant Officer Pierre's claim could be paid by the Department of the Army was the sum of \$2,500. The claim, therefore, was duly allowed in the sum of \$2,500 on December 30, 1954, and a check in that amount has been dispatched. After the making of said payment there remains a balance of damages sustained by the claimant in the sum of \$1,293.65, for which he has not been compensated. There is no method by which he may be reimbursed for this loss except through the enactment by the Congress of a private relief bill.

The claimant in this case is a relatively young warrant officer with a family and he has over 10 years of honorable military service. It would be a rather severe hardship

for him to bear the loss sustained as a result of this fire. It is the view of the Department of the Army that under the facts and circumstances in this case Warrant Officer Pierre is justly and equitably entitled to recover the full amount of damages sustained by him. The Department, accordingly, recommends the enactment of this proposed legislation granting an award to the claimant in the sum of \$1,293.65.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be \$1,293.65.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

S. 1996. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1996 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the absence of Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of this Office, I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Senate of the United States, the draft of a bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of such section. Section 66a now provides that dividends and other moneys which remain unclaimed for 60 days after the final dividend has been declared and distributed, shall be paid by the trustee into the court of bankruptcy. The regular registry account of the court is used for this purpose.

The amendment of subdivision a of section 66 would add at the end thereof a new sentence providing that unclaimed moneys and dividends shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042, and shall not be subject to escheat under the laws of any State. Section 2042 provides that moneys not withdrawn from the registry account within 5 years shall be deposited in the United States Treasury and that any claimant entitled thereto, may upon petition to the court and upon notice to the United States attorney, obtain an order directing payment to him of any sum due him.

At its meeting in June 1952 the Judicial Conference of the Seventh Circuit adopted a resolution regarding the amendment of section 66b. This proposal was brought to the attention of the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1952 and was referred to a special committee for study of the proposal and draft of an amendment. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1952, pp. 11 and 12.)

The special committee, consisting of United States Circuit Judge F. Ryan Duffy, chairman, United States District Judge Charles G. Briggles and Edwin L. Covey, Chief of the Bankruptcy Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, reported to the Judicial Conference at its meeting in March 1953. The Judicial Conference, in accordance with its usual practice, directed that the report be circulated among the circuit and district judges; that the judges and the judicial conferences and the judicial councils of the circuits be requested to express their views upon the re-

port and the proposed amendment; that all views expressed be communicated to the Committee on Bankruptcy Administration of the Judicial Conference at its next regular meeting. (See report of the Judicial Conference, special session, March 1953, pp. 11 and 12.)

The report was circulated as directed and the views expressed communicated to the bankruptcy committee. This committee recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, that section 66a be amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof so that as amended it would read as follows:

"Dividends or other moneys which remain unclaimed for 60 days after the final dividend has been declared and distributed shall be paid by the trustee into the court of bankruptcy; and at the same time the trustee shall file with the clerk a list of the names and post-office addresses, as far as known, of the persons entitled thereto, showing the respective amounts payable to them. Such moneys and dividends shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042, and shall not be subject to escheat under the laws of any State." (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1953, pp. 10 and 11.)

Section 66b of the Bankruptcy Act now provides as follows:

"Dividends remaining unclaimed for 1 year shall, under the direction of the court, be distributed to the creditors whose claims have been allowed but not paid in full, and after such claims have been paid in full the balance shall be paid to the bankrupt: *Provided*, That, in case unclaimed dividends belong to minors, such minors may have 1 year after arriving at majority to claim such dividends."

With the amendment above proposed, section 66b is no longer needed. The bankruptcy committee recommended, and the Judicial Conference approved, the repeal of section 66b. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1953, pp. 10 and 11.)

A bill (H. R. 8209) was introduced in the 83d Congress carrying out the proposals, but not acted upon. The Judicial Conference at its meeting in September 1954 upon the recommendation of its bankruptcy committee reaffirmed its previous approval of the measure. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1954, pp. 14 and 15.)

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

ELMORE WHITEHURST.

S. 1997. A bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1997 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: In the absence of Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of this Office, I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Senate of the United States, a bill to amend subdivision b of section 14—Discharges, When Granted—and clause 2 of subdivision b of section 58—Notices—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended so as to permit the 30-day notice of the last day fixed by the court for the filing of objections to the discharge of the bankrupt (sec. 58b) to be combined with the 10-day notice of the first meeting of creditors (sec. 58a (33)). In the interest of economy in the cost of administering bankruptcy cases these

amendments were approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its regular meeting in September 1953 (see report of September session of the Judicial Conference, pp. 13 and 14).

Under the present provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, at least two separate notices are required to be given in every case. The first is a 10-day notice of the first meeting of creditors and the second is a 30-day notice of the last day fixed by the court for the filing of objections to the discharge.

Section 14b provides, however, that the order fixing the last day for filing objections to the discharge shall not be entered until after the bankrupt has been examined. This makes it impossible to combine the two notices even in the simplest case.

The amendment of section 14b would permit the 2 notices to be combined in approximately 75 percent of the ordinary bankruptcy cases and would effect an estimated saving of \$40,000 a year in postage alone. But an even greater indirect saving would be accomplished in the expenditures for clerical help, supplies and equipment. Such procedure would eliminate the cost of preparing, folding, stuffing and sealing 1 set of notices, the cost of addressing 1 set of envelopes, and the cost of paper and envelopes for 1 set of notices (about 1,400,000 notices a year).

Section 14b as amended would read as follows:

"After the filing fees required to be paid by this act have been paid in full the court shall make an order fixing a time for the filing of objections to the bankrupt's discharge which shall be not less than 30 days after the first date set for the first meeting of creditors. Notice of such order shall be given to all parties in interest as provided in section 58b of this act. If the examination of the bankrupt concerning his acts, conduct and property has not or will not be completed within the time fixed for the filing of objections to the discharge the court may, upon its own motion or upon motion of the receiver, trustee, a creditor or any other party in interest or for other cause shown, extend the time for filing such objections. Upon the expiration of the time fixed in such order or of any extension of such time granted by the court, the court shall discharge the bankrupt if no objection has been filed; otherwise, the court shall hear such proofs and pleas as may be made in opposition to the discharge, by the trustee, creditors, the United States attorney, or such other attorney as the Attorney General may designate, at such time as will give the bankrupt and the objecting parties a reasonable opportunity to be fully heard."

Under General Order 35 (4) of the Supreme Court a petition in a voluntary proceeding in ordinary bankruptcy may be accepted for filing by the clerk of the court if accompanied by a verified petition of the bankrupt stating that he is without and cannot obtain the money with which to pay the filing fees in full at the time of filing. Subsection c of General Order 35 (4) further provides: "No proceeding upon the discharge of a bankrupt or debtor shall be instituted until the filing fees are paid in full." The new language at the beginning of section 14b as amended would conform with General Order 35 (4) (c). About 25 percent of all ordinary bankruptcy cases are filed without payment of the filing fees at the time of filing and as to these the 2 notices mentioned above could not be combined under the proposed amendment of section 14b. It is essential in order to keep the bankruptcy system on a self-sustaining basis that these filing fees be paid and for this reason it is not advisable to set the discharge procedure in motion until the filing fees are fully paid.

A conforming amendment in section 58b (2) is made necessary by the present require-

ment of that subsection that a copy of the discharge notice be mailed to the trustee and his attorney. Obviously if the two notices are combined and mailed at the beginning of the proceeding, it could not be sent to the trustee, as he would not have been appointed when the notice is mailed. Section 58b, as amended, would read as follows:

"The court shall give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the last day fixed by its order for the filing of objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the creditors, in the manner prescribed in subdivision a of this section; (2) the trustee if any and his attorney if any, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court; and (3) to the United States attorney of the judicial district wherein the proceeding is pending. The court shall also give at least 30 days' notice by mail of the time and place of a hearing upon objections to a bankrupt's discharge (1) to the bankrupt, at his last known address as appears in his petition, schedules, list of creditors, or statement of affairs, or, if no address so appears, to his last-known address as furnished by the trustee or other party after inquiry; (2) to the bankrupt's attorney, if any, at his address as filed by him with the court; and (3) to the objecting parties and their attorneys, at their respective addresses as filed by them with the court."

In order that the trustee would be notified immediately upon his appointment of the last day fixed for the filing of objections to the discharge, the Bankruptcy Committee of the Judicial Conference suggested that the Supreme Court be requested to amend General Order 16 so as to read as follows:

"It shall be the duty of the referee, immediately upon the appointment and approval of the trustee, to notify him in person or by mail of his appointment and of the time fixed for the filing of objections to the bankrupt's discharge if such time has been fixed; and the notice shall require the trustee forthwith to notify the referee of his acceptance or rejection of the trust, and shall contain a statement of the penal sum of the trustee's bond."

The Conference approved this suggestion (see report of September 1953 session, p. 14).

A bill (H. R. 8210) to carry out these proposals was introduced in the 83d Congress and passed the House of Representatives on August 3, 1954. No action was taken in the Senate. At the meeting of the Judicial Conference in September 1954 the Conference upon the recommendation of its Bankruptcy Committee, reaffirmed its approval of this measure. (See report of September 1954 session, pp. 14 and 15).

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

ELMORE WHITEHURST.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE LIABILITY UNDER INSURANCE CONTRACTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

In view of the recent decision of *Lake v. New York Life Insurance Co.* (218 Fed., 2d., 394), a life-insurance company which, without knowledge of a pending bankruptcy proceeding, innocently, and in good faith, loans money to a bankrupt after the petition in bankruptcy is filed, can be held liable for payment of the same amount the second time upon suit by the trustee in bankruptcy.

To protect themselves, insurance companies will be forced to engage in protracted and expensive investigations before loans on policies are made as a result of the court decision. This will mean unusual delays when policyholders seek to borrow for emergency purposes to meet immediate needs. These bills, if enacted, will eliminate this problem.

The first bill would amend section 70a (5) of the Bankruptcy Act and would provide when any insurance company, in good faith, and without actual knowledge of the bankruptcy proceeding, makes any payment under a life-insurance policy, either before or after bankruptcy. Such payment shall have the same effect so far as the insurance company is concerned, as if no bankruptcy proceeding were pending.

The second bill would amend section 70d (5) of the Bankruptcy Act, and would likewise relieve an insurance company from double liability after bankruptcy and before adjudication.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these bills may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1998

Be it enacted, etc., That clause No. (5) of subdivision a of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (11 U. S. C. 110 (a)), is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "And provided further, That when any insurance company, either before or after the adjudication of bankruptcy, in good faith and without actual knowledge of bankruptcy, makes any payment pursuant to the provisions of a life-insurance policy or contract, such payment shall have the same effect so far as such company is concerned as if the bankruptcy were not pending."

S. 1999

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence contained in paragraph (5) of subdivision d of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (11 U. S. C. 110 (d)), is amended to read as follows: "Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, in the third proviso of clause (5) of subdivision (a) of this section, and in subdivision (g) of section 21 of this act, no transfer by or in behalf of the bankrupt after the date of bankruptcy shall be valid against the trustee: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall impair the negotiability of currency or negotiable instruments."

NATHAN L. GARNER

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner. The bill has been submitted by the Secretary of the Army, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany this bill the letter forwarded with this proposal by him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and ap-

propriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2000) for the relief of Nathan L. Garner, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Nathan L. Garner," which it is recommended be enacted into law. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the payment of \$1,600, plus all accrued interest, to M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner, Mount Olive, N. C., for the loss sustained by him because certain deposits of his savings made at Fort Bragg, N. C., in 1953-54 to Soldiers' Deposits were never applied or returned to him by the responsible officer and for which he has not heretofore been fully compensated.

The records of the Department of the Army show that M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner, RA 6852930, was born at Mount Olive, N. C., on December 5, 1911. He enlisted in the United States Army on August 9, 1934, at the age of 22 years, 8 months, and since that time he has been a career soldier. He fought as a combat infantryman in the grade of corporal at Bataan and was taken prisoner there by the Japanese forces. Corporal Garner was a prisoner of war from April 9, 1942, to August 28, 1945, during which time he suffered physical deterioration from malnutrition and disease. Corporal Garner was liberated on August 28, 1945. The next day he was promoted to sergeant and shortly thereafter he was transferred to the United States for physical recoupment and reassignment. He was promoted to staff sergeant on June 8, 1948, to sergeant first class on November 30, 1948, and to master sergeant on September 11, 1953.

The monthly pay of Master Sergeant Garner is \$304.20. He is married and has two children.

Early in his military career Master Sergeant Garner initiated a program of depositing a small portion of his pay each payday in Soldiers' Deposits, a system established by Congress whereby soldiers are permitted to deposit their savings. He deposited \$25 on February 1, 1936, and, depending upon his financial ability, he continued the practice of making regular deposits, increasing the amount of deposits with advancement in grade. His balance as of June 30, 1953, amounted to \$6,600.

Master Sergeant Garner joined Headquarters Company, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N. C., on July 29, 1953, and thereafter he conducted his soldiers' deposits transactions with Chief Warrant Officer Robert M. Unchester, W907032, the personnel officer who was officially authorized to handle the Soldiers' Deposits of personnel of the organization. On June 19, 1954, Mr. Unchester departed the organization for reassignment and the next day, June 20, 1954, irregularities regarding the handling of soldiers' deposits in the organization were discovered and brought to the attention of the military authorities.

This matter was duly investigated, and, on August 5, 1954, it was determined that contrary to established procedure, the personnel officer had retained in his custody the deposit

book of Master Sergeant Garner, that the deposit book could not be located, and that certain sums submitted for deposit had not been credited properly. This investigation resulted in a recommendation for immediate enforcement of all safeguards relative to soldiers' deposits and that appropriate disciplinary action be taken in respect to the personnel officer who is presently confined in the Post Stockade, Fort Bragg, N. C., awaiting trial by court-martial under charges and specifications involving desertion, fraudulent enlistment, and larceny.

This investigation disclosed that Master Sergeant Garner turned over to the personnel officer for deposit in Master Sergeant Garner's soldiers' deposit account the following sums of money on the dates indicated and he received receipts for same (with exception noted) from the personnel officer:

Oct. 31, 1953 (this deposit was made during the period July-October 1953 and a receipt was obtained, but after a length of time the receipt was discarded)-----	\$200
Oct. 31, 1953-----	\$200
Mar. 17, 1954 (a redeposit of a previous withdrawal)-----	3,000
Mar. 31, 1954-----	500
May 31, 1954 (date established, however receipt is undated)-----	200

The investigation further disclosed that the above amounts, aggregating \$4,100, were not returned to Master Sergeant Garner, were not properly accounted for by the personnel officer, and were never credited to the Finance office records and the pay records of Master Sergeant Garner.

On September 28, 1954, Master Sergeant Garner filed a claim with the Department of the Army in the amount of \$4,100, plus interest, till date of payment. The claim was submitted under the provisions of Army Regulations No. 25-100, subject: Claims, dated August 20, 1953, which states in pertinent part:

"3. Claims payable.—a. General.—Any claim falling within the statutory provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended, not hereinafter excluded, may be submitted for consideration and in proper cases approved for payment in an amount not to exceed \$2,500.

"b. Examples:

"(5) Money: When personal funds of personnel are accepted by personnel acting with authority of the unit or detachment commanding officer for safekeeping, soldiers' deposit, * * *, and such personal funds are neither applied as directed by the owner nor returned to him, such losses are reimbursable when established by satisfactory evidence."

The only statute under which this claim could be considered by the Department of the Army was the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended by the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 321), which provides, among other things, that the amount which may be paid under such statute in any one case shall be limited to the sum "not in excess of \$2,500." Prior to the enactment of the last-cited act there was no limitation with respect to the amount that might be paid by the Department of the Army to a claimant under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act for the loss of money under circumstances such as presented in this case. In view of the limitation contained in the act of July 3, 1952, supra, the maximum amount in which this claim could be paid by the Department of the Army was the sum of \$2,500. The claim, therefore, was duly allowed in the sum of \$2,500, and a check in that amount was dispatched to Master Sergeant Garner on November 10, 1954. After the making of said

payment there remains a loss sustained by the claimant of the sum of \$1,600, coupled with the sum of \$110.22 (interest on the certain sums aggregating \$4,100, computed to November 10, 1954), and interest on the outstanding balance of \$1,600, at the rate of 4 percent per annum from November 10, 1954, to the date of making final payment.

On November 9, 1954, Master Sergeant Garner advised the Department of the Army, in part, as follows:

"2. I will accept, as partial payment only, the sum of \$2,500, which is to be mailed to me. I protest the decision to pay only the reduced amount, and request that, * * * the file in this matter be forwarded to the Secretary of the Army for the purpose of bringing it to the attention of Congress for consideration.

"3. I further protest the disapproval of my claim for interest. Under the terms of the soldier's deposit agreement, interest at the rate of 4 percent is to accrue on all deposits after 6 months. The interest that has accrued, and is accruing, is part of the principal of my claim, and should be paid, together with the return of the principal. I am not seeking interest on the amount of the claim. I am only claiming that the terms of the soldier's deposit agreement be met, and that I be made whole on the loss."

The attitude of this claimant relative to the loss of his savings is natural and expected. The practice of economy and utilization of savings plans have been emphasized in the military. Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard have been informed as to the merits of savings plans including Service Deposits (Soldiers' Deposits) and advised:

"Speaking of soundness, you can be sure that the various plans for your future economic safety offered by virtue of your being a member of the Armed Forces are completely sound. For behind each such plan stands, as your guarantor against loss, the full strength of the United States Government." (Armed Forces Information Pamphlet No. 4, December 11, 1953.)

Congress established the Soldiers' Deposit System on May 15, 1872. In effect, a Federal facility was established whereby enlisted members of the Armed Forces were permitted to build up a money reserve with interest while in uniform. The rules have changed but little over the years relative to the basic requirements that the deposits of enlisted men must be made to a properly authorized officer; that the deposits must be made in cash; that the deposits may be in any dollar amount not less than \$5; that a deposit book shall be furnished the depositor; and that an interest rate of 4 percent per annum shall be paid for any sums not less than \$5 deposited for a period of 6 months or longer. (10 U. S. C. 906, 907; 68 Stat. 485; 10 U. S. C. A., sec. 908 a and b.)

The receipts issued to this claimant do acknowledge the receipt of money from the depositor for deposit with the United States. They are substantially certificates of deposit and obligations or securities of the United States. The law imports the time and conditions of repayment (*Neall v. U. S.* (Cal. 1902) 118 F. 699; 56 C. C. A. 31). As to the matter of interest, the general rule is that the United States is not liable for interest on its obligations except where interest is stipulated for in legal and proper contracts, or where the allowance of interest is specifically directed by statute (27 Comp. Gen. 691).

M. Sgt. Nathan L. Garner has had a long and honorable career in the United States Army. It would be a rather severe hardship for him to bear the loss of any part of his soldiers' deposits or interest incident thereto. It is the view of the Department of the Army that, under the facts and circum-

stances, this claimant is justly and equitably entitled to recover the full amount of the loss sustained by him. The Department accordingly recommends the enactment of this proposed legislation granting an award to the claimant in the sum of \$1,600 and providing for full payment of interest.

The cost of this bill, if enacted, will be \$1,600, together with interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from November 10, 1954, to the date of final payment and the sum of \$110.22, representing accrued interest on certain deposits to November 10, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2001) to amend the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I am introducing a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act in a number of important particulars.

The bill will provide standards for the guidance of the Federal Power Commission in seeking to further the sound conservation and utilization of natural gas, grant regulatory jurisdiction to the Commission over direct industrial sales of natural gas, to the end that it will be able to stop the sale of this scarce commodity at less than the actual cost including a fair share of the transportation costs, and provide that applications to import natural gas would be subject to the same standards which govern domestic applications for authority to establish a pipeline.

These proposals are in the public interest because they will contribute to the national security, assist in prolonging the supply of this valuable natural resource for its more beneficial uses, and will contribute to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base within the domestic fuels industry.

The enactment of my proposals will contribute to the long-range benefit of the general gas-consuming public, because it will slow down the uneconomic waste of gas for inferior purposes, thereby extending the period of time during which this convenient fuel will be available to household consumers. This is an extremely important objective, in view of the fact that the life index of natural gas reserves has decreased rapidly in recent years to the point where the known reserves constitute a supply sufficient to last only 22.5 years at the present rate of consumption. Natural gas sales have increased some 660 percent since the Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938, and we have an obligation to protect the public's interest under these changed circumstances.

My constituents in the State of West Virginia include the gas-consuming public,

people employed in competitive fuel industries, and natural gas producers. At the present time the State of West Virginia is still a natural gas exporter. In sponsoring this legislation, I am acting in the interests of all of these various groups in my State, as well as in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

Proposals are pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to deal with some of the problems which have arisen under the Natural Gas Act. The act itself has not been the subject of major revision since its enactment 17 years ago. In that period of time the rapid growth of the natural-gas industry, the accelerated depletion of gas reserves, and experience gained in the administration of the act bring about a situation which demands that the Congress now proceed to consider and take action upon all of the major problems involved in the proper utilization and conservation of this scarce resource.

We will be delinquent in our duty if we consider at this time only one or a few of the many problems which require solution for the protection of the national interest with respect to this limited natural resource.

CURRENT STRENGTH OF THE SOVIET AIR FORCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for many years some of us have been warning the American people not to rely on those who would minimize the ability of the Soviet Communists to produce modern combat weapons. But even I am shocked and astounded upon learning more about the announcement made last Friday by the Department of Defense with respect to the current strength of the Soviet air force.

It is now clear that the United States, along with the rest of the free world, may have lost control of the air, except for the possibility we still have advantages in base location and training. But it is now also clear that in quality, as well as quantity of planes the Communists are at least in the process of surpassing the United States; and I am confident they are well ahead with the production of the possible ultimate weapon; namely, the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Why is this true? Is it because some of us believe that money is more important than freedom?

If this statement from the Department of Defense was issued, as some have felt possible, to obtain more funds for the military, the President should promptly discharge those responsible for the release. If it was not, we are entitled to have the President tell us more of the facts, more details to back up this somewhat vague warning.

In any case, we should now be given an accounting, a balance sheet, as to our strength, as against that of the Communists. We are entitled to the facts. It is time to put an end to this game of blind man's buff.

We must always remember that adequate arms are necessary, not only for defense, but also for permanent world peace. If, however, we are to have that greatest assurance toward peace, disarmament, we must negotiate from a position of strength.

Only last year the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, emphasized to the American people that the Soviets were building primarily a defensive air force.

The statement now issued by his authority proves that he was dead wrong. Throughout his tenure of office, Mr. Wilson has underestimated the strength of the Communists and their ability to produce modern arms. Nor has he taken the steps necessary to obtain adequate arms for this country.

The American people want and deserve an accounting. They want and deserve a military balance sheet from their Commander in Chief, because unless this danger is now recognized, and adequate steps taken to overcome it, the lights of freedom will soon be going out, all over the world.

Mr. President, in this connection I submit a resolution, and ask that it be read and referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) was read, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the Department of Defense has now announced that the Soviet Air Force has achieved a position of great offensive strength as well as defensive strength; and

Whereas this announcement conflicts with information previously published and circulated with respect to the position of the Soviet Air Force; and

Whereas administration representatives appearing before the Congress have attempted to justify their planned further heavy reductions in the Army and the Marine Corps, on the grounds that the United States holds air supremacy over the Communists; and

Whereas the spiritual, economic, and military strength of the United States is the last bastion of the free world capable of resisting the great and growing strength of international communism; and

Whereas the ultimate salvation for all mankind is permanent world peace, which can only be obtained through negotiations for disarmament, conducted from a position of real and relative strength; and

Whereas it is imperative that the people of the United States and their elected representatives be fully and truthfully informed as to the relative military strength of the United States and the Communist forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate investigate this announcement recently put out by the Department of Defense and the implications thereof, and that the Senate take appropriate steps to determine the relative strength of the Communist forces as against the forces of the free world in all military categories, and with respect to all weapons systems.

PROPOSED CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a number of other Members of the Senate I am again submitting a resolution to establish a code of fair procedure for Senate investigating committees. Senators joining with me are: Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GORE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr.

McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER for himself and other Senators, was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Whereas investigation of matters of public importance through committee hearings is of vital importance to the discharge of the constitutional functions of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the investigative power of Senate committees is derived from the power of the Congress to inquire into matters of public importance within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the following be, and hereby are, adopted as the Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Senate of the United States in connection with all investigations and hearings involving alleged violations of law or improper or unethical conduct.

SUBCOMMITTEE, MEETINGS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND REPORTS

SEC. 2. (a) Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the committee chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of no less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the minority (the designation of the majority and minority members of a subcommittee shall be subject to the approval of the majority and minority members of the committee, respectively, in caucus assembled). Subcommittees of less than three members may be designated by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee.

(b) Committee meetings, other than regular meetings authorized by section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 837), shall be called only upon a minimum of 16 hours' written notice to the office of each committee member. This provision may be waived by the assent of the majority of the members of the committee.

(c) Committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) and committee investigations shall be scheduled and conducted only upon the majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(d) A resolution or motion scheduling hearings or ordering a particular investigation shall state clearly and with particularity the subject thereof, which resolution may be amended only upon majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(e) The chairman or a member shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

(f) No committee report shall be issued unless a draft of such report is submitted to the office of each committee member 24 hours in advance of the meeting at which it is to be considered and is adopted at a meeting at which a majority is actually present.

(g) No testimony given in executive session or part or summary thereof shall be released or disclosed orally or in writing by a

member or employee of the Senate without the authorization of the committee by majority vote at a meeting at which a majority of members are present. No committee or staff report or news release or statement based upon evidence or testimony adversely affecting a person shall be released or disclosed by the committee or any member or employee orally or in writing unless such evidence or testimony and the complete evidence or testimony offered in rebuttal thereto, if any, is published prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the report, or news release, or statement.

(h) The rule as to the secrecy of executive sessions as set forth in subsection (g) of this section shall be applicable to Members and employees of the Senate for a reasonable period following an executive session until the committee has had a reasonable time to conclude the pertinent investigation and hearings and to issue a report; subject, however, to any decision by a committee majority for prior release in the manner set forth in subsection (g).

HEARINGS

SEC. 3. (a) Witnesses at committee hearings (whether public or in executive session) shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, of their own choosing, who shall have the right to advise witnesses of their rights and to make brief objections to the relevancy of questions and to procedure.

(b) Rulings on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the members present on motion of a member.

(c) At least 24 hours prior to his testifying a witness shall be given a copy of that portion of the motion or resolution scheduling the hearing stating the subject of the hearing; at the same time he shall be given a statement of the subject matters about which he is to be interrogated.

(d) It is the policy of the Senate that only evidence and testimony which is reliable and of probative value shall be received and considered by a committee. The privileged character of communications between clergyman and parishioner, doctor and patient, lawyer and client, and husband and wife shall be scrupulously observed.

(e) No testimony shall be taken in executive session unless at least two members of the committee are present.

(f) (i) Every witness shall have the right to make complete and brief answers to questions and to make concise explanations of such answers.

(ii) Every witness who testifies in a hearing shall have a right to make an oral statement and to file a sworn statement which shall be made part of the transcript of such hearing, but such oral or written statement shall be relevant to the subject of the hearing.

(g) A stenographic verbatim transcript shall be made of all committee hearings. Copies of such transcript, so far as practicable, shall be available for inspection or purchase at regularly prescribed rates from the official reporter by any witness or person mentioned in a public hearing. Any witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY TESTIMONY

SEC. 4. (a) A person shall be considered to be adversely affected by evidence or testimony of a witness if the committee determines that—

(i) the evidence or testimony would constitute libel or slander if not presented before a committee of the Senate; or

(ii) the evidence or testimony alleges crime or misconduct or tends to disgrace or otherwise to expose the person to public contempt, hatred, or scorn.

(b) Insofar as practicable, any person whose activities are the subject of investigation by the committee, or about whom adverse information is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee, shall be fully advised by the committee as to the matters into which the committee proposes to inquire and the adverse material which is proposed to be presented. Insofar as practicable, all material reflecting adversely on the character or reputation of any individual which is proposed to be presented at a public hearing of the committee shall be first reviewed in executive session to determine its reliability and probative value and shall not be presented at a public hearing except pursuant to majority vote of the committee.

(c) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in a public hearing that person shall have the right—

(i) to appear and testify or file a sworn statement in his own behalf;

(ii) to have the adverse witness recalled upon application made within 30 days after introduction of such evidence or the termination of the adverse witness' testimony;

(iii) to be represented by counsel (as in (3) (a) hereof);

(iv) to cross-examine (in person or by counsel) such adverse witness; and

(v) subject to the discretion of the committee, to obtain the issuance by the committee of subpoenas for witnesses, documents, and other evidence in his defense. Such opportunity for rebuttal shall be afforded promptly and, so far as practicable, such hearing shall be conducted at the same place and under the same circumstances as the hearing at which adverse testimony was presented.

Cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour for each witness, unless the committee by majority vote extends the time for a witness or group of witnesses.

(d) If a person is adversely affected by evidence or testimony given in executive session or by material in the committee files or records, and if public release of such evidence, testimony, or material is contemplated, such person shall have, prior to the public release of such evidence or testimony or material or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or committee staff or taking of similar evidence or testimony in a public hearing, the rights conferred by subsection (4) (c) hereof and the right to inspect at least as much of the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness or material as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

(e) Any witness (except a member of the press who testifies in his professional capacity) who gives testimony before the committee in an open hearing which reflects adversely on the character or reputation of another person may be required by the committee to disclose his sources of information unless the committee determines that to do so would endanger the national security.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 5. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of a committee only upon written notice to all members of the committee with a statement as to the identity of the witness or material and their relevancy to the investigation or hearing already authorized. Upon the request of any member of the committee the question of whether a subpoena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote.

COMMITTEE STAFF

SEC. 6. The composition and selection of, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

TELEVISION AND OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND REPORTING

Sec. 7. (a) Subject to the physical limitations of the hearing room and consideration of the physical comfort of committee members, staff and witnesses, equal access for coverage of the hearings shall be provided to the various means of communications, including newspapers, magazines, radio, newsreels, and television. It shall be the duty of the committee chairman to see that the various communication devices and instruments do not unreasonably distract, harass, or confuse the witness and interfere with his presentation.

(b) No witness shall be televised, filmed, or photographed during the hearing if he objects on the ground of distraction, harassment, or physical handicap.

SUPERVISION, APPEALS, AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 8. The application of this code shall be supervised in the Senate by the Presiding Officer of the Senate and four Members selected by the Senate (not more than two of the Members selected shall be of the same party), who shall have authority (1) to receive and investigate complaints of alleged violations of this code filed by persons claiming to be aggrieved and by Members, (2) to advise committee chairmen of their conclusions and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, if any, they deem appropriate.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 9. As used in this act—

"Committee" shall mean any standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the majority and minority policy committees) and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

"Person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is the same resolution that most of us joined in submitting at the last session. For a long time, some of us have been trying to get a set of fair and impartial rules of committee procedure before the Congress.

In August of 1951, I submitted such a proposal to the 82d Congress, but no action was taken on it. I reoffered it on February 10, 1953, soon after the beginning of the 83d Congress, but again there was no action.

Similar attempts to bring order and uniformity into congressional proceedings have been made by Senators DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, MORSE, and others. Last year we decided that those of us who had sponsored such codes in the past should make some effort to arrive at a plan on which we could all agree, and after numerous sessions the present resolution resulted. We submitted it last May. Again there was no action. We are resubmitting it today; and at this session we hope to be successful.

This resolution includes some of the features of all of the previous proposals which we have offered as individuals. It does not include all of the proposals made by any one of us. It is a joint product of our determination that the United States Senate shall be preserved as the embodiment of our finest traditions of freedom and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of the proposed code of fair procedure for Senate committees.

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

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CODE OF FAIR PROCEDURE FOR SENATE COMMITTEES

Provisions covering committee organizations, investigations, reports:

1. Approval of full committee required for appointment of subcommittees with less than three members.

2. Selection of committee staff and personnel subject to approval of the majority of committee members.

3. Written notice must be given 16 hours prior to committee meeting, unless waived by the majority of committee.

4. The resolution setting forth the subject and scope of committee hearings or investigations must be specific and can be amended by majority vote of full committee.

5. Submission of any official committee report to all members 24 hours prior to its consideration by committee is required.

6. Testimony taken in executive sessions cannot be released by members of staff without prior authorization by majority of full committee.

Provisions covering the rights of witnesses:

1. Twenty-four hour prior notification must be given a witness called by committee outlining the subject matter on which the witness is to be interrogated.

2. The right to make an oral statement or submit a sworn statement is given to every witness, and the statement must be included in the transcript of the hearings.

3. Release of statements or material adversely affecting an individual by a member of committee staff is prohibited, unless there has been prior or simultaneous release of rebuttal statement.

4. Persons adversely affected by testimony taken in public hearings are given the right to: cross-examine witnesses in public hearings, be represented by counsel, and subpoena witnesses and documents on his behalf at the discretion of the committee.

5. Persons adversely affected by the release of testimony taken in executive sessions are given the same rights to cross-examine, etc., as if the testimony had been taken in public hearings.

Supervision and enforcement: 1. The Vice President and four other Members of the Senate are constituted as a group to receive complaints and investigate violations of these rules. They can advise the committee chairmen of their findings, and present their findings to the Senate with such recommendations for remedial action as they deem appropriate.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD a statement by me on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Agencies of the Federal Government in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955 spent \$31.5 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling \$116.1 billion.

As of December 31, 1954, military services, exclusive of civil functions, in the first 6 months of the year had spent \$17.4 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling \$66.2 billion.

During the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955, the Foreign Operations Administration had spent \$2 billion, and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in its appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling \$10.9 billion.

Other agencies of the Government in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1955 spent \$12.1 billion and entered the second half of the year with unexpended balances in their appropriations and other expenditure authorizations totaling \$39.1 billion.

Of the \$31.5 billion spent in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1955, \$13.3 billion was spent from appropriations and other authorizations enacted for fiscal year 1955 and \$18.2 billion was spent out of balances carried over from appropriations and other authorizations enacted in prior years.

These figures were revealed today in the 17th report in a series of compilations of "Federal Appropriations and Authorizations, Expenditures and Unexpended Balances," by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures.

The term "unexpended balances" in appropriations and authorizations does not mean that the cash is in the Treasury. It means the agencies, on December 31, 1954, were still authorized to call upon the Treasury to meet their obligations to the amount of the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As the bills come due, the Treasury must provide the funds from tax collections, other cash on hand, or from borrowed funds which increase the Federal debt.

APPROPRIATIONS AND AUTHORITY TO EXPEND FROM PUBLIC DEBT RECEIPTS

The \$116.1 billion in unexpended balances included \$94.2 billion of balances in appropriations, etc., and \$21.9 billion in unused authority to expend from public debt receipts. Expenditures from appropriations, etc., and use of the authority to expend out of the debt, along with the balances in each of these categories as of December 31, 1954, are summarized as follows:

Appropriations and authorizations

[In billions]

	Prior year balance	Current fiscal year 1955	Transfers	Total after transfers	Expenditures	Unexpended balances
Appropriations.....	\$77.6	\$48.1	-----	\$125.7	\$31.5	\$94.2
Authority to expend from public debt receipts.....	20.8	2.9	-1.8	21.9	-----	21.9
Total.....	98.4	51.0	-1.8	147.6	31.5	116.1

Figures in the committee report are summarized as follows:

Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,¹ showing appropriations and other authorizations by current and prior years; and 1955 expenditures from appropriations for the current year and appropriations enacted in prior years, and unexpended balances, as of Dec. 31, 1954

[In thousands of dollars]

Department or agency	Appropriations and authorizations					Expenditures (through Dec. 31, 1954)			Unexpended balances as of Dec. 31, 1954
	Prior-year appropriations and authorizations ²	Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1955 ³	Total funds	Transfers ⁴	Total after transfers	Our of prior-year appropriations and authorizations	Out of current appropriations and authorizations	Total ⁵	
Executive Office of the President	2,731	8,755	11,486		11,486	647	3,681	4,329	7,157
Funds appropriated to the President (including foreign aid)	11,463,675	2,823,668	14,287,343	-19,797	14,267,546	1,915,684	143,174	2,058,851	12,208,695
Independent offices	12,577,751	3,275,873	15,853,624	-171,856	15,681,768	2,902,790	349,157	3,251,952	12,429,817
General Services Administration	1,258,709	535,394	1,794,103	+6,732	1,800,835	499,245	71,853	571,129	1,229,705
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,923,563	570,555	6,494,118	-129,193	6,364,925	174,508	-128,450	46,060	6,318,865
Department of Agriculture	5,555,971	2,837,034	8,393,005	-2,960	8,390,045	1,621,240	340,171	1,961,409	6,428,637
Department of Commerce	365,792	971,798	1,275,590	+1,102	1,276,692	79,523	572,165	651,689	625,003
Department of Defense	55,470,562	30,118,853	85,589,415	-1,058,691	84,530,724	10,236,008	7,514,619	17,750,627	66,779,491
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	588,778	1,354,068	1,942,846		1,942,846	374,253	619,944	994,197	948,650
Department of the Interior	289,197	474,564	763,761	+2,238	765,999	157,275	129,005	286,280	479,631
Department of Justice	23,810	181,365	205,175	-1,268	203,907	15,988	75,544	91,535	112,372
Department of Labor	55,987	338,205	394,192	-1	394,191	32,697	133,557	166,257	227,935
Department of the Post Office	365,576	126,500	492,076		492,076	276	149,212	149,489	342,587
Department of State	56,662	130,240	186,902	-6,341	180,561	14,409	64,215	78,626	104,934
Department of the Treasury	4,479,866	7,248,006	11,727,872	-424,857	11,303,015	142,849	3,300,922	3,443,771	7,859,244
Undistributed ⁷						15,439		15,439	-15,439
Total	98,419,630	50,994,877	149,414,507	-1,804,893	147,609,614	18,183,451	13,338,889	31,522,333	116,087,279

¹ Excluding trust and deposit fund accounts.

² Includes balances in 1953 and 1954 appropriation and other authorization accounts and balances in no-year and multiyear appropriation and other authorization accounts.

³ Includes all regular appropriations and all supplemental appropriations to date.

⁴ Represents transfer of funds from one account to another within the same agency or among agencies; funds so transferred from parent accounts are merged with balances in recipient accounts, and all expenditures are charged against the recipient accounts and not against the parent accounts.

⁵ Negative expenditures in these columns represent an excess of collections over disbursements, for example: Credits in the expenditures of working funds represent advances to the funds from other accounts. Expenditures will be charged against these funds as work is performed or completed.

⁶ Includes interest on the public debt. Excludes principal of refunds of receipts representing overpayment of taxes.

⁷ Represents \$25,000,000 estimate of undistributed overseas disbursements for which

reports have not been received and \$9,560,741 credit representing net differences resulting from variations in methods of reporting and classifying expenditure data. For this reason expenditures stated in this report may differ slightly from those reported in the Monthly Treasury Statement in certain line items.

⁸ Includes relatively small amounts for which time for obligation has expired, and time for transfer to surplus has not arrived.

⁹ Represents largely transfers to the surplus fund and capital transfers representing payment to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury for the retirement of capital stock and for disposition of earnings of business-type activities (principally wholly owned Government corporations).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Fiscal Service, Bureau of Accounts, Department of the Treasury. (Expenditures are stated on the basis of checks issued and cash payments made as reported by Government disbursing officers.)

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. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him before the Cleveland Engineering Society, at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 16, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by himself on immigration and naturalization policies, and excerpts from address by Irving Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, delivered before the executive board of the American Jewish Committee, in Washington, D. C., on May 7, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by Senator GOLDWATER on May 12, 1955, before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce.

Article entitled "The Struggle for Survival," written by Senator BUTLER for the Marine News of May 1955, dealing with the precarious status of our merchant marine.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Article entitled "The Future: Sound as a Dollar," written by Hon. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, and published in Fortune magazine for April 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Portion of article relating to lack of adequate detention facilities for juvenile delinquents, published in the Woman's Home Companion for May 1955.

By Mr. THYE:

Article headed "Minnesota Editors Say," published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune of May 11, 1955, which quotes from an article by W. F. Schilling, of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

By Mr. BENDER:

Returns in registered voters' poll of Ohio sentiment concerning Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the committee on the Judiciary:

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, elevated to United States Supreme Court.

Sterry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Harrie B. Chase, retired.

Kenneth P. Grubb, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge, for the eastern district of Wisconsin, to fill a new position.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Tuesday, May 24, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judi-

ciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 25, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the following nominations:

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge, for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

RETURN OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL FOR DUTY IN THE UNITED STATES—LETTERS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I sent on May 11 to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, in regard to the desirability of having Foreign Service personnel who have served continuously for long periods overseas, return to spend some time in this country.

I ask that there also be printed my letter of the same date to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who wrote me in regard to this important matter.

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

MAY 11, 1955.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A review of the testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Justice Departments prompts me to write on a matter affecting your Department, which I feel strongly should be developed immediately.

As you know, under your initiative a citizen's committee to study the Foreign Service submitted a report last year recommending a number of steps in which there could be developed a stronger Foreign Service with the Department of State. I have become particularly interested in that phase of the Wriston committee report which calls for the transferring of Foreign Service personnel from overseas posts back to the United States after an extended term of service abroad.

Your attention is directed to the fact that 102 of the 564 members of the Foreign Service have over 15 years' service and have not had any part of that service in the United States. There are 51 members of the Foreign Service who have more than 20 years' service, and the longest anyone of that group has served in the United States is 2 years and 10 months.

I am sure you will recall that the Wriston Report observed that the Foreign Service is, in effect, in a condition of exile abroad. Despite a general willingness and desire on the part of the corps to alternate home duty with foreign, the great preponderance of Foreign Service officers spend their period of service out of the United States and the Wriston report further observed that it has been a serious mistake to keep so much of the Foreign Service orbiting overseas so long.

In view of the fact that the United States today has activities extending over the face of the globe and we are trying through our American representatives abroad to develop friendship among our foreign friends, it is evident to me to be necessary to bring back our representatives to this country at periodic intervals in order that they may be thoroughly refreshed in our American way of life. It is imperative that these members of our Foreign Service who have served continuously long periods overseas should be brought home for service here or on leave, so that they will be encouraged to renew their association within their home communities and with their fellow citizens, in order that they may be reacquainted and refreshed with the circumstances and attitudes that shape national policy at home.

I believe it inevitable that if we leave these people overseas too long it is only natural that they get out of touch with the principles and the attitudes and faith which they are trying to develop and point out to our friends abroad.

I, therefore, would like to inquire what steps have been taken by the Department to carry out the recommendations of the Wriston report on the rotation of Foreign Service personnel and would appreciate your advice on the progress of the Wriston program.

With kindest regards, I am
Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

MAY 11, 1955.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Thank you for your letter of May 5, urging that efforts be made to insure that the Department of State carry out the Wriston program of transferring personnel from overseas posts back to the United States after extended periods of service abroad.

I am in complete agreement with your view that the Wriston program should be carried out and am enclosing copy of a letter I have just sent to Secretary Dulles pointing out the need for transferring back to this country periodically our Foreign Service personnel, in order that their knowledge of American life may be refreshed.

With kindest regards, I am
Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

SIGNING OF THE AUSTRIAN TREATY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, all of us are rejoicing over the wonderful news, which came to us on Sunday, of the signing of the Austrian Treaty. At an appropriate time I hope to address myself to that subject; but, Mr. President, at the moment I submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a splendid editorial entitled "Austria Is Free," which appeared in the New York Times of May 16, yesterday. In my judgment the editorial is a wonderful tribute to this outstanding accomplishment by our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who has just returned from Austria.

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

AUSTRIA IS FREE

The cause of freedom won another important triumph when the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain, France, Soviet Russia, and Austria signed and sealed in Vienna yesterday the long-delayed treaty which makes Austria again a sovereign and independent country. The treaty must still be ratified and the foreign occupation troops must still be withdrawn. But the notable Soviet concessions in this case give assurance that these steps will be taken without undue delay, and that the pledge of Austria's liberation made by the big powers in their Moscow declaration as far back as 1943 will now be redeemed.

To Austria this was a day of thanksgiving and jubilation. After 17 years of subjection to foreign rule—first under Hitler and then under Hitler's conquerors, in particular the Soviets, which bled the country of all they could—the Austrians can look forward again to becoming masters in their own house in a matter of months. What is more, owing to the Soviets' renunciation of some of their most onerous previous exactions, Austria has been able to obtain a far better treaty than appeared possible only a short while ago. No wonder the flags were flying, the church bells were ringing, the bands were playing, and the people were dancing in the streets all over Austria. The free world will join the Foreign Ministers in congratulating Austria on this happy event.

But the Austrian treaty has also world political implications reaching far beyond Austria. Like the latest Soviet peace and disarmament proposals, like all recent Soviet moves, the concessions to Austria, made in return for Austrian neutrality, are merely part of a wider program being built up by the Soviets for the forthcoming big power conference at top levels, to which they have agreed. That program takes into account the patent fact that all the Soviet threats and bluster have been unable to prevent the implementation of the Paris pacts. The Soviets seek, therefore, to supplement their threats with more amiable gestures designed to persuade—and lull—the world into the belief that they have suddenly become reasonable and open to conciliatory negotiations when in reality they continue to pursue their unchanging aims.

Their long-term aim is, of course, a Communist world. And their continued resort to threats is demonstrated by the formal military alliance between Soviet Russia and its European satellites and the creation of a unified command under Soviet Marshal Konev for the integrated satellite armies. But the attainment of the long-term aim is dependent on the prior achievement of some more immediate objectives, and it is to these that the Soviets now devote their energies.

These more immediate objectives are, quite obviously, the nullification of the Paris alliance pacts that include Germany and the creation of a neutral belt reaching from Yugoslavia across central Europe to Sweden and Finland. These objectives were frankly disclosed by Foreign Minister Molotov in Vienna when he called on other nations to follow Austria into neutrality. This call is addressed first of all to Germany, which is promised unity and liberation in return and is threatened with continued partition and subjugation of her eastern part if she refuses. But it is also addressed to Marshal Tito, whom the topranking Soviet chiefs propose to visit soon to mend the quarrel that drove Yugoslavia out of the Cominform. Marshal Tito does expound an independent policy which eschews alliances with any blocs, but neither Germany nor Yugoslavia is likely to fall into a Soviet trap which would mean their end.

As for the Austrian treaty itself, it brings Austria not only sovereignty and freedom but also abrogates previous clauses limiting her armaments, endangering the refugees within her borders, and gratuitously charging her with war guilt. It does so at the cost of heavy economic burdens and at the price of severing the Western military front between Germany and Italy. But such as it is, it is a welcome first dividend of the Paris pacts, and there is every reason to assume that continued Western firmness and solidarity will bring even greater results in the future to the benefit of the free world and of peace.

TREATMENT OF ASIA AS A REGION IN THE MUTUAL-SECURITY BILL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, those of us who are studying the mutual-security bill of this year are naturally interested in the new stress and the special emphasis laid on the Far Eastern area of the world. We are considering especially the question of treating Asia as a region, to be dealt with by itself under a special provision of the bill to provide for the expenditure of certain funds in accordance with the discretion of the President.

Already there have been some conversations in regard to treating Asia as a region, in this connection. Because of the confusion in the minds of many of the people of the country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Asia as a Region," which appeared on May 16 in the New York Times.

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

ASIA AS A REGION

Planning for United States aid to Asia on a regional basis has received something of a setback at the just-concluded Simla Conference. The Asian states that would have been the beneficiaries of American help could not agree upon any program in which they could share as parts of a regional whole. Naturally there is disappointment in this country, but it may be well to look the facts

in the face and rid ourselves of some preconceptions.

We think and speak too often of Asia and Asians as if we were dealing with one cohesive part of the world and one unit of its populations. The Simla Conference should have made it plain to us that there are differences, areas of mistrust and antagonism, conflicting views and aims that will make it difficult, if not impossible, to deal with a geographical area as if it were unified in spirit as it is in need. The unity does not yet exist and the Conference made it clear that it is still some considerable way in the future.

This does not mean, however, that the idea of regional planning is unsound. Far from it. The very differences that were expressed at this Asian economic conference make it clearer than ever that the problems posed and the questions raised cannot be solved on a narrow basis.

Several of the Asian states, apparently concerned over the possibility that individual assistance might be lessened if there were any commitment to assistance to all, insisted that all the aid program must continue on a bilateral basis. Their concern is understandable, but their reasoning is sufficiently unsound to be self-defeating in the long run.

It cannot be expected that the United States will continue for an indefinite time to be the illimitable source of American money for all nations that are in need. The whole basis for our economic assistance was set forth, from the beginning, as mutuality of effort. If there is not a "counterpart" in the countries that need and want help our assistance become ineffective.

We earnestly hope that our Asian friends will understand this fact. It will be to their great disadvantage if their inability to make even tentative agreements becomes a weapon in this country that can be used, politically, to defeat an essential part of our foreign-aid program.

Asia, as such, is not a "region." But the idea of having special funds that can be used in multinational projects is thoroughly sound. Congress should approve the earmarking of such funds, and the Asian states should take advantage of them.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the House of Representatives, in approving funds for the international education exchange program, reduced the amount of \$22 million, requested by the Department of State, to \$12 million. This is a drastic reduction, and is \$6½ million below the \$18½ million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

This is an important program, and it seems to me it is one for which funds should be increased, rather than decreased.

Unless increased funds are voted by the Senate, we must drastically curtail these worthwhile activities in all parts of the free world, and must eliminate them in 31 out of 75 countries. The plans for 1956 called for an expansion of the program, as recommended by high officials of the executive branch, and supported by several congressional committees, in the Far East, Near East, and Latin America. Not only will the reduction of the appropriation wipe out the possibility of expansion, but it will result in the program being cut below the present level in all three areas. In the Near East, South Asia, and Africa, for example, the program would have to

be cut 53 percent below the present level.

One of the most important and effective features of this program is that providing grants to prominent foreign leaders and specialists—in government, labor and management, the press, and other fields—to enable them to come to the United States for observation and to gain practical experience. The program for 1956 proposed to bring 1,284 such persons to the United States. The cut in the appropriation would reduce this number to 221, and would allow no leaders and specialists to come from 31 countries.

The programs for bringing foreign nationals to this country for study, teaching, or teacher-training would also be severely curtailed, and would be completely eliminated in a dozen or more countries. Even the small, but significant, amount of aid we are giving to American-sponsored schools in Latin America, to supplement the salaries of American teachers, and to provide guidance in educational methods, would be cut in half—from \$250,000 to \$128,250.

Recently, I received from Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of Kansas University at Lawrence, Kans., a letter urging favorable action on the part of the Senate of a proposal to restore the full amount requested by the State Department.

I have also received letters from Dr. James McCain, president of Kansas State College, at Manhattan; and Dr. Rees Hughes, president of the State Teachers College at Pittsburg, Kans., and other leading school men in our State urging the same course.

Dr. Murphy's letter frankly discusses the need for increased appropriations, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
Lawrence, April 26, 1955.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
and

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I find myself writing you on a matter about which I wrote you last year, and from the looks of things I expect you will have to be burdened by an annual letter from me on this matter.

The House of Representatives has reduced the appropriation for the International Education Exchange program from a requested \$22 million to \$12 million, which is actually a reduction of 6½ million below the \$18½ million appropriated for the current fiscal year.

My basic comment must be, "How dumb can we get?" Here is the Russian, trying by every means at his command to get as many of the young potential leaders of southeastern Asia and central Europe to come to Russia for study (and of course indoctrination). These are the newspaper publishers, the scientists, the political leaders, the business leaders, the teachers, of today and tomorrow in vast parts of the world which we desperately hope will follow the real freedom as portrayed by the United States, rather than that of the tyranny of the Russians.

Nearly every day I keep reading the comments of political leaders, educators, and

practically every top person, that the issue today is the battle for not the bodies but the minds of men. With our international education program already too tragically small, we nonetheless annually have been bringing to this country the smarter motivated and able young men and women from Europe, the Middle East and Asia. Here with their own eyes and not through a picture of biased press, they can see how our economic and political system really works, that Wall Street is actually no more important than Main Street, and that nowhere in the world does an average citizen have a greater opportunity, etc., etc. Further, they have the opportunity of a professional or technical education in any American institution so that they can return and do a better job for their own people. Subconsciously, for this they must always be grateful to the United States, and more often than not remain basically ever her friend.

What purpose technical assistance to underdeveloped countries if there are no trained natives of that country capable of picking up the ball when our technical missions leave? We spend billions building plants, dams, etc., in all parts of the world—facilities which could easily become part of the arsenal of the Communists if such countries become overrun—and yet we are unwilling to spend a few millions to provide the greatest opportunity to convince the present and the future leaders of these same countries that we are sincere in our desire to help, not to conquer, and that we have a system quite worth emulating, at least within the economic limitations of each country.

Apparently we still can't understand that in this cold war of unlimited duration we need the hearts and minds of the potential leaders around the world. And as I pointed out above, the Russian has fully understood this and has annually geared up his educational exchange program far beyond what we have even contemplated doing.

Everybody seems to feel that these educational exchange programs are among the most important things we do in regard to our foreign policy—at least so the representatives of the NAM, the United States Chambers of Commerce, church groups, labor groups, educational groups, and political groups all say.

And yet apparently either as a result of oversight or just plain lack of understanding, we are willing to cut away, not fat but muscle and blood vessel itself. If we set a budget for ourselves in building our own home, it seems to me that it is unwise to come within that budget by cutting out a part of the foundation or some of the major beams. Rather, we should get along with a little less fancy wallpaper.

I shall not deny that this action last year (which was finally corrected in the Senate) angered me then, as it does now. I have with my own eyes on the campus seen young Indian and Egyptian journalists and scientists change their feeling about America 180° after having been here for 6 or 8 months. I have seen them come to these shores, cynical and questioning, and have seen them leave as enthusiastic friends and supporters of our system. I can only say that if this kind of shortsighted disposition of the available tax dollar continues, the Communist himself could not have hoped for greater good fortune.

I hope you will clearly understand that I am not critical of anyone to whom this letter goes, either in original form or copy. I note that none of our Kansas representation in Congress was on the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee dealing with this matter. I further note that rarely do I bother you gentlemen with an expression of this vigor and intensity. It is not a large amount that is involved, and perhaps to some the issue itself is small, but to me it is a classic example of the kind of

thing meant in the old ditty, "For want of a nail the shoe was lost * * *."

I do hope that these restorations can be made, and would further hope that Congress might understand the crucial desirability of not shrinking but expanding these programs so that this issue of restoration does not become an annual matter.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY,
Chancellor.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Commonwealth Club of California in connection with the so-called Bricker amendment. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to the poll which was taken by that organization, showing an overwhelming number of votes in favor of the Bricker amendment.

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

COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, May 6, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR: You may be interested in a vote just taken by the Commonwealth Club of California on the Bricker amendment and related issues.

Before this poll was taken, the club's section on international relations had made a year's study of the Bricker amendment, hearing speakers from every point of view.

The section's printed report, summarizing all pro and con arguments, was then mailed all members of the Commonwealth Club in all parts of California and a ballot was subsequently submitted to them.

The tabulation of the Commonwealth Club ballot returns is recorded on the attached sheet.

Very truly yours,

STUART R. WARD,
Executive Secretary.

VOTE OF COMMONWEALTH CLUB ON BRICKER AMENDMENT

Ballot of club membership following circulation to all club members of report of international relations section and pro and con report meeting discussion (vote tabulated April 21, 1955).

TREATIES

1. Are existing provisions of the Constitution adequate to prevent abuse of the treaty-making power? Yes, 583; no, 509.

2. Do you believe treaties should be able to impair the protections given the people in the first ten amendments? Yes, 61; no, 1,053.

3. Should the Constitution prohibit the Federal Government from entering into international pacts which invade the powers reserved to the States by the Constitution? Yes, 615; no, 475.

4. Do you think the Constitution should have an express provision to the effect that no treaty shall supersede any provision of the Constitution? Yes, 645; no, 469.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

5. Do you believe that treaties are in danger of being supplanted by executive agreements? Yes, 626; no, 490.

6. Do you believe that an executive agreement—

(a) Should prevail over the laws of a State? Yes, 304; no, 806.

(b) Should prevail over Federal laws? Yes, 112; no, 1,001.

7. Do you believe that the power to make executive agreements—

(a) Has been abused in the past? Yes, 796; no, 324.

(b) May be abused in the future? Yes, 808; no, 277.

8. (a) Should the President as director of our foreign affairs have the power to make such an agreement as Yalta? 246; or

(b) Should Congress have the power to regulate it? 131; or

(c) Should such power of the President be subject to approval by the Senate? 728.

9. (a) Should approval by both Houses of Congress be required before the President as Commander-in-Chief may make an agreement bringing hostilities to an end (as in the Japanese surrender)? Yes, 249; no, 782.

(b) Should such power be subject to approval by the Senate only? Yes, 612; no, 351.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

10. (a) Should section 1 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 647; no, 467. (Section 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.)

(b) Should section 2 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 562; no, 512. (Sec. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.)

(c) Should the first sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 517; no, 575. (Sec. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization.)

(d) Should the second sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 547; no, 518. (All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.)

NINETY-PERCENT PARITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a Member on this side of the aisle, let me say that I believe the other side will be responsible for whether or not the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on 90-percent parity. The people of my State are very eager to have a vote on this question, even though the bill, if passed by the Senate, should be vetoed by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have written to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; also a letter which I have written to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas]. I sincerely hope that we may have an opportunity to vote on House bill 12 before the adjournment of Congress.

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

MAY 16, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Rightfully or wrongfully, the statement has gone out that the Senate is not going to consider H. R. 12, passed by the House on May 4, 1955, for 90-percent parity.

While I realize that the bill passed the House by only a margin of five, nevertheless, I am stating the views of my constituents in North Dakota—and I believe in the Northwest—when I respectfully ask that under your chairmanship, this bill be reported to the Senate.

Even if the bill is vetoed by President Eisenhower, the people in my State will want to know where the responsibility for not passing this bill—which was promised to the people during the last campaign—may lie.

Thanking you for the many courtesies you have shown me, and hoping that you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,

MAY 16, 1955.

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Majority Leader of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Rightfully or wrongfully, the statement has gone out that the Senate is not going to consider H. R. 12, passed by the House on May 4, 1955, for 90 percent parity.

While I realize that the bill only passed the House by a margin of 5, nevertheless, I am stating the views of my constituents in North Dakota—and I believe in the Northwest—and I respectfully ask that under your leadership of the Democratic majority, that an opportunity will be given the Senators to vote upon this bill.

Today I have written Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, asking that the committee report out the bill for action by the Senate, because even if the bill is vetoed by President Eisenhower, people in my State want to know where the responsibility for not passing this bill—which was promised to the people during the last campaign—may lie.

Thanking you for the many courtesies you have shown me, and hoping that you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the same connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from Hon. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

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

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 16, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received the news of your determination to fight for 90-percent support prices for the basic commodities as the most important domestic news of the day. We are in the midst of a very costly advertising program, in addition to our radio, to explain to the farmers the calamitous situation that may confront this country if our support programs fall apart in 1956 and 1957. We are very proud of our Senators from these Central Northwest States. Our continuing farm survey audit discloses the same general character of economic deterioration on the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if our Senators do their utmost that we can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before the wheat referendum of June 25, the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate would, in my judgment, cause irreparable damage to the entire price-support program. The House has approved this legislation and I now believe that, if the Senate approves it, President Eisenhower would not veto it.

Deep appreciation and best regards,

M. W. THATCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union
Grain Terminal Association.

STATUS OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Expellees, and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a state-

ment submitted by the Department of State on May 6 last relative to the status of visa applications under the refugee relief program.

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

Refugee relief program, status of visa applications, May 6, 1955

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	Far East	Others	Total
1. Applicants notified of documents required	62,744	17,506	1,211	19,307	9,552	2,175	3,970	116,465
2. Visas issued	17,946	4,761	512	1,730	2,298	584	462	28,293
3. Visas refused	1,465	674	25	1,846	853	569	236	5,668
4. Canceled action	543	106	109	876	495	67	247	2,443
5. Applicants still in process	42,790	11,955	565	14,855	5,906	955	3,025	80,061
6. Assurances received by Administrator	5,705	8,874	300	11,291	4,313	2,648	3,607	36,738
7. Assurances verified and sent to field	4,820	7,894	178	10,110	3,999	2,157	2,779	31,937
Assurances received								36,738
Assurances sent to field								31,937
Assurances canceled returned								2,296
Assurances on hand								2,505

NOTE.—All figures cumulative. Items 6 and 7 reflect principal aliens only.

Source: State—FD, Washington, D. C.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO GOOD CITIZENSHIP BY GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, everyone interested in developing an informed and active electorate will rejoice with me, I am sure, at the news that the Girl Scouts are continuing their efforts to train girls in participating citizenship. Word has just reached me that the national Girl Scout organization once more has reminded its 1,340 councils of plans for local get-out-the-vote campaigns, and has urged girls in Scouting to cooperate as aids to voters with the voter education drives of nonpartisan organizations. Initiated in 1952, the Girl Scout aids-to-voters program each year has given hundreds of thousands of girls opportunities to work with adults to bring about as high a level as possible of voter information and activity.

One may ask how in the world little girls can help increase voter interest. Basically, they furnish willing hands and nimble feet to augment the effectiveness of adult volunteers. They influence their families, neighbors, and adult friends. Even 7-year-old Brownies can distribute informational literature, hang reminder tags on doorknobs, obtain pledges to register and vote. And the clever little hands that stuff envelopes for the March of Dimes or the Christmas Seal campaign certainly can contribute the same girl power to a get-out-the-vote drive.

In the aids-to-voters program older Girl Scouts man information centers, demonstrate the use of voting machines, and help adults locate their own voting districts or polling places. They serve as babysitters to release adults for educational activities. On registration, primary, or election day, they set up informal nursery centers where babies and toddlers can be cared for while mothers go to the polling places.

All these very practical contributions to voter information and activity are a part of an overall Girl Scout program

whose objective is to help girls grow up to be useful citizens.

The aids-to-voters program is, in addition, a part of a citizenship training program exemplified by such proficiency badges as "Active Citizen," "My Community," "My Country," "My Government," for which more than 100,000 girls, 10 through 13 years old, qualify each year.

These various badges cover a broad range of information important to citizens of all ages—information about the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship, the basic documents of American democracy, the workings of representative government, and the functions of government at local, State, and National levels. The most difficult of them, "My Government," was introduced 2 years ago. When it was brought to my attention at that time, I found myself in hearty agreement with the educators and civic leaders who helped the Girl Scouts outline and develop it, and who felt that the requirements would have been challenging even for an adult.

Even though the "My Government" badge is one of the most difficult ever offered to girls in Scouting, more than 11,000 girls of junior-high-school age have qualified for it in the 2 years since it was introduced. Because it provides, in effect, a postgraduate course in citizenship knowledge and skills, its popularity indicates that we may look forward to growing numbers of girls who, thanks to their Girl Scout training, will reach voting age with an exceptionally broad background of useful information. And since the hope of the future lies in the skill, the knowledge, and the sense of responsibility of our voters, I am happy to bring to the attention of Senators the contribution to the growth of informed citizenship which is being made by the Girl Scout organization.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted

to proceed for more than the usual 2 minutes, so that I may make a brief statement on Norwegian Independence Day, May 17.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, May 17, 1955, finds millions of Norwegians and persons of Norwegian descent commemorating the 141st anniversary of the declaration of Norway's independence. It was with faith and vision that a small group of men met at Eidsvold on May 17, 1814, to promulgate a constitution which would guide the destinies of their country for generations to come. The dramatic and moving chapters of the story of Norway and its people have left a lasting imprint on world history.

To understand how such a relatively small country could contribute so much to civilization, one must come to recognize the characteristics of its people. They are a reverent people, who recognize man as the creation of God. A driving spirit of independence and love for freedom is a part of all Norwegians. They are highly creative, and inherent in their makeup is a restraint and calm which has tempered their action and thinking.

The United States, within its 48 States, has more than one million people who were either born in Norway or are of Norwegian descent. In Minnesota we have nearly one-fourth of this total. These people began a migration to the United States when 53 immigrants from Stavanger landed in New York Harbor on October 9, 1825. The spirit of Norway was carried by subsequent immigrants who settled in Illinois, moved north into Wisconsin and Iowa, and west to Minnesota and the Dakotas. Next came a major move into Montana and a final path into the great Pacific Northwest, with settlements springing up in Washington and Oregon. Later, California attracted a sizable number, as did Alaska.

These were the people who went into the forests of the North and West and made logging and sawmill operations an exciting era in our history. It was the Norwegians who tilled the soil and built up the farms which provided food and fiber for a growing country.

They used the lumber to build communities which still stand as testimonials to their courage and industry. They also turned to the waters in the development of the shipping and fishing industries.

Underlying all this activity there was a consistent determination on the part of these people to provide for future generations. This was not a selfish exploration of land and resources with no thought for tomorrow. They demonstrated a lesson in living which we will do well to emulate in our day.

As they worked long hours to provide for the necessities of life, so also did they erect schools for their children, churches in which to worship, homes which exemplified family life at its best, and local governments which fostered freedom. Here we find the seeds from which grew the great contributions the

Norwegians have made to the history of the United States.

To call the roll of all who have risen to fame from the ranks of these Norwegian immigrants would fill volumes. But to remind us of this great heritage, let us go through the ranks and demonstrate their contribution by citing a few examples.

Olaf Hoff constructed tunnels under the Detroit and Harlem Rivers. In New York City, the Holland, Lincoln, and Queens Midtown tunnels were built by Ole Singstad. We look across at the Supreme Court Building here in the Nation's Capital and recall that it was built by Gunvald Aus and Kort Merle, who also erected the Woolworth Building in New York.

Today we live in the atom age and realize the impact of science on our lives. Science claims the names of Oswald Veblen, John A. Eisland, Ostein Ore, Merle Tuve, and Lawrence Hafstad. In 1939 Ernest O. Lawrence won a Nobel prize for his invention of the cyclotron.

Just a few short days ago, the entire world woke up one morning to hear of the Salk vaccine to combat polio. Once again the wonders of medical science and research were revealed to us. Norway has given us many famous men in medicine. Dr. Ludwig Hektoen is well recognized in the area of cancer research, while Dr. Alfred Owre gained prominence in dentistry.

One of the greatest contributions has been made in the field of education. A few miles from my farm home in Northfield, Minn., is St. Olaf College, one of the leading Lutheran colleges of the United States. Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; Concordia College at Moorhead, Minn.; Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.; Waldorf College in Iowa and numerous Lutheran parochial schools are living tributes to a people determined to afford educational opportunities for its children.

Norwegian contributions in the field of arts and letters are well known. I think of O. E. Rolvaag, who wrote *Giants in the Earth*. Dr. F. Melius Christiansen is known the world over for his contribution to music both as a composer and as founder of the world-famous St. Olaf Choir.

The Norwegian Lutheran Church was founded in 1917 and now, as the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, continues to serve the entire Nation by bringing the word of God to its people. L. W. Boe, John Aasgaard, T. F. Gullixson, S. W. Eastvold, Lawrence M. Stavig, C. M. Granskow, and the Preus family are only a few, both past and present, who have dedicated their lives to the church.

Herman Ekern, who founded the Lutheran Brotherhood Life Insurance Co.; publisher Victor F. Lawson; and Eric Sevareid of the Columbia Broadcasting System further illustrate the versatility of the Norwegian people.

The names of Knute Rockne, Sonja Henie, and Torger Tøkle will live forever in the field of sports.

Norwegians have been well represented in government on both State and national level down through the years.

The contributions of Norwegians in both World War I and World War II were honorable ones. At Fort Snelling, Minn., in World War II we had a Norse battalion trained as a part of the Ninth Infantry Regiment. They were trained in the rigors of winter combat conditions to help in the liberation of Norway from Nazi rule. Evans Carlson commanded the famous Marine Battalion known as Carlson's Raiders. From Red Wing, Minn., came Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad.

Today, as we recall this history of a great people and their contributions to our life, we look to Norway where the flame of freedom flares brightly after 141 years of independence. Norway, since World War II, has assumed its role of leadership in exploring the frontiers of a new era of tensions, threats of conflict, and hopes for world peace. Norway's contributions to the United Nations and to NATO have been an inspiration to all member countries. From the famous fjord country, from the farms, from the cities, and from her mountains, Norway has justified the faith and vision demonstrated at Eidsvold in 1814. As one who was raised by a Norwegian mother and father, I am thankful for this heritage and proud of this country whose people are dedicated to God, to freedom, to peace, and to the dignity of men.

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

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield. Mr. LANGER. I wonder why the Senator from Minnesota omitted to mention the name of perhaps one of the greatest Norwegians ever born in the United States of America, Ben Eilson. He was a pioneer in aviation in the United States. He was born in North Dakota and was killed on a mission of mercy in Alaska, flying serum to that Territory. He now lies buried in the soil of North Dakota. As I listened to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, it occurred to me that perhaps with one exception, no greater Norwegian ever lived than Ben Eilson, who was born in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. THYE. When the distinguished Senator from North Dakota brings back to my memory the facts he has stated, I only regret that Mr. Eilson's name was not included among the list of Norwegians to whom I have referred. But I could have read on for most of the afternoon in paying tribute to those of Norwegian origin who have made important and valuable contributions to this country as they blazed trails across the Nation, creating homes and communities which later became incorporated as States of the Union. I could not touch on all of them. That is my only regret. I thank the Senator for calling to my attention the achievements of Mr. Eilson.

THE LATEST RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the latest recommendations of the Hoover Commission task forces would put Government in my State back in the "dark ages" before Teddy Roosevelt rode up San Juan Hill with the Rough Riders.

These recommendations would wipe out the postal savings system, although

this is the only banking available to people in very remote rural areas, far from commercial banks.

They would raise parcel-post rates, although men and women in many sections of Oregon are totally reliant on parcel post for delivery of the necessities of life.

They would wipe out post exchanges and military commissaries, although these so-called fringe benefits have been regarded for decades as a part of the retirement pay of thousands of retired servicemen who are trying to exist on comparatively meager military pensions.

They would totally end the philosophy of the United States Government as a service organization, providing many essential benefits for citizens.

These recommendations of the Hoover Commission are a challenge to the Republican Party, for it is up to that party either to repudiate the advice of its only living ex-President or to take the responsibility for limiting governmental services of vital importance to millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask that these latest recommendations of the Hoover Commission, as printed in the New York Times of May 16, 1955, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of the Senate and the American people.

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

HOOVER UNIT ASKS GOVERNMENT END 1,000 ENTERPRISES—CITES MILITARY COMMISSARIES, POST EXCHANGES, POSTAL SAVINGS, TVA STUDY

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—The Hoover Commission recommended today that "going out of business" signs be nailed on more than a thousand Government enterprises competing with private business.

And, within a "reasonable time," it said, they ought to be closed or transferred to private hands.

The Commission cited military commissaries and post exchanges, bakeries, meat-cutting houses, clothing factories, dry cleaning plants, laundries and other Federal businesslike ventures.

The Commission urged a gradual end to the Postal Savings System. This had been previously recommended by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury. Deposits in the system, set up in 1910 to serve bankless towns, have declined from a peak of \$3,393,000,000 in 1947, to \$2,251,000,000 last year.

PARCEL POST RATE RISE

Under the Commission's proposal, depositors would have 5 years to exchange their deposit certificates for United States Savings Bonds or place their savings elsewhere.

The Commission also proposed an increase in parcel-post rates because their failure to cover the full cost of service constitutes a subsidy to parcel-post users and represents unfair competition for private express services.

Moreover, the Commission recommended that the Tennessee Valley Authority end all chemical research. The TVA's fertilizer research functions would be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. And, the Commission suggested, the price of TVA-produced fertilizer should be raised to cover all costs, including the loss of taxes that could be obtained from private industry.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, as

directed by Congress, went beyond the report of the old 1947-49 commission, but did not go as far as had been forecast.

The more limited recommendations of the old commission, also headed by former President Herbert Hoover, were far from embraced in full by the Executive and the Congress. Of its 23 proposals for getting the Government out of business, only 4 were adopted in their entirety. Ten got no approval. The other nine were adopted only in part.

In its report today, the 10th of the current series, the Commission made 22 proposals. It could not estimate what they would save if enacted.

"Far more important than the dollar savings are the beneficial results to our economy from eliminating Government competition to the greatest practicable extent," the Commission declared.

It said unjustified continuance is a definite injury to the vitality of the whole private enterprise system on which our future security and prosperity is based.

TAX LOSS CITED

Except in a few instances, it continued, Government business-type enterprises pay no taxes and pay little or no interest on the capital invested. They seldom charge depreciation and frequently do not include their personnel on their payroll.

They also deprive the Government of taxes that would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted the operations, the Hoover group added.

The Commission said that the Defense Department alone operated about 2,500 stores, shops, and other businesses with a total capital investment of more than \$15 billion.

About 1,000 of these could be eliminated "without injury to our national defense or any essential governmental function," the Commission said.

In addition, it added, probably a few hundred businesses in the civilian branches of Government could be closed in favor of private interests.

Two of the 12 commissioners dissented from the report. James A. Farley, of New York, the former Postmaster General, objected to the proposal calling for an end to all TVA chemical research. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, in a general dissent, objected to the "summary, mechanical, and sometimes arbitrary manner in which the Commission's report would dispose" of Federal activities.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, who frequently has dissented from Commission reports, said the majority had failed to consider that the curtailment of the TVA fertilizer program, for example, might benefit some fertilizer firms but not the farmer.

"An increase in parcel-post rates might benefit the Railway Express Agency but not the businessmen who use parcel post extensively and the consumers who benefit by cheaper rates," he added.

In casting the role of private business, he continued, it is not enough to say "Government enterprise is inherently bad and private enterprise is inherently good."

ADDITIONAL POINTS MADE

In its report, the majority made these additional points:

Congress should appoint a commission to study the effect on the industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in 10 Navy shipyards. The commission should recommend the transfer, where possible, of all such work to private yards.

As many as possible of the 288 large industrial plants in the national military industrial reserve should be sold to private companies. The Government investment in these plants—mostly built in World War II—is about \$9 billion and maintenance costs run about \$200 million a year.

Despite "minor" competition with private industry, the industrial output of 49 shops

in 19 Federal prisons should continue. The question of competition is outweighed by the social importance of occupation, discipline, and rehabilitation afforded by the prison shops.

The Post Office mailbag and lock manufacturing and repair operations be transferred to the Federal Prisons Industries, Inc., the Government enterprise that operates the prison shops.

All military post exchanges and commissaries should be eliminated except those where "adequate or reasonably convenient services are not available." Their prices should be increased to cover all costs; the Department of Defense should enforce penalties against resale of the goods bought at bargain prices; and remaining post exchanges should stop selling jewelry, sporting goods, cameras, and other items of high value.

"The real justification of the continued operation of most these stores," the Commission commented, "is a 'fringe benefit' to the military personnel and their families."

The Government should discontinue, where possible, its aluminum-sweating operations and scrap baling and dispose of the processing plants.

The Defense Department should be commended for its recent efforts to get out of business. While the Commission's report was being prepared the Defense Department, in a constructive move, scheduled the closing of nearly 100 facilities.

The Department of the Interior should study all ways to lease or sell the Federal helium-production plants "and still protect strategic requirements."

Rates of the Alaska Railway should be increased. Its hotels and its other commercial services should be leased or closed down whenever feasible.

The Commission noted that it was keenly aware that its recommendations, if enacted, would mean that "many loyal career Federal employees would lose their jobs."

Similarly, it added, communities where the Federal activities are closed down would suffer economic hardship.

Accordingly, it proposed that in the implementation of its recommendation the Government proceed on a "reasonable time schedule," providing advance notice of its actions and assisting dismissed employees in obtaining other jobs.

The Commission's report, entitled "Business Enterprises," was based on the studies of 4 task forces, or study groups, 2 committees, and 2 subcommittees.

GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIP—LETTER FROM FLOYD OFFICER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a constituent of mine in Seneca, Oreg., Mr. Floyd Officer, has symbolized the strange administration power partnership in a fine letter sent to the Pendleton East-Oregonian, and reprinted in the Pacific Northwest Ruralite.

Mr. Officer suggests a lumber partnership with the Government on the same terms that the utility companies seek to take over powerplants at such dam sites as John Day, on the Columbia River.

I myself often have wondered why smaller industries did not seek the same preferential treatment the utility industry tries to get under the administration's power partnership. Why should not farmers seek to claim the advantages which the utilities will get under partnership?

Mr. President, I am curious to know, for example, why the partnership at

our powerplants should not be reversed, so that the utilities would get the fish ladders, and the public would get the powerhouses. I wonder whether the Interior Department still would be interested in such a partnership, or would it not interest the power companies, which want the revenues and the kilowatts from the dams on the Columbia, but not the deadweight, such as fish ladders and floodgates?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks the pertinent letter written by Floyd Officer, of Seneca, and published in the Pendleton East-Oregonian and the Northwest Ruralite.

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

PARTNERSHIP IN THE LUMBER BUSINESS

DEAR SIR: After due consideration, I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing wrong with Douglas McKay's power partnership policy. That is, nothing wrong, unless it cannot be extended to other fields of endeavor.

Now I have in mind an excellent plan promulgated along the same lines, except that the Government and I are going in together on a sawmill.

The Government will build the mill, supply the logs, pay for the cost of milling, and other incidentals. All I want is the green chain, which I will build and maintain. I will hire the labor to pull the lumber from the green chain into neat little piles, these little piles of lumber will, of course, be mine. I will also agree to build and maintain roads into the mill on which to haul the loot—whups, I mean lumber, away from the mill. All this expense to me is to be financed by long-time loans from the Government at a low rate of interest.

The big thing about it is that this partnership is to last for only 50 years, after which time the whole operation, green chain and all, will revert back to the Government. All, that is except the roads which will still be mine. The Government can either buy them at my price or pay toll whichever they wish. All I'll get out of the deal is a 50-year practically free supply of lumber. I can't see anything ridiculous about that since the Government will still own the mill.

I am sending out a feeler letter to good ole Doug today, and who knows, within a fortnight, I may be in business with the Government.

Very truly yours,

SENECA, OREG.

FLOYD OFFICER.

DEATH OF FORMER SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the wires have just brought to us the sad news of the passing of former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts at his home near Phoenixville, Pa.

The United Press reports that—

Former United States Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts died today at his home in nearby West Vincent Township.

The 80-year-old "great dissenter" of the High Court had retired from the bench 10 years ago, devoting his time to civic affairs and an occasional appearance in court as an attorney.

Roberts left behind a reputation as an independent and "unpredictable" jurist who frequently cast the deciding vote in 5 to 4 decisions of the high tribunal.

Roberts died at his farm home, Bryncoed, after an illness of 4 months, which left him bedfast.

His wife and his daughter, Elizabeth, were at his bedside when he died.

Roberts died of a heart ailment. Private funeral services will be held Thursday.

Mr. President, Justice Roberts was one of the greatest legal minds of our times. He participated in some of the most important judicial decisions of the past few decades.

It is not often that a man of Justice Roberts' capacity and intellectual ability comes along. When he does, a nation can rejoice.

Justice Roberts was a man of outstanding integrity and unshakable independence of thought. He refused to be bound by narrow customs, and he insisted upon making his decisions in accordance with the great tradition of the American judiciary.

When he retired from the bench 10 years ago, he did not retire from public life. He felt that he had an obligation to his country, an obligation which could be discharged only through service.

He has devoted the past 10 years to civic affairs, and his friends, his neighbors, and the whole country have been enriched by his activities.

His passing leaves an aching void in our national life. But to those of us who knew him and admired him, he will always be with us.

A man of such stature never really dies. His personality and his character are stamped upon the permanent life of our country. And this consolation will forever be with his friends and with the dear ones he has left behind him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I desire to join the distinguished majority leader in expressing deep regret over the passing of former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts.

Justice Roberts was 80 years of age. According to the Associated Press dispatch, he died at his home at Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. President, Justice Roberts was not only a distinguished jurist whose decisions will be respected over the years for their wisdom and legal content; but during the time when he was a member of the Supreme Court, he always maintained an active interest in the civic and economic problems of the Nation. After retiring from the Supreme Court in 1945, Justice Roberts continued to take an active interest not only in the law, but in political, economic, and world problems of many kinds. He served as dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, where he rendered outstanding service to one of the finest law schools in the Nation.

He was active in his support of efforts of both Democratic and Republican administrations to bring about peace in the world. His support and testimony in behalf of the United Nations, NATO, and other efforts are well known to Members of the Senate.

Justice Roberts was also national chairman of the Atlantic Union Committee, which is one of the outstanding organizations of the Nation. It is composed of many prominent men and women in all stations of our society who have been trying to make a contribution toward an effort which would give us

an opportunity to ease international tensions and bring the democratic nations closer together.

Justice Roberts was always interested in young men. He gave generously of his time to various causes; and he will be remembered as one of America's greatest jurists and most outstanding citizens.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill, and concurred therein.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; and

H. R. 2581. An act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical-research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC POWER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for a long time now we have heard rumors about what the Hoover Commission had in mind so far as the future of public power is concerned. The task force, which was stacked against public power in its membership, has been working for many months. Early this month the task force completed its report which embraces some 1,800 typewritten pages, touching on every power and resource development in the country.

This report is a most closely guarded secret. Last Saturday, I understand that Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, a member of the Hoover Commission, tried to get the task force report published, but was overruled. Mr. HOLIFIELD said:

The report is completely one sided, which was all that could be expected from a task force composed entirely of proponents of private power and antagonistic to public power.

I am today dispatching the following telegram to Mr. Hoover:

Hon. HERBERT HOOVER,
Chairman, Commission on Organization
of the Executive Branch of the Gov-
ernment, Washington, D. C.:

Urge that your Commission release the task force report on public power and water resources. Reports are that recommendations contained therein are of sweeping va-

riety. Public has vital interest in the recommendations, since public owns these properties involved.

ESTES KEFAUVER.

I have before me an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of last Sunday, by Mr. Edward F. Woods, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

HOOPER SURVEY ABOUT TO DROP BLOCKBUSTER ON LOW-COST POWER—STACKED REPORT DRAFTED BY STACKED COMMITTEE IS AIMED AT CURBING TVA TYPE OF PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—A task force of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has prepared for publication in mid-June a set of recommendations intended to doom low-cost power undertakings, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Post-Dispatch learned today.

The task force report, which is being kept secret until its publication as an official document of the Hoover Commission, will be a blockbuster against TVA and similar projects. It will not advocate outright sale of TVA to private interests but the net effect of its recommendations would be the break-up of TVA and the systems of public-power distribution which TVA represents.

While all members of the Hoover Commission are bound by secrecy against revealing the contents of the task force recommendations, the Post-Dispatch has learned from other sources that, from the standpoint of the public power interests, it is a stacked report by a stacked committee.

CALLED "BIBLE" FOR UTILITIES

The report consists of about 1,800 typewritten pages in its present form. It is said to be the most comprehensive and statistically documented work of its kind ever drafted against public power. It also has been described as a document which will serve the public utilities for at least 20 years as the "bible" for private power lobbyists who wish to see the public projects wind up in the hands of private interests.

The task force, the Post-Dispatch learned, is composed of 26 men, all of whose backgrounds lend themselves to antagonism to the idea of public power at low cost. The task force was selected in September 1953, it was learned, after a bitter fight within the commission, in which former President Herbert Hoover's selections of its personnel prevailed.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD (Democrat), California, who is neither a public power nor private power man, insisted that of the 26 to be named to the task force, at least 2 should be persons who represented the public power point of view so that when the commission got around to evaluating the task force's recommendations it might have the varying viewpoints before it.

HOW COMMISSION DIVIDED

HOLIFIELD's motion, it has been learned, was voted down by 7 to 5. Those on the Commission who favored this fair approach were former Postmaster General James A. Farley, Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican Representative from Ohio, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN (Democrat), Arkansas, and HOLIFIELD.

Against the Holifield move were Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., Arthur S. Flemming, Senator STYLES BRIDGES (Republican), New Hampshire, Robert G. Storey, Sidney A. Mitchell, and Solomon C. Hollister.

Sources close to the Commission say that since the Hoover Commission went back into business in July 1953, the forthcoming attack upon public power has been its main objective.

It was Hoover and Mitchell who hand-picked the task force of anti-public-power members. Mitchell is a director of the American Gas & Electric Co. and a private-utility-career man. His father, Sidney Z. Mitchell, organized the electric plants of the Edison Co. and was chairman of the board of the Electric Bond & Share Co.

Electric Bond & Share Co.'s wholly owned subsidiary, Ebasco Services, recently was approved by the Atomic Energy Commission as engineers and construction management contractor for the controversial \$107,250,000 Dixon-Yates power project at West Memphis, Ark.

Despite bad management and waste of the taxpayers' money, according to the General Accounting Office, on an AEC project at Joppla, Ill., Ebasco also has been selected for another AEC project at Portsmouth, Ohio.

The fight over personnel of the task force centered on the fact that of the 26 members not 1 was sympathetic to the philosophy of low-cost public power, and none had even had any administrative experience in the field.

Hoover has said publicly he thought TVA should be sold to private utilities. The task force report will fit in with his philosophy.

It is going to be extremely difficult for Hoover to keep the contents of the task force report secret much longer. There will be demands from Congress next week that it be released.

This task force has, since February 1954, spent more than \$324,000 and before it is finished its bill will run upwards of \$400,000.

The Hoover Commission on the whole, since September 1953, has spent more than \$2,500,000 on various studies and is expected to ask for more money from Congress Monday.

There have been frequent demands on Hoover that the reports of the so-called task forces be made public as they are submitted to the Commission so that the Commission might, in drafting its reports, have the benefit of public reaction.

Hoover has turned down these requests with the observation that to publish the task force reports would only stir up controversy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This article reports that the task-force report is a blockbuster against TVA and similar projects. The article continues:

While all members of the Hoover Commission are bound by secrecy against revealing the contents of the task-force recommendations, the Post-Dispatch has learned from other sources that, from the standpoint of the public-power interests, it is a stacked report by a stacked committee.

The Nashville Tennessean, in a copyrighted story this morning, reports that the report recommends that Congress immediately take bids from private industry for the sale or lease of all TVA facilities by private industry except those facilities used by the AEC for its supply of power. The AEC would take over TVA power-producing facilities which it requires. The Commission suggests that local and State governments also be considered if they desire to lease or purchase the TVA facilities. The Corps of Engineers would be required to transfer all of its facilities on the Cumberland River to TVA in order that they might be included in the sale or lease of such facilities.

Mr. President, since February 1954 the task force has spent more than \$324,000,

and before it is finished its bill will run upward of \$400,000. This force was assembled by Mr. Hoover and Sidney A. Mitchell, a director of the American Gas & Electric Co., son of the man who was chairman of the board of Electric Bond & Share Co. Therefore we expected an attack upon all public power. It is regrettable that it cost \$400,000 to find out the views of Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Hoover. However, since they have spent that sum, and inasmuch as it is our property that they are here disposing of, we have a right to know what is proposed. I hope the report will be made available immediately.

INTEREST AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE IN CONSERVATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is most refreshing and reassuring to me as a conservationist of long standing, to see the interest in conservation that is now developing among the young people.

In my own State, Boy Scouts, 4-H Clubs, and other youth groups have undertaken extensive conservation projects and have made and are making an impressive contribution to the care and preservation of our lands, forests, and wilderness areas.

One of the outstanding activities of this kind which has come to my attention recently is the publication of a special conservation issue of a monthly newspaper of a small-town elementary school in my State. This publication was issued in March by the Milford Elementary School, under the supervision of Faculty Adviser Curn C. Harvey. To my knowledge, this is the first student newspaper to devote a complete issue to conservation.

This special publication of the Siren received commendation in the current issue of Nature magazine, published by the American Nature Association. A brief review of this article was published in the May 5 issue of the Milford News, a community newspaper.

The Milford Elementary School also had another distinction recently. They solicited an article on Youth's Part in Conservation from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. He complied with their request, and his article will be featured in a supplementary issue of the school newspaper.

However, because of the general interest in this subject among the young people of the country, and because of the possibility that other schools may wish to emulate this pioneering activity by the Milford Elementary School, I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Benson's article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of these remarks.

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

YOUTH'S PART IN CONSERVATION

Natural resources, either through their exploitation or wise use, have played a leading part in shaping the history of all mankind. The young people of today have an opportunity to study the most important phase of our history—the history of man; the development of his arts and sciences over the years; his progress from savagery to civilization; his exploitations, travels, and discov-

eries; his standard of living through the years up to the present time; and his ability to exist, which has been shaped to a large extent by the available land and water resources and his need for additional resources.

Professional conservationists, educators, and scientists are amazed with the progress and contributions to conservation being made by the youth of today. The seeds of conservation are in the classroom, the church, schoolgrounds, the fields, the forests, streams, camps, and all other areas where youth groups assemble. In these days of crowded classrooms the teachers are not disposed to enlarge the curriculum. Fortunately, the best interest of conservation is not served by squeezing in a course labeled "conservation." The growing number of conservation-minded teachers recognize that the many-sided subject lends itself to treatment of conservation in some degree in all existing courses from simple reading and drawing exercises to the highly technical scientific subjects. Young people love it, and that is being demonstrated in the classrooms all over America today.

All youth groups have come to realize that we can no longer afford the luxury of waste. They have come to know that conservation of soil, water, grasslands, forests, wildlife, and minerals is not something that should interest only farmers, ranchers, timber owners, miners, and sportsmen.

Conservation is an integral part of the National 4-H Club program. During 1953 nearly 254,000 boys and girls received specific training in soil and water conservation. More than 196,000 club members received training in forestry.

During the same year 30 States conducted organized land appreciation schools and land, pasture, and range judging contests. It was estimated that more than 150,000 boys and girls participated in these soil projects.

Last year 49 percent of the 371,000 members of Future Farmers of America participated in the National Awards Program on Soil and Water Management, which is sponsored by the FFA Foundation. Awards were made to 4,850 FFA chapters throughout the country. In Alabama alone, FFA boys planted more than 1 million tree seedlings. During the same year more than 100,000 boys participated in the FFA National Speaking contest. More than 20 percent of these boys selected "conservation" as their topic.

During the past few years hundreds of conservation-minded organizations and groups have sponsored conservation contests and field days of one kind or another for youth groups. A good example of this is the annual national essay contest sponsored by the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council. Last year approximately 25,000 boys and girls participated in the contest, the topic of which was "Building Fertility."

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four was proclaimed "Boy Scout Conservation Good Turn Year" by President Eisenhower, honorary president of BSA. It is estimated that approximately 1 million scouts participated in conservation projects of one kind or another in soil, water, wildlife, and forestry. It is truly amazing the number of conservation activities that were accomplished by the scouts during the year. During scout week—February 6-12 of this year—I had the pleasure of presenting certificates to the 12 regional achievement award winners here in Washington.

This wide interest of young people in conservation is both stimulating and encouraging. We must continue and, where possible, enlarge the opportunities for furtherance of this interest.

We must also create a recognition that our resources are to be used to produce the materials to make the lives of our people possible and satisfying and to contribute toward a spiritual awareness of the Creator's boun-

tiful blessing. To this end we must use these resources wisely, and this is the real purpose of conservation, so that future generations shall share in the Creator's great bounty.

Our use is transitory. Our use must not destroy. It must satisfy our needs and, at the same time, enhance our great natural resources so that future generations may find satisfaction equal to ours from these great national assets.

Mr. WATKINS. I also wish to commend the students and faculty of the Milford Elementary School and all young people and youth groups everywhere who are taking such an active interest in the subject of conservation. Youth has a real stake in the conservation of our soil, water, and other natural resources, and I am extremely gratified that young people in my State are taking a leading part in this burgeoning interest and activity in that important field.

In connection with the statement I have just made, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the *Nature* magazine article, published in the *Milford News* of May 5, 1955, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

NATURE MAGAZINE LAUDS SIREN CONSERVATION ISSUE

Nature magazine, published by the American Nature Association at Washington, D. C., has an article in the May issue, just off the press, praising the Milford Siren for the special number for March on conservation.

The article points to the special edition of the Siren as "an outstanding example of what boys and girls in grade schools can do to help with conservation, and especially to make people of their communities conscious of conservation needs."

It suggests that other schools would find editions of their papers on this theme valuable.

"Pupils in Milford Elementary School who worked on the articles, who made drawings to illustrate it, as well as those who participate in the activities described, proved themselves to be real conservationists," the articles states.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an article appearing in the *Baltimore Sun*, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it for not more than 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none. The article will be printed in the *RECORD*, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

The article ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, is as follows:

EISENHOWER O. K.'S PLAN ON VACCINE—VOLUNTARY DISTRIBUTION SETUP DEFENDED BY MRS. HOBBY

(By John Van Camp)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—President Eisenhower this morning approved a voluntary plan for the distribution of Salk antipolio vaccine, and early in the afternoon Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, author of the plan, appeared before a Senate committee to defend it.

The 11-point voluntary plan carries with it a \$28 million appropriation to make sure

no child goes without Salk shots because of his parents' inability to pay.

The plan also calls for additional appropriations to expand research, testing and policing by the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration.

CHALLENGES CRITICS

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been accused of having no plan at all for distribution of the antipolio vaccine.

With her jaw jutting and her back stiff as a ramrod, she challenged critics on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to show her a federalized control system that would work as well or as fast as her proposals.

She was back up by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who said the Government already has all the laws it needs and that new laws could do nothing to speed up production of the vaccine.

One new medical fact was brought out when Senator IVES, Republican, of New York, asked if Salk shots would be administered during the height of the polio season—August and September.

HELD NOT YET RESOLVED

Dr. Scheele said that was a medical question not yet resolved.

It is still expected that enough vaccine will be available within the next 60 to 90 days to give second shots to the Nation's first- and second-graders and to the "polio pioneers," those children who took dummy shots in the great experiment last year.

There are 9 million children in this group, and completing their inoculations will require 18 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. So far 7,362,000 cubic centimeters have been released.

Not all of this, however, has been "reappraised" and given a second approval. The withdrawal of the vaccine made by the Cutter Laboratories, of California, and the subsequent moratorium on use of the vaccine for a double check at the manufacturing plants are the two factors causing the delay.

FINAL TARGET NOTED

The final target is inoculation of all persons in the 1-to-19 age group and all pregnant women. There are 59 million in these groups. Dr. Scheele said that under present conditions they all will not get their shots until late fall or early winter.

These are the 11 planks in the voluntary program which Mrs. Hobby recommended to President Eisenhower, and which he adopted:

1. The Public Health Service must have every facility, including additional funds and staff, to insure maximum precautions in continued testing of the vaccine for safety and potency.

2. The dedication of the first 18 million cubic centimeters of vaccine to the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis for free immunization of first- and second-graders and "pioneers" must be honored.

3. For the time being, vaccine must go only to the most susceptible group in the population—children between 5 and 9. Further priorities will be announced by the National Advisory Committee on Allocation of the Vaccine.

4. Mrs. Hobby will direct the allocation of vaccine among the States, on the basis of age groups. The manufacturers have pledged to observe these allocations.

5. The supply will be allocated among the States until all children in the 5-to-9 group are inoculated. Manufacturers will make reports to Mrs. Hobby on their shipments.

6. Each State will assume responsibility for distribution within its borders and will decide what portion goes to public agencies and what portion to the private medical profession.

ASKS POLICING FUNDS

7. Additional funds must be given to the Food and Drug Administration for policing to make sure supplies do not get outside authorized channels of distribution for prescription drugs.

8. Medical associations will be urged to take steps to assure that each physician gives shots only to children in the priority age groups and that he keeps a record of the child's name, the age, date of vaccination, manufacturer of the vaccine, and lot number of the vaccine.

9. That the drug system—from manufacturer to corner druggist—insure that every transaction involving Salk vaccine is recorded and that the record includes the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the person or agency making the purchase.

10. Action by Congress to appropriate \$28 million for grants to the States for the purchase of the vaccine for indigent children.

NAMING OF SPECIAL GROUP

11. Appointment of a special congressional committee to study methods of assisting other nations to get needed supplies of Salk vaccine.

It is expected that after the 5-9 age group is inoculated, the Advisory Committee on Vaccine Allocation will issue new recommendations.

These are the other age groups, in the descending order of susceptibility: 1 to 4; 10 to 14; 15 to 19; 20 to 45.

At the base, as a representative of the Department said, the program rests "on the faith that the medical profession will give the vaccine to the 15-to-19 age group first."

POWER OF STATES QUESTIONED

Senator HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, and Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, questioned the power of the States to control the allocation of the vaccine between private physicians and public agencies.

Mrs. Hobby answered that governors did not seem to have any hesitation about their powers to control distribution within the States.

LEHMAN wanted to know why Mrs. Hobby had waited until after April 12—when the results of last summer's experiment was announced—to start formulating a plan for distribution.

Mrs. Hobby said the Salk vaccine was "unique in medical history . . . no one could have foreseen the public demand."

FOUNDATION LAID PLANS

The Polio Foundation, however, in October of last year laid its plans for inoculating first- and second-graders. Its contracts with the manufacturers, according to Mrs. Hobby's report to the President, helped underwrite the risk involved in keeping facilities and staff intact while waiting for the evaluation of the experiment.

Mrs. Hobby, in her reports to the President and the Senate committee, said the voluntary plan was based on these four principles:

1. Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

2. The vaccine must be distributed on an equitable basis among the States and among individuals within the States.

3. Children should be able to receive the vaccine regardless of the ability of their parents to pay.

4. Any distribution system adopted must be as practical, fast, and effective as is possible while still meeting the foregoing principles.

Mrs. Hobby said that a poll of 51 governors of States and Territories taken last week showed that 43 believed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should stand

responsible for vaccine allocation. Six governors objected, and two did not comment, she said.

Already, Mrs. Hobby added, 29 States have established advisory committees to deal with allocation of vaccine within the States.

REACTION IS MIXED

The Hobby voluntary plan for the control of Salk vaccine met with a mixed reaction. Democrats were in general critical and Republicans receptive.

Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, thought it would only add to the "confusion," while Senator SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, complimented Mrs. Hobby on her program.

Representative SPENCE, Democrat, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, said he would not have final comment until he studied the report further. But he said it was his feeling that strict Federal controls, of a mandatory nature, still were needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read a paragraph or two from the article and then make a brief statement.

Speaking of Mrs. Hobby's testimony, the article says:

Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been accused of having no plan at all for distribution of the anti-polio vaccine.

With her jaw jutting and her back stiff as a ramrod, she challenged critics on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to show her a federalized control system that would work as well or as fast as her proposals.

She was backed up by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who said that Government already has all the laws it needs and that new laws could do nothing to speed up production of the vaccine.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am not at all impressed with the efforts of Mrs. Hobby to bullhead through and alibi her horrendous mistake in connection with her handling of the polio vaccine problem. I am not at all impressed with her record in this matter; and that statement goes for Dr. Scheele, too.

Both of them months ago knew that the vaccine was about to be made available, but neither of them did anything to protect the boys and girls and the parents of this country by seeing to it that the vaccine was thoroughly tested before being released to the public. They left that matter up to the drug companies. The public was entitled to have a very careful testing check placed on the drug companies by the Federal Government.

Furthermore, they knew for months that there would be a shortage of the vaccine. Now they are trying to alibi their way out of the mistake they made by proposing an administrative monstrosity, whereby the vaccine would be made available and distributed on the basis of 48 distinct setups. They are opposed to a Federal law to cover the distribution of the vaccine. The fact is a Federal law would have protected the boys and girls of the United States from the damage which has been done to some of them because the vaccine got into the stream of commerce without being tested.

Meat is tested and inspected more carefully in the big packing plants than Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele permitted the polio vaccine to be tested by the

Federal Government. If they did not have sufficient personnel to provide for testing the vaccine, they had the power to prevent its release until the testing had been consummated. The soundness of my criticism that the vaccine should have been tested by the Federal Government batch by batch before it was released by the drug companies is borne out by the fact that after defective vaccine was discovered on the market a stop order had to be issued.

If Secretary Hobby wants to know of a better plan, let me tell her of the introduction on April 14 of the Morse bill, which would have brought the vaccine under Federal control until an adequate supply was available for all the boys and girls of the United States.

The distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] sometime later introduced a similar bill.

That is my answer to Secretary Hobby.

She emitted from her lips yesterday in her testimony before a Senate committee not one word which justifies the horrendous mistake she has made. She and Dr. Scheele will have much to answer for to the parents of the children of this country for allowing this mistake to be made. What Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele ought to be required to do is to visit the hospital rooms of the boys and girls who have contracted this horrible disease, largely, I think, because the Federal public health authorities did not test the vaccine, or see to it that it was tested, before it was released.

That is my answer to Secretary Hobby. She has not met the problem calling for a fair distribution of the vaccine by the kind of administrative monstrosity she proposed yesterday. What ought to be done is to bring the limited supply of vaccine under complete Federal control until an ample supply is available for all the people of the United States.

Furthermore, with respect to Mrs. Hobby's proposal to make the vaccine available without cost to those who are unable to pay, let us not forget that the vaccine was developed from the March of Dimes drives over the years. It ought to be made available free, irrespective of ability to pay, to all the children of the country. All of us who are adults have a great interest in our boys and girls. They represent the greatest asset our Nation possesses.

I think this is a Federal public-health problem which ought to be handled by Federal public authorities. The inoculations, when the vaccine is declared to be safe, should be made available free to every American boy and girl. However, each batch of the vaccine should be double-checked by the Federal authorities before it is released.

I again refer Mrs. Hobby and Dr. Scheele to the Morse bill or the Ives bill. I think they are just as sound today as when we introduced them. Nothing Secretary Hobby said yesterday, in my judgment, justifies the kind of administrative monstrosity she proposes. She deserves severe public censure.

Mr. BENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was on the floor of the Senate during the most unfortunate comment by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] regarding the

President of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General of the United States.

If the American people will read the report made to the President by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the committee hearings of yesterday before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am sure they will get a wholly different view and form a different estimate of the work done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with the Salk vaccine program.

Certainly, the Department has been on its toes, and certainly it has been aware of the problem. The Department knows what to do, and it is doing it. The Department is protecting the people of the United States, particularly the children, in handling a difficult situation in the most intelligent and professional way any such situation has ever been handled.

I am sure the medical profession, along with the Department, deserves the greatest credit for its wholesome treatment of the subject and for meeting its responsibilities.

Mrs. Hobby distinguished herself as a great stateswoman and as a fine leader by the manner in which she answered questions and presented the facts.

Certainly the matter should be handled by the States, instead of by the Federal Government. The administration of the Selective Service Act works extremely well through a system of co-operation between the Federal Government and the various States. Whenever a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has any problem in any State, the first person he contacts is the State director of health.

To establish a new bureaucracy, necessitating the hiring of a great many employees, to handle the problem would be expensive and needless. To deal with matters affecting the health of the Nation we already have at work a fine system which operates through the cooperation of the various States with the Department.

All questions involving the Salk vaccine are being handled in an intelligent and proper manner for the protection of all the people.

I suggest to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that he read the report and the hearings before the committee yesterday. All Senators present at the hearings, both Democrats and Republicans, almost without exception were very well satisfied, in my opinion, with the report made by the distinguished member of the Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby.

(At this point Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained unanimous consent that, following the discussion of the subject of Salk vaccine the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriations, action on which appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial printed in a newspaper published in the State of Ohio. The editorial is my reply

to the Senator from Ohio. I suggest that he read it. The editorial was published in the *Trainman News* of May 16, 1955. It is entitled "Send Hobby to Hubby."

In the course of the editorial the editor states:

For several months, the Government has known that the Salk formula was going to be successful. It also knew that for some time after its release, the vaccine would be in short supply. And it should have known that along with the great strengths of the free enterprise system, there are some weaknesses, among them being that sometimes profiteering and favoritism retard fair distribution of commodities in short supply. And it should also have known that production of a medicine, particularly a new, long yearned for and relatively untried one, requires more than normal precaution in manufacture.

In the face of this, the Government indifferently let matters rock along, unguided, uncounseled, until the present disgraceful situation resulted.

The blame for this must fall more heavily on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and its head, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, than on any other department of the Government, since it was close to the vaccine development from the beginning.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in full be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

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

SEND HOBBY TO HUBBY

The temporary halting of the Salk vaccine program was the only course possible after the Government's shocking failure to provide an orderly procedure for the antipolio serum's safe manufacture and fair and fast distribution.

While the serum and the methods of production are being rechecked, Congress should enact legislation rigidly controlling the manufacture and distribution of the vaccine, finally giving us the protection which the Government should have already provided.

Congress should also find out why the administration did not take steps long before the public announcement of the vaccine's success to protect the people.

As it stands now, the people have considerably more confidence in the probable effectiveness of the Salk vaccine than in the ability of the present administration to see that it is safely manufactured and fairly and quickly distributed.

This is unfortunate, but what other conclusion can be drawn from the monstrous muddling and confusion which has marked the Government's handling of the antipolio program so far?

For several months, the Government has known that the Salk formula was going to be successful. It also knew that for some time after its release the vaccine would be in short supply. And it should have known that along with the great strengths of the free-enterprise system, there are some weaknesses, among them being that sometimes profiteering and favoritism retard fair distribution of commodities in short supply. And it should have also known that production of a medicine, particularly a new, long yearned for and relatively untried one, required more than normal precaution in manufacture.

In the face of this, the Government indifferently let matters rock along, unguided, uncounseled, until the present disgraceful situation resulted.

The blame for this must fall more heavily on the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and its head, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, than on any other Department of

the Government, since it was close to the vaccine development from the beginning.

If President Eisenhower wants to restore public confidence in the antipolio program, he should immediately call for the kind of regulation an effective program needs and fire the lady Cabinet member who failed to give him or the people the kind of advice that is expected of all public officials, especially those concerned with the people's health, welfare, and education.

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully but solemnly that in my judgment Secretary Hobby has been guilty of bad administration, which borders on immorality, so far as living up to her moral responsibilities as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is concerned. As I said before, what she ought to be required to do is to visit the children who have become the victims of polio, because, in my opinion, of the gross incompetency of which she and Dr. Scheele were guilty in not seeing to it that the vaccine was tested before it ever was used to inoculate American children. As I said the other day, I speak as a parent, who knows what it means to have polio strike one's home. Fortunately, our case proved to be a mild one, but the anxiety was terrific. I have some idea what parents whose children are suffering from the affects of impure vaccine must think of Mrs. Hobby's bungling. In my opinion, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, ought to be removed from office today for her gross incompetency in the handling of this matter.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is quite wrong if he thinks the Secretary has unanimously convinced members of the Senate Labor Committee. I have talked to some members of the committee, and they have briefed me on their criticism of Mrs. Hobby's unconvincing alibi. Her effort to alibi her mistake in the bullheaded manner she has followed does not relieve her of the charge of incompetency. The Federal Government should take over the supply of vaccine and distribute it until such time as there is an adequate quantity for the needs of all the children of America. This is about as glaring an example of how a Secretary of a Government department should not act as I have ever seen in the administration of our Government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report to the President by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be printed in the body of the *RECORD* at this point.

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

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ON DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE, MAY 16, 1955

INTRODUCTION

On April 14, 1955, the President directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to survey and report to him on the best means of assuring an equitable distribution of the Salk polio vaccine. This directive resulted from the great significance to the Nation and to the world of the announcement at Ann Arbor, Mich., on April 12, 1955, of the success of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine which was field tested during the summer and fall of 1954, and licensed for commercial production on April 12, 1955.

In making this survey and report we have received the greatest possible cooperation from scientists, technical experts, representatives of the health and medical professions, the pharmaceutical industry, and of health, welfare and public interest organizations.

This report deals almost entirely with the problems of equitable distribution of the vaccine. It deals only in summary form with the technical and scientific problems relating to preparation, production in quantity and testing of the vaccine. A more detailed report by the Surgeon General on the technical and scientific problems will follow.

The principles that guided us in our study of the situation, and in our actions to date, are:

1. Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration; and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.
2. The vaccine must be distributed on an equitable basis among the States and among individuals within the States.
3. Children should be able to receive the vaccine regardless of the ability of their parents to pay.
4. Any distribution system adopted must be as practical, fast, and effective as is possible while still meeting the foregoing principles.

Since the first official action of this Department with respect to the vaccine was the licensing of the manufacturers on April 12, 1955, a brief summary of the background of the licensing process is set forth below.¹

I. LICENSING THE MANUFACTURERS

Under the biologics control provisions of the Public Health Service Act, Salk vaccine, because it is a biologic product, cannot lawfully be imported, exported or shipped between States for sale unless it has been propagated or manufactured at an establishment holding a license issued by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Biologic products are defined as medicinal preparations made from living organisms and their products, and include serums, vaccines, antigens, and antitoxins.

The Secretary acts upon recommendation of the Surgeon General, who, in turn, bases his decisions on the findings of the Laboratory of Biologics Control of the National Institutes of Health, the research arm of the Public Health Service.

The purpose of the law and of the licensing procedure is to insure the purity, potency, and safety of biologics manufactured and distributed in interstate commerce and those which are imported or exported.

Under the law, before a manufacturer undertakes production of a biologic product, his plant and equipment are inspected by the Laboratory of Biologics Control and the personnel involved in its production are interviewed on their backgrounds and competence.

The laboratory, thereafter, if it deems necessary, may review individual lots of the product. The method by which this is accomplished is as follows:

Such review consists of checking what are known as protocols. These protocols are extensive reports summarizing and precisely detailing all events in manufacture and results of all tests made by the manufacturer during the production process. If, in the judgment of the laboratory, there are insufficient data, further information may be required. The laboratory may require that, in addition to protocols, samples of the material be submitted for laboratory analysis and study. If the protocols contain all essential data, and, in the judgment of the

¹ See appendix No. 1 for events concerning the preparation and testing of the vaccine after Apr. 12.

laboratory, give satisfactory evidence of compliance with the standards to assure the purity, potency and safety of the product, no further action is taken.

During the field trials of the Salk vaccine in the spring and fall of 1954, the manufacturers, Dr. Jonas Salk, and the Laboratory of Biologics Control separately tested each lot of the vaccine. The manufacturing standards and the testing procedures used were developed jointly by Dr. Salk, the manufacturers, an advisory committee of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and experts of the Laboratory of Biologics Control. The laboratory collaborated in developing these procedures and acquired many months of experience in testing under circumstances that permitted comparison and assessment of the performance of the several laboratories.

The six manufacturers that are now licensed for poliomyelitis vaccine have produced biologics for many years. The Laboratory of Biologics Control is familiar with the scientific qualifications of personnel of these manufacturers, their methods and standards of manufacturing, and the physical layout of their plants.

In addition, the field tests conducted during 1954 provided the widest possible experience, unique in the history of testing new drugs, concerning the safety of the vaccine used. These field trials consisted of a systematic testing of the effectiveness of the vaccine among some 400,000 first and second grade school children in scattered localities. This was the largest field test of a new biologic product in history. These results were evaluated under the direction of Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., chairman of the department of epidemiology at the University of Michigan School of Public Health. These results, announced on April 12, 1955, proved the vaccine prevented from 60 percent to 90 percent of the cases of paralytic poliomyelitis which might otherwise have occurred among these children. In addition, the study clearly showed the safety of the material used in the field trials.

On the basis of this solid knowledge of the vaccine, the Director of the Laboratory of Biologics Control, on April 12, 1955, with the concurrence of a group of eminent scientific advisers, recommended to the Surgeon General, and the Surgeon General recommended to the Secretary, the licensing of six manufacturers: Cutter Laboratories, Berkeley, Calif.; Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; Parke-Davis & Co., Detroit, Mich.; Pitman-Moore Co., Zionsville, Ind.; Sharpe & Dohme, Philadelphia, Pa.; and Wyeth Laboratories, Inc., Marietta, Pa. The Secretary, with whom the Surgeon General had previously discussed the proposed licensing, signed the licenses on the same day.

II. SUMMARY OUTLINE OF EVENTS FOLLOWING LICENSING OF PRODUCTION

The following is a brief summary of events since April 12, 1955, concerning the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and the activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

On April 14, the President directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to survey and report to him on the best means of assuring equitable distribution of the vaccine.

On the same day, a senior member of the Department met with the presidents of 5 producing companies, and the executive vice president of the sixth firm, to discuss supply and distribution problems and the proposed meetings on April 21-22.

On April 20, a scientific meeting was held at the National Institutes of Health with technical representatives of the manufacturers to review technical problems in manufacturing and testing.

On April 21, interviews with individual manufacturers brought out essential facts

about present and estimated future production of the vaccine. (The manufacturers have reported that, since this date, they have sold no vaccine in commercial channels.)

On April 22, a scientific and technical meeting called by the Secretary was attended by 25 groups and organizations representing the health and medical professions, the pharmaceutical and drug industries, and other professional groups. Among the recommendations that came out of the meeting was the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine to serve during the next few months. The Secretary, on the same day, recommended to the President and received approval for the appointment of such a committee.

On April 26, a telegram was addressed to the governors of all States and Territories requesting their help in distributing the vaccine equitably.

On April 27, a meeting of some 50 national organizations broadly representative of the public interest was held to provide them with current information about the availability of the vaccine and to obtain their views on the questions of supply and distribution.

On the same day, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, in response to reports of six cases of poliomyelitis among children who had been vaccinated with material from the Cutter Laboratories of Berkeley, Calif., instructed that manufacturer to withdraw all of its vaccine from distribution.

On the same day, two scientists were dispatched from the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda to Berkeley, Calif., to conduct an on-the-scene study of the manufacturing and testing of the Cutter product.²

On April 28, the Surgeon General directed the establishment of a Poliomyelitis Surveillance Unit within the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga., to maintain day-by-day information on the occurrence of poliomyelitis.

On April 29-30, a committee of 11 scientific advisers met with the staff of the National Institutes of Health to review the situation with respect to the Cutter vaccine, and to recommend specific steps in the investigation of that problem.

On May 2, the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine had its first meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs and adviser to the President on poliomyelitis.

On May 3, the Secretary and the Surgeon General presented an up-to-the-minute resumé of the poliomyelitis vaccine situation at the Governors' Conference. On the same day an advisory committee of governors was named to work with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on problems of vaccine distribution.

On May 5-6, a special committee of experts met at the National Institutes of Health to advise on testing procedures with respect to safety of poliomyelitis vaccine.

On May 7, the Surgeon General issued a bulletin recommending that States and municipalities postpone their vaccination programs until Public Health Service recommendations could be released on Sunday, May 8.

On May 8, the Surgeon General recommended that all poliomyelitis vaccination programs be temporarily suspended pending a reappraisal of all production procedures and testing methods.

On May 9, a meeting was held between the Secretary and three members of the advisory committee of governors to obtain their suggestions regarding recommendations to be contained in this report.

²A summary of technical and scientific problems in this connection is contained in appendix 1.

On May 11, the first field review following the Surgeon General's action of May 8 was begun at Parke-Davis & Co., in Detroit.

On May 13, the Public Health Service announced the release of virtually all of the Parke-Davis & Co. vaccine that had been reappraised.

On May 15, the Public Health Service announced the release of all Eli Lilly & Co. vaccine that had been reappraised.

III. SUPPLY

Throughout the history of the development of new vaccines and other modern drugs, there have been a variety of production problems at the start. Large-scale production of a new biologic product presents initial technical problems which can only be solved through experience.

A. Production problems

Why cannot the production of this new vaccine be speeded up? The answer lies in the fact that the problems inherent in the production of Salk vaccine are among the most complex in the field of large-scale biologic preparations.

1. Limited Number of Manufacturers

There are at present six licensed manufacturers of the Salk vaccine, the product of one of which has been recalled. These were the only companies that the NFIP could interest in entering the field to produce vaccine for use in the large-scale field trial of the vaccine in 1954.

Only two manufacturers produced quantities early enough and in sufficient volume to be used in the field trials. The expense of tooling up for the production of such large quantities of Salk vaccine was guaranteed in part by the NFIP. All six manufacturers also contributed substantial risk capital for the development of plant capacity. Inasmuch as the outcome of the field investigation during 1954 could not be predicted there was little inducement for other manufacturers to engage in producing the vaccine, and no others applied for licenses.

2. Expansion of Production Capacity

Discussions with the manufacturers indicate that with the present techniques used in the manufacture of poliomyelitis vaccine, each now is or soon will be operating at maximum capacity. In addition, it was announced by one of the manufacturers on May 11, 1955, that construction will begin immediately to double the company's production of the vaccine. It is estimated that such construction will take 4 months.

The possibility of encouraging other manufacturers to enter the field has been considered. The time needed for tooling up and acquiring know-how for the production of the vaccine would probably require 9 to 12 months, or possibly longer. Consequently any such move would have no effect on the vaccine supply for the current year.

An accurate estimate of the vaccine supply at any future date is impeded by the complexity of the biological and chemical processes on which manufacture is dependent, by the intermediate testing procedures by which each step in manufacture is regulated, and by the final quality control tests that each lot of vaccine must meet. The processing may offer technical problems at any point with a consequent effect on the yield of finished product. From beginning to end the cycle of manufacture requires at least 90 days, so that any delay or failure of a particular lot may have a significant effect on the supply at any given time.

B. Supply estimates

1. Prior to April 12, 1955

On March 29, 1955, initial contact was made with the manufacturers about production estimates if the field trials showed the vaccine to be effective. Rough estimates

were submitted to the Department by each manufacturer on April 5.

2. For April 22, 1955, Meeting

As a result of the favorable report on effectiveness of the vaccine, arrangements were made on April 15 for obtaining production estimates for presentation at the scientific and technical conference on April 22. The estimates announced at the meeting were later revised, and, as of April 28, new cumulative production estimates were made.

3. As of May 3, 1955

Subsequently, there was another revision of the estimates, as of May 3. It is important to emphasize that all these estimates are subject to a variety of factors which might necessitate either upward or downward revisions. Biologics are subject to fluctuations in production because of the sensitive nature of operations involved. The production schedules assume each finished batch will successfully pass the necessary tests. Failure of any batch, therefore, cuts production schedules. Further, the production of vaccine by the manufacturer, as of any given date as shown in his estimates, assumes that the stated quantity will be checked out and released for clinical use by the Laboratory of Biologics Control. Data furnished by industry as of May 3 on estimated production indicated that there would be enough vaccine by July 1 to make possible two inoculations for all children in the particularly susceptible age group 5 to 9, inclusive. Estimates of production as of that date indicated that, if no delays developed, approximately 58 million cc. might be available (including NFIP contract material) or enough vaccine to provide two injections for approximately 29 million persons, through July 31, 1955. This represents roughly 94 percent of the children age 1 to 9 inclusive, the most susceptible age groups. Data on the estimated supply of vaccine as of May 3 indicated that production was expected to increase steadily to a cumulative total of at least 120 million cc. produced by January 1, 1956. This is equivalent to vaccine for two injections of close to 60 million persons. This does not take into account the additional supply that will be produced as the result of the planned plant expansion reported on May 11, 1955.

On the basis of recommendations made by the scientific advisors who met April 29-30, 1955, further detailed consideration has been given to the problem of safety in producing the vaccine in large quantities. As a result of recommendations made by the expert committee on May 5-6, and the action of May 8, new techniques may be developed in the manufacturing process. It is not possible, therefore, to provide a reestimate of projected production at this time, and no attempt has been made to revise the last estimates prepared on May 3, 1955.

In any event it appears that the period of greatest shortage would fall between now and August 1, 1955. However, as has already been noted, these projections must be reappraised in the light of later developments and their effect on delivery dates.

C. Distribution to date

1. National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis

(a) NFIP contracts

Dr. Salk and his associates began to work on a poliomyelitis vaccine with the financial support of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, during 1951. In early 1953, Dr. Salk began his own clinical trials.

In early 1953, the NFIP met with approximately 10 manufacturers experienced in producing biologic preparations. The purpose was to determine who would be willing to participate in the large-scale production of the Salk vaccine. In late 1953, the NFIP made agreements for the production of enough vaccine for large-scale field trials to

be instituted early in 1954. The foundation underwrote the cost of this material.

In October 1954, the foundation announced that contracts were being negotiated for enough material to inoculate 9 million children. A primary purpose of the foundation's contracts was to provide some financial assistance, so that industry would keep its technical staff and production facilities active and in readiness if field trials indicated that the vaccine was effective. The decision to use this material for children in the first and second grades was reached after consultation with a committee of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association and other epidemiologists and health experts. The foundation first agreed to purchase all vaccine produced through June 30, 1955, up to 27 million cubic centimeters. It has since announced that it will purchase 18 million cubic centimeters, enough for two shots for all first and second grade children, and in addition, for all participants in the field trials who received placebo injections (dummy shots).

(b) NFIP contract fulfillment

The NFIP present purchase goal is for the delivery of 18 million cubic centimeters of Salk vaccine during 1955. As of May 6, according to information furnished to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by the NFIP, manufacturers had shipped 7,361,690 cubic centimeters, on NFIP contracts.

The withdrawal of Cutter vaccine on April 27 upset the NFIP timetable. The foundation now holds options under which other manufacturers will provide sufficient quantities of the vaccine to take care of the foundation's program.

2. General Sale

At the time of the purchase agreements announced by the foundation in October 1954, it was thought production would be sufficient to permit concurrent production of some vaccine for general sale. Consequently, by April 12, 1955, a small supply had been prepared for other than foundation use, packaged in individual doses, and labeled for general sale. Information furnished individually by the manufacturers indicates that after April 13, this small quantity, approximately 650,000 cubic centimeters, packaged in individual dose containers was distributed by three companies for general sale. This was the basis for reports of sale of vaccine or administration by physicians to their private patients.

Four companies relabeled material they had packaged for commercial distribution and provided it to NFIP when the need for additional vaccine became apparent. Each manufacturer has informed the Department that no vaccine has been delivered to anybody, except on the NFIP contract, since April 21, and that no vaccine will be delivered in commercial channels until the NFIP's first and second grade vaccination program has been completed.

The assembly of information having to do with the production and distribution of Salk vaccine has been facilitated by the extremely cooperative relationship that has existed between the Department and representatives of six firms. Each manufacturer individually has exhibited complete willingness to give confidential information with respect to current production and future estimates. Each manufacturer has also made clear his willingness to cooperate in a plan for distribution of the vaccine on an equitable basis among the States.

IV. CONSULTATION AS TO DISTRIBUTION

A. Meetings with outside representatives, April 22 and 27, 1955

Immediately following the President's directive of April 14, 1955, the Secretary invited representatives of the medical and health professions, the pharmaceutical in-

dustry, and others to a technical and scientific meeting in Washington on April 22, 1955. (Appendix 2 is a list of organizations and representatives in attendance at the meeting on April 22.)

On April 27, 1955, a meeting called by the Secretary was held with representatives of approximately 50 national organizations representing the consumer public. The purpose was to present the findings of the April 22 technical and scientific meeting and to obtain from those who attended a full expression of their views about allocation and equitable distribution of the vaccine. (Appendix 3 lists the organizations represented at the meeting on April 27.)

The essence of the discussions at the technical-scientific group meeting on April 22 and the meeting of representatives of citizens groups on April 27 is:

1. There will be a continuing need for expert, technical assessment of the vaccination program. This continuing evaluation should be made by a committee appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service from the leaders in poliomyelitis research and control.

2. Definite age-group priorities for vaccination should be set for the guidance of the general public, health officials, practicing physicians, and the drug trade. Wide circulation of the agreed-upon priority schedule would be in the public interest, and is, in fact, essential to a national utilization of vaccine while it remains in short supply. The most effective mechanism for determining the priority schedule would be a national advisory committee appointed at the highest possible level of Government.

3. The equitable distribution of vaccine should be assured.

All children within the priority age-groups should have an opportunity to be vaccinated.

B. Organization and first meeting of National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine

The membership of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine was announced by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on April 27. The membership of the committee includes:

Chairman: Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Members: Dr. Philip S. Barba, American Academy of Pediatrics, 5919 Green Street, Germantown, Pa.; Dr. Daniel Bergsma, State commissioner of health, State department of health, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. Robert P. Fischel, executive secretary, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Frank W. Moudry, National Association of Retail Druggists, 5th and St. Peter, St. Paul, Minnesota; Mr. Basil O'Connor, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Malcolm Phelps, American Academy of General Practice, El Reno, Okla.; Dr. Julian P. Price, trustee of American Medical Association, 117 W. Cheves Street, Florence, S. C.; Dr. George M. Uhl, health officer, city health department, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Charles L. Williams, National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers Association, 1200 NW 6th Avenue, Miami, Fla.

The committee first met on May 2 and discussed thoroughly the current status of supply and distribution of the vaccine. A review was made of (1) the epidemiological considerations in poliomyelitis; (2) the activities of the laboratory of biologics control; (3) the present data on the vaccine supply and requirements; (4) population and distribution by age groups and by States; (5) State programs for poliomyelitis vaccination.

The committee discussed thoroughly the question of commercial sale, emergency supply and reserve, and equitable distribution. The committee's first recommendation was that the supplies of Salk vaccine be distributed on a State-by-State basis, and that the total supply for the next 2 months (that is, until July 1) be limited to children aged 5 through 9. The complete recommendations made at this meeting are included in appendix No. 4.

C. Consultation with States

A telegram was addressed to the governors of all States and Territories on April 26, 1955, requesting each of them to name an individual or State agency to serve as primary point of contact in connection with the activities on allocation. This action was taken in anticipation of the need for an organized system for the distribution of vaccine which was to be the subject of the aforementioned meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

At the afternoon meeting of the Governors' Conference on May 3, an up-to-the-minute résumé of the Salk vaccine situation was presented by the Secretary. There was a discussion of the current supply situation (based on May 3 telephonic reports by the manufacturers), and the problems of equitable distribution of the vaccine, including the areas of Federal and States responsibility.

Following the meeting with the governors, an Advisory Committee on Salk Vaccine was named as follows: Gov. Frank J. Clement (Tennessee), chairman; Gov. J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Maryland; and Gov. Robert B. Meyner, New Jersey.

This committee is to work closely with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on problems of vaccine distribution, and will serve as liaison with the governors of all the States.

A wire to all governors was sent out by the Council of State Governments the evening of May 4 asking these questions:

1. Do you think that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should assume responsibility for equitable allocation of available poliomyelitis vaccine among the States on the basis of child population within the critical age groups and other relevant factors?

2. What agency or department in your State will cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in advising it as to how to have the States' allocation of vaccine shipped within the State? That is, how much should go into normal commercial channels, and how much in other channels such as tax-supported agencies?

(NOTE.—This was in effect a follow-up of the earlier telegram of April 26.)

As of May 12 replies to the telegram on May 4, mentioned above, had been received from 51 governors, of whom 43 replied that they believed the Department should assume responsibility for allocation among States of vaccine supplies. Nine of these answers were qualified in some way. In general, the qualifications were that the Department act with the advice of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine or some other group, or that allocation by the Department was advisable only if there is no other way to insure equitable distribution. Six governors indicated that they did not think the Department should assume such responsibility, and two made no commitment on the question.

Forty-nine governors said that the State health officer or State health department would be the effective agent to work with the Department, six of them in cooperation with a State advisory group. In one State the State advisory committee would be the cooperating agency. One governor did not answer this question. There are now State advisory committees dealing with Salk vaccine in 29 States.

On May 9 three members of the Governors' Advisory Committee on Salk Vaccine met with the Secretary and other senior officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At this meeting the broad outlines of the recommendations to be included later in this report were discussed; and the committee agreed to poll the governors of all the States with respect to certain questions. The governors present at the meeting indicated their general approval of the plans being framed by the Department.

D. State plans for vaccination

State health departments are presently concentrating on carrying out the recommendations of NFIP for administering the vaccine to children in the first and second grades.

States have expanded substantially their plans for using the vaccine. By May 13, 1955, 25 State health departments either had extended or were contemplating extension of their programs to provide free vaccine to other than first and second graders. By that date, 12 State legislatures had already made special appropriations for extending the vaccination programs, and 13 others were considering additional appropriations. Six additional States are using other available funds to purchase vaccine.

E. The Congress

While at a hearing before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on April 13, 1955, the impact of the Francis report of the previous day was discussed. At that time the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service stated that the Service was already in touch with the president of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association to discuss the possibility of having a conference of members of the medical profession and various other groups to discuss the number of technical questions which had arisen in connection with the best plan for utilization of the available vaccine supply.

Members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and representatives of the committee staffs attended the meeting with representatives of the health and medical professions and the pharmaceutical industry on April 22.

At hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 27, representatives of the Public Health Service told the Committee about the problem with Cutter vaccine. The possible need for additional funds for testing, research, and epidemic intelligence was discussed. The Committee said it wanted to facilitate this work and asked to be told of specific additional requirements as soon as they were formulated.

A variety of bills has been introduced into the Senate and the House dealing with various aspects of the poliomyelitis vaccine program. Essentially, these bills provide (1) for a commission to plan and carry out the distribution of the vaccine; (2) for an extension of the authority of the President or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish rules and regulations for the control and distribution of the product; or (3) for financing purchase of the vaccine for free distribution.

Representatives of the Department attended an informal meeting with the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on May 4 to discuss the entire problem of allocation and distribution of poliomyelitis vaccine. On May 6, and again on May 13, the House Banking and Currency Committee conducted an open hearing at which the principal witness was the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

V. ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTION PROBLEM

Because of the limited supply of vaccine, it is apparent that not all children can be immunized by the end of the summer 1955. Hence, it is imperative that an equitable

priority system be established and adhered to during this period of limited supply.

We believe that the basic elements of an equitable and sound priority and distribution system during the shortage period are these:

1. Responsibility in a single agency at the national level to direct the division among States of the entire output of the manufacturers, in accordance with an overall plan.

2. A technical advisory body to that agency, which will recommend priorities on the basis of age groups and other epidemiological factors.

3. Responsibility in a single agency at the State level to direct the intra-State distribution of the vaccine made available to each State, under the plan recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

4. Assurance that the vaccine shipped into a State in normal drug distribution channels will remain in those channels, and will be sold at the retail level only to licensed physicians or on their prescriptions.

5. Adherence by all licensed physicians within a State to the priorities and distribution plan established for that State.

6. Sufficient public or privately raised funds to assure that no child will be denied opportunity for immunization by reason of the cost of vaccination.

The distribution system, established by the NFIP, under which the vaccine is distributed free, has, in effect, embodied the foregoing six basic elements (except No. 4, which is inapplicable, since the vaccine did not flow through commercial channels). The pertinent aspects of the NFIP system are as follows:

1. Essentially the entire initial output of vaccine was pledged to fulfill the contracts which had been made between NFIP and the manufacturers. The NFIP program to vaccinate first- and second-grade children therefore became, in effect a national allocation plan.

2. NFIP had a technical advisory committee which recommended age group and geographical priorities on the basis of epidemiological factors.

3. NFIP dealt with State health officers who, with assistance from NFIP, effectuated the intra-State distribution to first- and second-grade children.

4. The physicians who administered the inoculations with NFIP vaccine gave it only to first and second graders, in accordance with the national plan.

5. The cost of the vaccine and distribution costs were met with NFIP funds. Physicians and others donated their services in connection with administration of vaccinations.

As soon as the NFIP free distribution program has been completed, another national distribution plan must be ready to go into immediate effect. Such a plan is set forth below, constructed on the six basic elements already described. The required mechanics of the plan are, in large part, already in operation.

1. Single national agency to allocate entire output of vaccine among States

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, by virtue of its status, as the principal Federal agency dealing with health matters, should, we believe, properly continue to assume responsibility for establishing a national allocation plan which assures each State its fair share of the total output of the vaccine. The great majority of Governors of the several States have expressed their agreement with this proposal. On April 22, each manufacturer individually pledged his company to ship vaccine only in accordance with a voluntary-allocation program, recommended by a national advisory committee and adopted by the Secretary.

This voluntary commitment is a key factor in the entire supply and distribution picture

which has been generally overlooked. It enables the Secretary to allocate the available supply of vaccine in accordance with a formula developed by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine. Since April 21, 1955, no vaccine has been shipped into commercial channels; it is being delivered solely to complete the NFIP contracts.

No legislation is necessary to carry out the allocation among States described above.

2. *Advisory Committee to recommend priorities*

As described above under part IV of this report, a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine was established on April 27, and it held its first meeting on May 2.

The National Advisory Committee has recommended a first priority age group of 5-9, without variation for geographical or other factors.

3. *Agencies at the State level to direct intra-State distribution*

In their responses to telegrams addressed to them on May 4 by the Council of State Governors, the Governors of the States have indicated generally their willingness and desire to accept responsibility for intra-State distribution of any allocation to their respective States. In almost all cases, they have designated the State health officer to carry out that responsibility.

The State officials—the Governor and his designee, such as the State health officer—can direct and carry out a distribution plan within any State far more effectively than could Federal officials set up within each State to do the same job. The time required to establish a Federal organization, with the difficult problems of recruiting and assigning personnel, would result in prolonged delay in getting the vaccine to the children.

4. *Assurance of sales in authorized channels and on prescription*

The usual laws applicable to the distribution and sale of prescription drugs are applicable to the distribution and sale of the Salk vaccine.

Under the terms of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, section 503 (b) (1), the Salk vaccine may be lawfully sold only to a licensed physician or on the prescription of a licensed physician. Penalties are provided for unauthorized sales—up to a \$1,000 fine and 1 year in prison (\$10,000 and 3 years for second offense).

In addition, other sections of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provide sanctions which help to assure that in the distribution channels above the level of retail sales—that is, during the course of the flow of the shipments from the manufacturers through the wholesalers and to the retail druggists—the vaccine will not get into illegitimate channels of trade.

Under section 502 (f) (1) of the act, a drug is deemed to be "misbranded" unless its labeling bears adequate directions for use. The vaccine, as a prescription drug, would be subject to seizure, under the provisions of section 304, if it were found in the possession of a person not regularly and lawfully engaged in the manufacture, transportation, storage, or wholesale distribution of prescription drugs. Furthermore, the person making a sale to such an unauthorized person would be causing a "misbranding" and subject to the same penalties mentioned above.

Thus, existing Federal laws provide adequate sanctions against unauthorized sales of such portions of the vaccine as may be distributed through normal commercial channels within the State. Furthermore,

* Other than in the possession of "a retail, hospital, or clinic pharmacy, or a public health agency," where to be dispensed on prescription.

State laws relating to distribution and sale of drugs generally provide similar protection.

5. *Adherence by licensed physicians to priority plans*

The American Medical Association and other medical groups have pledged their full support in carrying out a voluntary distribution and priority system. The establishment of definite age group priorities will help the practicing physician determine which of his patients may be immunized first. Medical societies will back up these priorities, and help to make them widely known and understood. The physicians of America can be counted on to adhere to a priority plan.

6. *Funds to assure that no child will be denied immunization by reason of the cost of vaccination*

Many steps have been taken by State legislatures, local public bodies, voluntary organizations, groups of doctors, and other groups of citizens, to assure free vaccination of all children, including those whose parents might not be able to afford it.

To supplement these steps and in order to carry out your expressed desire, Mr. President, that no child be denied immunization by reason of the financial inability of his parents, we recommend Federal funds for grants to States. These grants would provide for purchase of vaccine to be used after completion of the NFIP free distribution program. These funds must be sufficient to pay the cost of vaccine for children in low-income families.

Conclusion: In conclusion, we are convinced that the most effective and equitable distribution of the vaccine will be accomplished through the voluntary cooperation of all concerned, within the framework of existing law, for the following reasons:

First, there are only six manufacturers, each of whom has agreed to dedicate his total output in accordance with an overall plan of division among States developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since April 21 the manufacturers have shipped no vaccine in normal drug distribution channels.

Second, the governors of the States and the State health officers can guide the intra-State allocation of the vaccine.

Third, a well regulated and established channel of distribution already exists, into which the vaccine not purchased for public agencies may flow. All vaccine in commercial channels is subject to a body of food and drug laws, built up over many years, relating to prescription drugs.

Fourth, the problems of fair allocation are minimized by the facts that (a) the priority consumers of the vaccine at any given time are a clearly and easily identifiable group—children within a specified age bracket, and (b) within the priority consumer group, there is no demand for more vaccine per individual than that needed for the single series of vaccinations.

Fifth, only a voluntary plan utilizing existing organizational machinery can be mobilized quickly enough to be effective during a brief period of shortage.

Sixth, all groups involved in the distribution flow, including the organized medical profession, have pledged their full cooperation in making a voluntary control plan effective.

On the basis of these conclusions, we make the recommendations which appear below.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

In making these recommendations, we emphasize that the safety of the vaccine must always be the first consideration. Distribution must be secondary to safety. The safety of the vaccine released for use will continue to be the responsibility of the Public Health Service under the biologics

control provisions of the Public Health Service Act, and is receiving the constant and diligent attention of the Public Health Service.

Recommendation No. 1. Resources of the Public Health Service

That, with safety the paramount consideration, the Public Health Service must have every facility, including necessary additional funds and personnel, to insure maximum precautions in continued testing of the vaccine for safety and potency.

Recommendation No. 2. National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis free immunization program

That all current distribution be directed toward fulfillment, at the earliest possible date, of the NFIP contracts and the free immunization program for first and second graders.

(NOTE.—Recommendations Nos. 3 through 11 outline an equitable distribution plan, based on age group priorities, to become effective as soon as the NFIP free distribution program is completed.)

Recommendation No. 3. Priorities

That, in accordance with the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, the vaccine should be administered for the time being only to children of the most susceptible age group, 5-9, inclusive.

Further priorities should be announced from time to time on the basis of recommendations of the National Advisory Committee.

Recommendation No. 4. Departmental responsibility

That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare direct on a national level the division among the States of the entire output of Salk vaccine, as pledged by the manufacturers.

Recommendation No. 5. Plan of allocation among the States

That the supplies of vaccine be allocated to each State on the basis of its population of children within the 5 through 9 age group until all children of that age group have been vaccinated. The Secretary will receive continuing reports from the manufacturers as to their total output and deliveries, and will keep the individual manufacturers advised of the quantities of vaccine they should ship to each State to assure fair allocation.

Recommendation No. 6. State responsibility

That each State, through an appropriate single agency to be designated by the Governor of the State, direct the distribution of the vaccine within the State. The State agency should advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the desired shipment of the State's allocation—for example, that portion which should be distributed through normal drug-distribution channels and that portion which should be shipped to public agencies.

Recommendation No. 7. Enforcement of Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and State laws

That, in order to give special attention to vigorous enforcement of those portions of the food and drug law prohibiting sales of the vaccine outside authorized channels for prescription drugs, additional funds be requested for Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is further recommended that State and local officials give special emphasis to the enforcement of applicable State laws relating to prescription drugs.

Recommendation No. 8. Adherence to priority plan by physicians, record keeping

That, with the cooperation of the medical profession pledged to insure the success of

a voluntary control plan, medical organizations take all appropriate steps to assure that:

(a) physicians will administer vaccinations only to, and issue prescriptions only for, children within the priority-age groups;

(b) physicians will, in accordance with the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine, keep a record of the name of each child receiving a vaccination, the age of the child, date of vaccination, site of vaccination (place on body), name of the manufacturer of the vaccine used, and the lot number.

Recommendation No. 9. Record keeping by distributors

That manufacturers, pharmaceutical organizations, wholesale and retail drug organizations and States and other public agencies, whose cooperation to make a voluntary control plan work has also been pledged, take necessary steps to assure that every distributor of the vaccine keep a record of the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the customer receiving the vaccine he handles.

Recommendation No. 10. Federal funds for grants to States

That legislation which has been prepared by this Department be submitted to the Congress to make Federal funds available to the States for the purchase of vaccine (or in lieu of funds, the vaccine itself). These funds must be sufficient to pay the cost of vaccine for children through age 19 in low-income families. The funds would be used after the NFIP free immunization program has been completed and until December 31, 1956. These funds would be paid to States upon assurance by the State that no child within the priority age groups would be denied vaccinations by reason of the cost.

Recommendation No. 11. International supply

That you designate a special committee to further study methods for assisting other nations of the world.

This voluntary control program, supplemented by existing law relating to drug distribution and Federal leadership and funds provides an immediately available system of distribution. Under this program, the vaccine will be distributed equitably and administered in accordance with scientifically established age priorities. It will get the vaccine to the children who need it most with the greatest speed, fairness, and effectiveness.

We will continuously review the progress of the total national program for distribution of the vaccine. A supplemental report will be submitted to you on or about July 1. In the event there should be any situation, either prior to or at that time, threatening the successful operation of the distribution program, which would warrant requesting additional legislation, we shall promptly recommend necessary action.

Respectfully submitted.

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare.

APPENDIX 1

TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC PROBLEMS

While the technical and scientific problems relating to the vaccine which have developed since April 12 will be treated in detail in the report of the Surgeon General, a brief summary is set forth below.

During the working hours of Tuesday, April 26, a report came to the Director of the Laboratory of Biologics Control that four children had developed paralytic poliomyelitis following injection of vaccine produced by the Cutter Laboratories, of Berkeley, Calif.

During the night of April 26 and the morning hours of April 27, the reports on the four children were confirmed and two other cases were reported and confirmed.

Shortly before noon, acting upon the recommendation of the National Institutes of Health, the Surgeon General directed that the Cutter product be immediately withdrawn. This decision was immediately communicated to State health officers and made public.

On April 27 it was decided to call an immediate meeting of technical advisors to review the situation presented by the vaccine of the Cutter Laboratories. Two representatives of the National Institutes of Health were dispatched to Berkeley by plane to conduct an on-the-spot investigation at the laboratory.

On April 29-30 a committee of 11 scientific advisors met with the staff of the National Institutes of Health to consider the problem. The committee included:

Dr. David Bodian, Johns Hopkins University, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Polio Laboratory.

Dr. John Enders, head, Department of Bacteriology and Immunology, Harvard University Medical School.

Dr. Thomas F. Francis, Jr., University of Michigan School of Public Health.

Dr. W. McD. Hammon, head, Department of Epidemiology and Microbiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health.

Dr. Edward Lennette, California State Health Department, director, Viral and Rickettsial Disease Laboratory, California.

Dr. Ford McGinnes, medical consultant, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Dr. H. J. Shaughnessy, director of laboratories, Illinois Department of Public Health.

Dr. John R. Paul, professor, preventive medicine, Yale University Medical School.

Dr. Albert Sabin, fellow-in-charge, infectious disease division, Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Cincinnati Department of Pediatrics, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, University of Pittsburgh, Virus Research Laboratory.

Dr. Joseph Smadel, chief, Department of Virus and Rickettsial Diseases, Army Medical Service Graduate School, Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

This committee considered possible explanations for the occurrence of paralytic poliomyelitis following administration of vaccine. Three possible explanations were proposed: (1) coincidence; (2) the provoking effect of an injection given while virus was in the blood stream as a result of natural infection; and (3) presence of a virulent virus in the injected vaccine. A number of studies was recommended in an attempt to determine which of these alternative explanations is correct.

The committee expressed the belief that continuance of vaccination with products of other manufacturers was warranted as of April 30, 1955. It suggested that a small technical committee be appointed to study and make recommendations concerning the minimum requirements for production of poliomyelitis vaccine to determine whether additional safeguards are possible.

The membership of this subcommittee was made up of:

Dr. H. J. Shaughnessy, chairman; deputy director of laboratories, Illinois Department of Public Health, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John Enders, associate professor of bacteriology and immunology, Department of Bacteriology, Harvard University Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Jonas E. Salk, research professor of bacteriology and director, virus research laboratory, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. David Bodian, associate professor of epidemiology, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Joseph Smadel, Chief, Department of Virus and Rickettsial Diseases, Army Medical Service Graduate School, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Thomas F. Francis, professor of epidemiology and chairman, Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

All of these doctors are experts in poliomyelitis, and represent the outstanding technical competence available to study and evaluate the problems associated with poliomyelitis vaccination.

On May 5 and 6 this subcommittee met with scientific personnel of the National Institutes of Health. They were joined on May 6 by technical representatives of industry. On Saturday, May 7, in view of the fact that a number of States was scheduled to conduct vaccination programs over the weekend and there was insufficient time to evaluate the committee's findings, the Surgeon General told State health officers that the Service recommended that they await a report to be made May 8.

The following statement with respect to the poliomyelitis vaccination program was issued on May 8, 1955, by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SURGEON GENERAL'S STATEMENT

"I know that the American people are concerned over recent developments with respect to the nationwide poliomyelitis vaccination program.

"As Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, my primary responsibility is to assure that our Nation's health is protected and that we make continuing progress against disease.

"In this capacity, I want first and foremost to assure the parents of children who have received an injection of poliomyelitis vaccine this spring that in the very best judgment of the Public Health Service they have no cause for alarm.

"Yesterday, May 7, I recommended that vaccinations immediately scheduled be postponed pending this report.

"This action was taken because several States are now in the midst of or are about to start inoculation programs. Since the final evaluation by a fact-finding group which has been consulting with us on the cumulative experience in the manufacture and testing of the Salk vaccine had not been completed, it seemed the wisest—and the safest—course to advise the health authorities of the Nation of this fact.

"What are the facts?

"Over 5 million children have been vaccinated with Salk vaccine thus far this year. To date there have been 50 confirmed cases of paralytic poliomyelitis and 2 cases of non-paralytic poliomyelitis among these children. Forty-four of them followed injection with vaccine produced by the Cutter Laboratories prior to its withdrawal from distribution on April 27.

"It must be remembered that last year nearly half a million children received Salk vaccine without any indication that it was hazardous. It must be remembered also that except for the unfortunate occurrences in California and Idaho there have been only sporadic cases in which poliomyelitis occurred within a short time after vaccination.

"The incidence of paralytic poliomyelitis among vaccinated children, other than those who received the Cutter vaccine, has been only 1 in almost 700,000. This corresponds to the expected natural occurrence of poliomyelitis in the United States among these children at this time of the year.

"So, simply in statistical terms, there is every reason to believe the product of the other manufacturers is safe.

"The five manufacturers whose vaccine has been used to date are: Cutter Laboratories, Eli Lilly & Co., Parke Davis & Co., Pitman-Moore Co., and Wyeth Laboratories, Inc.

"On April 27, after six cases of paralytic polio appeared among children inoculated with vaccine produced by the Cutter Labora-

tories, I directed the withdrawal of all lots of vaccine which had been distributed by that company pending a careful examination of their manufacturing processes.

"The steps taken were as follows:

"The Public Health Service immediately initiated a thorough check at the Cutter plant itself. We started extensive laboratory tests of samples of the vaccine itself. We organized a nationwide network of scientists, epidemiologists, and laboratories to collect and interpret significant data on every case of paralytic polio among these children and others of both the vaccinated and the unvaccinated population. This provides us with continued and quick intelligence on all cases of poliomyelitis reported to the Service.

"In addition, a group of the country's outstanding experts in poliomyelitis virology and epidemiology was immediately called to Washington to advise the Public Health Service on the interpretation of all data flowing in from the sources indicated above.

"This advisory group has included Dr. John Enders of Harvard, recent Nobel prize winner; Dr. John Paul of Yale, noted virologist and epidemiologist; Dr. Albert Sabin of Cincinnati, expert in virus diseases; Dr. Thomas Francis, whose recent report confirmed the efficacy of the Salk vaccine; Dr. Joseph Smadel, Army research specialist in virology and epidemiology; Dr. David Bodian, outstanding neuropathologist from Johns Hopkins; Dr. Jonas Salk, famed for the development of the vaccine now in use; Dr. Edward Lennette, Director of Laboratories of the California Department of Public Health, who brought first-hand reports from the California Department of Public Health; and Dr. Howard Shaughnessy, Chief of Laboratories of the Illinois State Department of Health.

"These men have been consulting with the Public Health Service almost continuously since April 28. They have studied the complex data from all sources, giving particular emphasis to the manufacturing and testing processes.

"The last of these meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine composed of Drs. Bodian, Enders, Francis, Salk, Shaughnessy and Smadel took place on May 5 and May 6.

"It was in order to make sure that their recommendations could be given the most careful consideration by scientific personnel of the Public Health Service, that early on May 7 I recommended that inoculation programs be suspended.

"That study has now been completed and the position of the Public Health Service is as follows:

"1. A detailed reappraisal of each lot of vaccine already prepared or in the final stages of production is being undertaken immediately by the Laboratory of Biologics Control, with suitable consultants.

"2. For the present, all vaccinations should continue to be postponed.

"3. As the reappraisal proceeds, vaccine will be cleared for use on a lot-by-lot basis.

"The reviews will proceed on a manufacturer-by-manufacturer basis, taking them in the order of their entrance into production—i. e., Parke-Davis, Eli Lilly, Wyeth, Pitman-Moore, and Sharp and Dohme. It is hoped that this process will result in a return of vaccine to availability beginning in the latter part of the current week. This program of action has been discussed with industry, and the Public Health Service has its assurances of full cooperation and support.

"The undertaking of such a review—and the slight delay in mass immunization—does not arise from lack of confidence on the part of the Public Health Service in the fundamental safety of the Salk vaccine that has been used to date, or will be available in the future.

"On the other hand, a great deal of new information has been developed during the past 10 days as the result of continuing consultation between the Public Health Service

and its consultants, and between these groups and the senior technicians of industry. It is only prudent to make the total industrial experience available to each separate manufacturer for use as a background in the review of past production and present processes—particularly in the interest of affording additional factors of safety in their distributed product. The manufacturers have indicated their desire to have this additional information and assistance.

"The reason for the association between administration of the Cutter vaccine and the few cases of poliomyelitis that have developed after its administration has not been determined. The association is so definite, however, that until the precise cause is found the vaccine produced by this laboratory will remain suspended.

"During the period of consideration by the Public Health Service consultants and the deliberations of our staff which has been under way, certain important facts have emerged.

"The vaccine is so prepared that the amount of residual infectious virus is below a level that is detectable by laboratory tests made in tissue culture and in monkeys or is expected to be harmful to man. In this respect, this vaccine is similar to other vaccines prepared in a similar way.

"I want to make this point absolutely clear. The vaccine has been called a 'killed' vaccine because of the theoretical total inactivation of virus particles with respect to their ability to cause disease in man—a fact which is borne out by the safety record among the 5 million American children who have received one or more injections of the Salk vaccine.

"We have derived valuable data from the manufacturers themselves. They have brought to us honestly and fully the sum total of their manufacturing experience and their professional skill. They—since the very beginning of the polio vaccine program—have acted with complete integrity and foresight. Our inquiry has revealed that they have, in many instances, gone far beyond the normal requirements of the pharmaceutical industry in checking existing procedures and making improvements as new information became available to them. To no small extent, the speed and efficiency with which we have been able to review an exceedingly complex situation is due to the aid of the senior professional staff of the manufacturers.

"We have been guided, too, by a continuing flow of detailed information on cases which has been supplied by the Poliomyelitis Surveillance Unit of the Public Health Service's Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga. State and local health officers are cooperating fully with this unit. At the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., the staff has also been working on assessing the technical and scientific data which have been accumulating.

"I want to enumerate now some of the facts which we have considered in relation to medical and public-health practices of long standing.

"1. Although the first injection of this vaccine confers a degree of immunity, the full value of the immunization process is not achieved until all three shots have been given. Thus, it is quite possible for polio to be contracted after the first or second injection without indicating that the vaccine is unsafe or ineffective.

"2. The Francis report on April 12 demonstrated that the experimental vaccine administered in last year's field trials was 60-90 percent effective, and that it is less effective against type I (which is the most prevalent type) than it was against types II and III. The difference was due to the effect of a particular preservative. This has now been corrected. The vaccine cannot be expected to prevent all polio. Dr. Salk is continuing work to improve the vaccine's effectiveness.

"3. Few important medical techniques are ever 100-percent safe. When a doctor gives an injection of penicillin, performs a tonsillectomy, or vaccinates against smallpox, there is always a possibility that something may go wrong. A physician's work consists in large measure of making decisions in which he weighs the benefits and the possible drawbacks, however small, in a given course of action. When, in his judgment, the values outweigh the possible hazards, he acts accordingly.

"The division on use of the poliomyelitis vaccine is based on such a series of calculations and judgments.

"Public health physicians are specialists in the practice of public health. They must exercise broad responsibility for the health of the American people. They thus share the responsibilities of physicians in private practice. Public health physicians, by and large, do not make decisions in matters of individual medical practice. Physicians are the best guardians of every individual's health and will at all times base their judgments on the soundest technical information available at the time. Health science is never static. Knowledge increases with passage of time and medical and health practice changes and improves in pace. But there has never been a time when medical and public health have been in important conflict.

"The Public Health Service, in discharging its responsibilities under this concept, is acting on the conclusions which have emerged from our study which, in our judgment, will guide and influence progressive improvements in production and testing of poliomyelitis vaccine.

"It is evident that the decision of the Service will cause some delay in making the vaccine available to the American people. I know that they will fully understand and appreciate the reasons for this decision which has been taken in their interest and on behalf of the children of the Nation. There will in time be ample safe vaccine for all who need it and wish it.

"In summary, may I say that the Salk vaccine has had careful and thorough development over a long period of time. It has emerged, as the culmination of the work of dedicated men and of the historic achievement of one of them, Dr. Jonas Salk. His achievement is a milestone of medical progress. It promises significant reduction in the occurrence of paralytic poliomyelitis.

"The Public Health Service has every faith that, within the ever-narrowing limits of human fallibility, that the Salk vaccine is safe and effective."

The first of such reviews was begun on May 11 and concluded on May 13 at the Parke-Davis plant in Detroit, Mich., with a team of Public Health Service scientists, headed by Dr. William Workman, chief of the Laboratory of Biologics Control, and including an outside consultant.

APPENDIX 2

ATTENDANCE AT TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEETING ON SALK POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 22, 1955

American Academy of General Practice: Dr. John R. Fowler, president; Dr. William B. Hildebrand; Dr. Malcom Phelps, chairman, board of directors.

American Academy of Pediatrics: Dr. Crawford Bost, president; Dr. E. H. Christopherson, executive secretary.

American Drug Manufacturers Association: Dr. J. H. Fitzgerald Dunning, president; Dr. Karl Bambach, executive vice president.

American Hospital Association: Dr. Morris H. Kreger; Mr. Kenneth Williamson, associate director; Dr. Albert W. Snoko.

American Medical Association: Dr. Elmer Hess; Dr. Frank Wilson; Dr. George F. Lull, secretary.

American Osteopathic Association: Dr. R. C. McCaughan, executive secretary; Dr. Chester D. Swope, chairman, department of public relations.

American Pharmaceutical Association: Mr. Newell W. Stewart, president; Dr. Robert P. Fischelis, secretary.

American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association: Mr. Kenneth F. Valentine, president-elect.

American Public Health Association: Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe, president; Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham.

American School Health Association: Dr. Claire A. Christman, director of school health; Miss Mary A. Thompson, superintendent, health education.

American Surgical Trade Association: Mr. Russell Schneider, consultant.

Cutter Laboratories: Mr. E. A. Cutter, Jr., executive vice president; Dr. Walter Ward.

Eli Lilly & Co.: Mr. Eugene N. Beesley, president; Mr. Forrest Teel, executive vice president.

Hospital Industries Associations: Mr. J. J. Egan, president; Mr. William Smith, executive secretary.

Manufacturers Surgical Trade Association: Dr. Arthur L. Faubel, secretary; Mr. F. A. Holt, Jr.

National Association of Chain Drug Stores: Mr. J. Louis Gundling; Mr. John E. Donaldson.

National Association of Retail Druggists: Mr. John W. Dargavel, executive secretary; Mr. George B. Frates.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis: Mr. Basil O'Connor, president; Mr. Raymond H. Barrows, executive director; Dr. Hart Van Riper, medical director.

National Medical Association: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, Dr. Joseph G. Gathings.

National Wholesale Druggists Association: Mr. James E. Allen, chairman of the board; Mr. E. Allen Newcomb, executive secretary.

Parke-Davis & Co.: Mr. Homer C. Fritsch, executive vice president; Dr. Fred Stimpert, director, microbiological research.

Pitman-Moore Co.: Mr. K. F. Valentine, president; Dr. S. R. Bozeman.

Sharp & Dohme, Inc.: Mr. William L. Dempsey, president; Mr. John G. Bill, vice president.

Wyeth Laboratories: Mr. Harry S. Howard, president; Mr. H. W. Blades, executive vice president.

Congressional: Senator Lister Hill, Alabama; Senator William A. Purtell, Connecticut; Representative J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Representative Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Representative John W. Heseltin, Massachusetts; Mr. Harry Carter, executive assistant to Senator Alexander H. Smith, New Jersey; Mr. William G. Reidy, professional staff, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; Mr. Kurt Borchardt, professional staff, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

State and Territorial health officers: Dr. D. G. Gill, Alabama; Dr. Stanley H. Osborn, Connecticut; Dr. Floyd I. Hudson, Delaware; Dr. D. L. Seckinger, District of Columbia; Dr. Ralph W. McComas, Florida; Dr. John H. Venable, Georgia; Dr. Roland R. Cross, Illinois; Dr. B. Groesbeck, Indiana; Dr. Edmund G. Zimmerer, Iowa; Dr. Thomas R. Hood and Dr. Philip A. Bearg, Kansas; Dr. Edward Davens, Maryland; Dr. S. B. Kirkwood, Massachusetts; Dr. Albert E. Heustis, Michigan; Dr. Daniel Borgsma, New Jersey; Dr. Herman E. Hilleboe and Dr. Robert F. Korn, New York; Dr. J. W. R. Norton, North Carolina; Dr. Ralph E. Dwork, Ohio; Dr. Abel DeJuan, Puerto Rico; Dr. N. H. Dyer, West Virginia; Dr. Carl N. Neupert, Wisconsin.

APPENDIX 3

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON SALK POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 27, 1955

Advertising Council.
American Academy of Obstetrics and Gynecology.
American Association of School Administrators.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of University Women.
American Council on Education.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Federation of Labor.
American Legion.
American Medical Association.
American Municipal Association.
American National Red Cross.
American Parents Committee, Inc.
American Public Welfare Association, Inc.
Association for Childhood Education.
Boys' Clubs of America, Inc.
Camp Fire Girls.
Child Welfare League of America, Inc.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Cooperative Health Federation.
Council of State Governments.
General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc.
Girl Scouts of the United States of America.
International Association of Machinists.
National Catholic Educational Association.
National Catholic Welfare Conference.
National Conference for Cooperation in Health Education.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Grange.
National Jewish Welfare Board.
National School Board Association.
National Social Welfare Assembly, Inc.
National Urban League.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
Save the Children Federation, Inc.
Spokesmen for Children, Inc.
Temple Hill Baptist Church.
United Mine Workers of America.
United Parents Association.
United States Conference of Mayors.
Young Women's Christian Association.

APPENDIX 4

MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE

The following recommendations were made at the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

(a) That the supplies of Salk vaccine be distributed in the most equitable manner on a State-by-State basis, and that the total supply for the next 2 months (i. e., until July 1) be limited to children 5-9 inclusive.

(NOTE.—This recommendation appears to vary somewhat with the epidemiological and geographical characteristics of poliomyelitis. The reasons for selecting this age group on a country-wide basis are:

(i) NFIP program has included 9 million children in this age group as their first priority.

(ii) It is not only the most susceptible age group for the whole country, but it is also the group in which there is evidence that the vaccine is effective.

(iii) It is currently estimated there will be enough vaccine to immunize age group 5-9

in the United States before the peak of the polio season.

(iv) It is a group easy to reach.

(v) If age priorities were set up on a State-by-State basis, it might create confusion between neighboring States.)

(b) That every physician keep a record of the name, address, age and date of vaccination on the individual, as well as the lot number and names of the distributor and manufacturer; and that every distributor keep a record of the lot number and manufacturer and the customer.

(c) That State advisory committees be set up immediately to gather information concerning the needs, distribution, and uses of vaccine within the States and that these committees be representative of the health departments, medical societies, pharmaceutical associations, and general public.

(d) That the State advisory groups work closely with the staff of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine to determine how much vaccine is needed for public agencies for the immunization of children who cannot afford to pay for it. Thus a fair proportion of the vaccine may be allocated for such children and who will be in the age group 5-9 years for the next 2 months.

(e) That the manufacturers report their supplies of vaccine to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare every 2 weeks so that the National Advisory Committee can recommend to the manufacturers equitable geographical distribution of vaccine so that it will reach the greatest number of 5-9 children during the next 2 months.

(f) That an allocation be made for the Department of Defense to procure vaccine for personnel of the uniformed services and their dependents, in accordance with recommendations of the National Advisory Committee for Poliomyelitis Vaccine as to distribution.

(g) That vaccine for members and dependents of the uniformed services abroad, and for personnel and dependents of the Department of State and other United States Government agencies abroad be administered by the Department of Defense; and that allocations for such use be determined by the committee consistent with the age-group priority in effect in the United States.

(h) That the vaccine should be made available on a world-wide scale as soon as possible.

In connection with these recommendations, the committee urged that the people of the United States be kept thoroughly informed of the status of vaccine supplies, priority groups, allocation plans, and the like.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the colloquy between Mr. MORSE and Mr. BENDER on the subject of the Salk vaccine, the following occurred:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the House has adopted the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is in the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the statement by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the conference

report may be in order immediately following the Senator's statement.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Has unanimous consent been granted that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill may be taken up at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has been granted for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings on pp. 6456-6457.)

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly that all the conferees were present when the conference report was agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all conferees on the part of the Senate who attended the conference. The minority was represented by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the ranking member of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. Also present was the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? Without objection, the report is agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the report been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the distinguished Presiding Officer was inquiring whether there was any objection to the consideration of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Presiding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presiding Officer assumed that the report should be considered and adopted at the same time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I inquire what the status of the conference report is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will withhold announcement of agreement to the conference report in order that the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a question or two which I should like to address to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who was chairman

of the conference committee which considered the bill.

I note, first, a reference in the report indicating that the action of the Senate in stepping up by \$308,700 the amount for plant quarantine inspection at ports was agreed to in conference, and that that additional amount will become available if the report shall be adopted. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment in respect to that item. It provides for \$308,700, which I think is the largest amount which has ever been made available for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is, for plant quarantine at ports of entry, particularly where the hazard is the greatest?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I assume that the Department of Agriculture will use the greater part of this sum at ports where the hazard is the greatest. That was brought out in the hearings, and I think that was the general understanding of the conferees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I should like to ask another question. The Senator will recall that the Senate committee took action by which the fund for emergency outbreaks of insects causing plant diseases was increased from \$400,000 to \$1,100,000. As I understand the report, which I have had in my possession for only a few minutes, it seems to indicate that an increase from \$400,000 to \$1 million was approved, but the complete increase to \$1,100,000 was not approved in conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. However, I should not like to have the Record closed with that statement, because it was generally understood that if it were necessary to have additional funds, they would be provided by way of supplemental appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, there was no feeling evidenced at all in the conference committee of an unwillingness to meet any outbreak of that sort?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all. There was some difference of opinion as to the sum that might be needed, but it was a matter of sheer conjecture on the part of the conferees on both sides, because we did not have the scientific information which would enable us to ascertain to a nicety the amount of money needed to deal with any emergency outbreak.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

My next question relates to the general amount available for research in the field of controlling, and, we hope, eradicating, screw worm, the pest which is so adversely affecting livestock, particularly in the southern portion of the United States. Is there in the report any departure from the approval of that objective?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I think the report very clearly indicates that it is the intention of the Department to deal with every one of the items set forth in the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Including research in the matter of spreading decline in the citrus industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. There is no question that the Department is obligated to do work in both of those fields.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the present, that work is to be in research and surveys, with the direction contained in the report of the Senate committee still standing that a speedy report be made if a method of control or elimination is discovered.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the conference report or in any agreement between the conferees of the House or the Senate that would in anywise indicate that a report will not be expedited as rapidly as may be possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I warmly congratulate the distinguished Senator and his fellow conferees upon retaining in the conference measure the important items which I have mentioned, as well as others.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if there is any change at all in the sum of money made available for the conservation program.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount provided for the next calendar year is \$250 million. As the Senator knows, the program operates on the calendar-year basis rather than on the fiscal-year basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I notice that the conferees agreed to the House language providing for a special study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and for that purpose appropriated the sum of \$250,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. The conferees, after some intensive discussion, concluded that that would be a sufficient amount to get the study under way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The study will be conducted by the Department of Agriculture under its marketing service program, will it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. They have a trained staff available to conduct that study.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the study also require some companion action by an appropriate committee of the Congress to doublecheck the survey and analysis which may be made?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know of nothing that is more important at this time to combat the unreasonable attitude of some persons toward the farmers than is a study of the price spread between the farmer and the consumer. I believe that if consumers were aware of the fact that the farmer's share of the dollar spent by consumers for food and clothing is constantly decreasing every year, they would have an entirely different attitude toward farm legislation which would place farmers on a parity with their fellow Americans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator, and I commend him for the wonderful contribution he has made toward bringing to the Senate and piloting the agricultural appropriation bill through the conference committee with the help, of course, of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have those kind words from such a stout fighter for the farmers of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5239, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

May 17, 1955.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to the bill entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make to the Senate, and I should like to have the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

When action has been concluded on H. R. 1573, which is the unfinished business, I hope it will be possible for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 217, Senate bill 153, to amend the REA loan formula. An effort is being made to reach an agreement among the members of the committee and other Senators interested in the measure.

I also wish to place the Senate on notice that it is planned to consider Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 8, to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster. I have previously cleared this measure with the able minority leader.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization, of the Committee on Government Operations, has ordered reported H. R. 3322, a bill to improve the administration of the program for utilization of surplus property for educational and health purposes. That bill could not be considered today, but it is possible that it may be called up on Thursday. I wish Senators to be informed of this possibility, and I should like the able minority leader to check H. R. 3322, since I have not previously cleared it with him.

I understand that the committee of conference will meet tomorrow to consider the reciprocal trade bill, so it may be that the conference report will be available for consideration by the Senate on Thursday. I desire to place the Senate on notice as to that possibility.

Also in conference are the Department of the Interior and the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bills. As soon as the conference reports on those bills are ready, I hope that the Senate may proceed promptly to consider them.

It is my plan to have the Senate take up on Friday Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, the road bill. The report on that bill is due to be filed on Thursday. By agreement, no votes will be taken on the bill on Friday, but Senators may engage in as much discussion as may be desired on that day. The Senate will again be in session on next Monday, and during the early part of the week a determination can be made as to when the Senate may wish to vote on that measure.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the program which the distinguished majority leader has outlined up to this time is concerned, it is entirely satisfactory, with the exception of the new bill he has mentioned. I will immediately check as to H. R. 3322. However, as to the other sequence of bills, I am certain that we will cooperate in every way possible.

I also want to call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to my uncertainty as to proceeding with S. 1048, the highway bill. That bill has been called to my attention by a number of Senators on this side of the aisle. I understand, as the majority leader has stated, that the report and minority views are due to be filed Thursday noon and presumably will go to the Public Printer at that time. The printed copies should be available and on the desks of Senators by noon on Friday.

But because the minority views constitute the supporting document for an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the proposed \$27 billion road bill, as to the need for which there is an honest difference of opinion, some Members, especially those who are not on the Committee on Public Works, have suggested that it might be more satisfactory for them to have the weekend in which to study the minority views and the accompanying amendment in the nature of a substitute, so as to enable them to participate more fully in the debate on Monday.

I merely mention this to the distinguished majority leader because I have had a number of requests from Senators on this side of the aisle to permit that to be done, if it would fit in with the plans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My inclination always is to conform with any suggestion made by the distinguished minority leader, if it is possible to do so. I would be the last to urge that any action whatsoever be taken on the road bill on Friday, other than to afford Senators

who are prepared to discuss the bill an opportunity to do so.

The bill was reported last Friday. It is somewhat unusual, whether it be an appropriation bill or a \$27 billion road bill, for a committee to have a full week to file a report on action which it has taken. But, Mr. President, the committee did have a week. The bill was reported to the Senate last Friday, and no action will be taken until Friday of this week, and then there will be only general discussion, and any 1 of the 96 Senators can take home the majority report and the minority views, and any individual reports which may be available, study them, read them, and digest them until Monday. I expect that the Senate will be considering the road bill into Tuesday, and perhaps Wednesday.

I desire to make it abundantly clear that I have assured the minority leader that there would be no votes on Friday, but I have also assured other Senators that we would proceed to the consideration of the bill, if the Senate sustains me, on Friday, for the purpose of having general discussion.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at the insistence of minority Members who requested that they be given until Thursday to file their views, the matter was delayed. As a matter of fact, I asked unanimous consent, because unanimous consent had to be obtained, that the minority be permitted until Thursday to file their views. The only reason for the delay is that they wanted time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I am sure the majority leader knows, it is the desire at all times of the minority leader, in the normal processes of the Senate, to cooperate fully, but the report of the committee itself, as shown on page 6 of the calendar, was apparently filed on May 13. This is only the 17th—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I call attention to the fact we are not debating the bill today. The report was filed last Friday. We are not even going to start debating the bill until next Friday, and then there will be nothing but general discussion. The bill will be discussed again on Monday. If the distinguished Senator from California desires, I am willing to agree that there be no votes on Monday. I am certain there is no possibility of getting a vote on Friday, and probably not on Monday.

I did not object to the unanimous consent request of the minority that they have one full week to explain what they had voted on a week before. I thought it was unusual. I said so to the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee. I desire to go along with my delightful friend, the minority leader, and the other Members of the minority, but I do not want to have further delay in the case of an important bill or program, for which the President has a plan; for which he submitted a recommendation; on which

in the committee there have been weeks and weeks of hearings, and then weeks of voting; and in connection with which there has been a week to write about what the committee did, and then another week to explain what the minority did. Senators can read the views on Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and vote on Tuesday. The Senate is going to be crowded at the end of the session if we keep dragging our feet, and that is exactly what I think was done in the matter of filing the minority views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not discuss too much dragging of feet—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from California can say what he wishes to, but the Senator from Texas will say it is unusual for a committee to take a week to have minority views filed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator remember the tax bill, when we had a discussion as to how much time should be allowed for filing minority views, after the bill had been reported by the Finance Committee, without a single change from the bill as passed by the House? There was a request for unlimited time within which to file minority views. After discussion we finally arranged for a certain period. I do not wish to trust to my recollection, but as soon as I can get the information—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will take the same position with regard to the filing of minority views on the road bill as on the filing of views on the tax bill, we shall have no difficulty. As I remember, the Senator from California did not wish to agree to giving unlimited time. He wanted prompt action. He was willing to let it go over the weekend, until Tuesday or Wednesday. Finally we arrived at a date which was agreeable.

I can understand no earthly reason why any Senator should object to having a general discussion of the road bill on Friday, when the minority views are to be filed on Thursday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Texas, both in his capacity as a distinguished Senator and as the majority leader is, that, in my capacity as minority leader, I also have some obligation to Members on our side of the aisle. What we agree to do is not a matter of personal convenience to the two of us. We can generally get to an understanding on these matters, and I intend to continue to try to do so. But some Senators on our side of the aisle who are not members of the committee are interested in the bill, and the governors of their States are interested in the bill. There has been discussion as to whether the highway program should be financed in one way or another way. There is a desire that progress be made. Since the minority views will not be available until Thursday, and the amendment is going to be in the nature of a substitute, it was thought it would be reasonable that the debate not start until Monday. I am merely trying to carry out a specific request, and at least explore the situation with the distinguished Senator, who is always so generous and affable in trying to adjust such matters to the satisfaction of 96 Senators, each of whom has a different

view regarding the procedure which should be followed and as to when a measure should be taken up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's position. I appreciate that some Senators on his side of the aisle make certain requests of him. There are occasions when Senators on my side of the aisle make certain requests of me. I think most of the time they are reasonable requests. Sometimes they fall in the category which the Senator has indicated. I would be the first one in the Senate to see to it that the Senator from California and the minority had full and ample time. The minority asked for a week to file their views, and got every day they requested. They got it by unanimous consent. The views are to be filed on Thursday. I think if the request had been made that the views be filed on Friday, the Senate would have gone that far. But, as the Senator from Texas has said to members of the committee, the highway measure is a major bill. There are Senators—certainly there are on the majority side—who will consume several hours discussing the action taken by the committee. I think Friday can be profitably used in that debate.

If the minority does not choose to speak on Friday, at the conclusion of the general discussion by Members on this side of the aisle the Senator from Texas will move that the Senate recess to Monday. He has already assured the Senator from California that there would be no votes on Friday. Such an arrangement would give every Senator an opportunity to confer with his colleagues, to confer with himself, if he needed to, and to confer and clear the matter with the governor of his State. The bill will merely be discussed, and it is not going to be passed on Friday, or on Monday, either. However, if we do not get started on it, there may be no bill passed at all.

I think the proposal before the Senate is a reasonable one. In view of the assurances I have given the distinguished minority leader, I hope he will do what I am sure I would do if I were in his position, which would be to say to the majority leader, "It is not proposed to have any votes on the bill. Senators can read the reports over the weekend. We do not think there will be any votes on Monday. On Tuesday perhaps we can decide when we can vote."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to clear the RECORD about the statement that the request with respect to the time within which to file minority views was unprecedented.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I never said it was unprecedented.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from New Mexico indicated either that it was unprecedented or at least that it was unusual.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said it was unusual, and I think the record will so show.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But this year, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, after considerable colloquy, during which the minority leader was prepared to agree to the allowance of a week's time for the filing of minority

views on the tax bill, there was considerable discussion to the effect that 1 week would not be sufficient time in which to prepare and present the minority views; and finally we agreed upon 10 days for the filing of the minority views. So I am not particularly raising the point as an issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from California in that connection, and I appeal for the same generosity now.

Of course at this time there is a somewhat different situation. On the other occasion I was in Minnesota, in a hospital bed, and I had not had a chance either to see and study the report which was prepared or to prepare separate views.

Although later it was determined that the report did not appeal to a majority of the Senate, the Senator from California agreed to provide that opportunity at that time; and in this case I shall appreciate having him read and digest the majority report, which I also hope he will support.

ELIGIBILITY FOR CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement which applies to the further consideration of the unfinished business will be read at this time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that, effective on Tuesday, May 17, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of H. R. 1573, a bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I call up the amendment which lies at the desk, and ask to have it stated.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I expect to join in making such a request at the appropriate time. However, there are some Senators who have said they

wish to change somewhat the wording of the amendment. So I prefer to leave to myself the right to change the wording, if such a request is made, and if it seems wise to change it. I assure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that at the conclusion of the debate I shall join with him in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment. I wish to have a ye-and-nay vote taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment, and I hope that all Members of the Senate will have a chance to express their position in that way.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. HOLLAND, on behalf of himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS, was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended, effective with respect to 1955 and subsequent crops, to read as follows:

"Sec. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests an acreage of any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any acreage of any basic agricultural commodity in excess of his farm acreage allotment by reason of harvesting corn for ensilage, harvesting wheat in an amount not in excess of 15 acres, harvesting a commodity or a crop with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas in a marketing-quota referendum, or harvesting peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

"(b) Persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be required to establish their eligibility for such payment under this section in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that 1 hour is now available to each side, for debate on the amendment, with the hour for the proponents to be controlled by myself, and the hour for the opponents to be controlled by the majority leader. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; if the majority leader is opposed to the amendment; otherwise, the time in opposition to the enactment will be under the control of the minority leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in order to read a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and to various other Senators. The communication, which came this morning, May

17, 1955, from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 17, 1955.

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

DEAR SENATORS: Our views have been requested on the proposed amendment to H. R. 1573 which was discussed in the Senate on Friday, May 13. This proposed amendment would retain section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as it now stands but would add language to exempt corn for ensilage, wheat acreages not in excess of 15 acres, crops with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas, and peanuts for seed to be used for the raising of peanuts to be hogged off.

The proposed amendment generally will tend to make eligible the smaller farms and thereby overcome many of the objections which the Department has to the provisions of section 348, as amended, by the Agricultural Act of 1954. However, these exemptions will involve some problems of administration, especially with respect to ensilage corn and seed peanuts.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I believe it is in the best interests not only of the American farmers, but also the general public, that H. R. 1573 in its present form not pass the Senate. Rather, I am of the opinion that the basic problem which this bill is designed to correct can better be handled by adoption of the amendments in the nature of a substitute which has been jointly sponsored by Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and myself.

H. R. 1573 would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1954. Section 348 provides that—

Any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm for each year * * * shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (Agricultural Conservation program).

The problem here, which H. R. 1573 hopes to solve, is basically this: Under marketing quota requirements, a farmer with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres can grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the eligibility requirement for payments under the Agricultural Conservation program as provided in section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. I do believe that it is rather inconsistent for the law to permit a farmer to market up to 15 acres of wheat without penalty when quotas are in effect and qualify for price support at the same time, but on the other hand to deny him assistance under the Agricultural Conservation program unless he plants within his acreage allotment. Why? Because

marketing quotas are a much more severe form of control than acreage allotments, yet when quotas are in effect a farmer can qualify for Government benefits even if he markets more than his acreage allotment, so long as it is less than 15 acres, while if only acreage allotments are in effect he cannot qualify for assistance under the Agricultural Conservation program if his acreage allotment is less than 15 acres and he should plant up to 15 acres.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. My time is limited, and I prefer to complete this statement. Then I shall be glad to yield, if I have time left.

Although H. R. 1573 would solve this problem, as would the amendment proposed by Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and myself, it has certain other defects which seem in my opinion to outweigh its benefits. On the other hand, the substitute we have proposed not only would solve this problem, but has additional advantages as well. This I believe will be apparent, Mr. President, from the following analysis:

The basic reason for requiring that farmers must comply with acreage allotments in order to receive assistance under the agricultural conservation program, is to provide an added sanction to induce compliance with production controls so that production can more nearly be brought into line with demand. Although production controls at best are not too effective in bringing and keeping supply in line with demand, it is important in light of the big surpluses on hand of basic commodities that they be reinforced by other sanctions such as that provided by section 348. This is especially true with respect to the farms owned by one-third of our farmers, who produce 80 percent of our marketable crop value and who receive 85 percent of our net farm income.

However, I do agree with the committee which reported H. R. 1573, that section 348 should not apply to our small farms, especially those having wheat and corn acreage allotments of less than 15 acres. But I cannot agree that it should not be made applicable to the large commercial farms, which, though fewer in number, produce the bulk of our food and forage crops. Specifically, my reasons for this are:

First. If public funds are to be used to increase the capacity of these commercial farms, as is the case with respect to the agricultural conservation program, while at the same time the Government is obliged to support the prices of the crops in question, then the public interest certainly requires that sanctions be imposed which will work toward the goal of keeping supply in line with demand.

That the bulk of payments now made under the agricultural conservation program are for practices which primarily increase output rather than build the soil as do more permanent type practices, is revealed by table 5 of the Summary of the Agricultural Conservation Program for 1953 published by the Department of Agriculture. In 1953, 42 percent of the \$185 million farmers received was spent for fertilizer and in-

organic materials—limestone, phosphate and potash. Another 14 percent was used for protective manure crops.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the commercial fertilizer producers are well aware of this fact, as the following newsletter dated May 3, 1955, by Robert M. Koch, executive secretary, National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., indicates:

ACP AUTHORIZATION FOR 1956

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1955.

To Persons Interested in the Agricultural
Conservation Program:

A week ago today the Senate, in the most unusual action taken since I have been associated with the agricultural-conservation program overwhelmingly approved continuing the ACP for 1956 at the \$250 million level. The administration originally requested \$175 million from the House and then, after it was passed by the House at \$250 million, it asked the Senate to reduce the amount to \$175 million. When the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee reported the bill at \$250 million, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, made an attempt on the Senate floor to reduce the 1956 ACP to \$195 million. In spite of the fact that his effort was to leave the program at \$20 million higher than that recommended by the Department of Agriculture, the Senate by a rollcall vote of 76 to 5 approved the \$250 million.

Strong bipartisan support was given to the program when many leading Republican and Democratic Senators pleaded for an adequate ACP. Everyone interested in the ACP should write to their Senators thanking those who supported the program at \$250 million and raising the question with those who voted against it as to whether they are voting in the best interests for the conservation of the soil in their States.

HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Furthermore, the repeal of the Holland amendment which had been expected momentarily has run into a serious snag. Here at the congressional level many fail to appreciate the significant effect which the so-called Holland amendment has on the administration of the ACP and the participation of farmers in this important program. Even though the House passed this bill unanimously to the Senate floor, we need grassroots support to assure passage. When Senator HOLLAND objected to passage of this bill on Monday, April 25, on the Consent Calendar, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader, scheduled it for consideration immediately after the USDA appropriation bill Tuesday. However, Senator HOLLAND then asked for time in which to work out an acceptable compromise. He is planning to propose this compromise this week and we need contacts from the grassroots to assure repeal of this obstacle to the administration of the ACP. While airmail letters may be in sufficient time, if the bill comes up Thursday or Friday of this week, we need telegrams and telephone calls to head off the industrious work of Senator HOLLAND and the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is actively backing Senator HOLLAND's effort to restrict the administration of the ACP. On the back of this letter is a complete list of Senators and how they voted on the ACP. Be sure and contact them on both the ACP and Holland amendment repeal.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. KOCH,
Executive Secretary.

P. S.—Both USDA Assistant Secretaries McConnell and Peterson testified for repeal of H. R. 1573.

CI—404

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Members of the Senate will not yield to this type of selfish pressure.

Second. If we want to really advance soil conservation on lands devoted to the growing of soil-depleting crops, then farmers, if they are to be eligible for price supports on such crops—and they are the crops in question here—should be required to observe acreage allotments. In this respect I invite attention to the fact that from 1936 to 1944 the Department of Agriculture paid farmers \$1,666,300,000 under the agricultural conservation program to withdraw from production soil-depleting crops, including those here in question. Farmers were given an acreage allotment, and if they kept within that allotment they received an agricultural conservation program payment.

That such a practice was more of a permanent soil-conserving nature than most of those for which farmers are compensated today under the agricultural conservation program cannot be disputed. As Rainer Schickele, chairman of the agricultural economics department of North Dakota Agricultural College, has so ably stated in his recent book, *Agricultural Policy*:

The public interest is concerned primarily with erosion control, with keeping the topsoil in place, because it constitutes the non-renewable fund resource of the soil. Fertility maintenance, better farm use of water, and maintaining forages are essential only insofar as they are needed to control erosion. The ACP objective fails to make this important distinction. Consequently, a certain proportion of the available funds is used to pay for practices on land which would not have been permanently damaged if these practices had not been performed * * *.

There can be no question that a considerable part of the ACP payments are being made for practices on land where those practices are not necessary for the public interest in soil conservation * * *.

If the funds now disbursed on lands not subject to erosion could be shifted over to unprotected erodible lands the effectiveness of the program could be substantially increased. We, as a nation, would get more real soil conservation per tax dollar spent than we are getting now (p. 104).

Contrary to the opinion of some with respect to this matter, it is evident that not to require compliance with acreage allotments on soil-depleting crops as a condition for receiving ACP payments on farms having an allotment of over 15 acres would result in less conservation worthy of the name than would be the case if section 348 were repealed outright.

Third. The situation which H. R. 1573 is designed to correct is a problem primarily in only the commercial wheat and corn areas. Wheat farmers in the following States are not affected by the eligibility requirement imposed by section 348, since they are outside the commercial wheat areas and acreage allotments are not allocated to farmers: Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

The same is true with respect to corn farmers in the States of Arizona, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,

Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

With respect to wheat and corn farmers having allotments of less than 15 acres, the problem can more effectively be solved by the amendment which Senators HOLLAND, AIKEN, ANDERSON, and I have proposed to H. R. 1573.

Mr. President, that concludes the statement I had intended to make on this amendment. I shall be glad now to respond to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the point in the Senator's remarks, where I sought to interrogate him, my attention was attracted by his reference to a comparison between marketing quotas and acreage allotments.

I thought I understood him to say that marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was wondering on what basis he felt that was true.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know that I understand all the technicalities involved in the question, but I believe that to be a correct statement. I am not a member of the committee. I take that statement largely from Senators who have made a study of the subject.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If a farmer has an allotment and he violates it, he loses his price support; if he violates his marketing quota he suffers a stiff penalty, which probably makes it unprofitable for him to violate the agreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not sure that that goes to the point here involved. I must say that my feeling through the years has been more and more that a marketing-quota system would be preferable to acreage allotments. I recognize the fact that that may be true in my case particularly, because of the problem that arises in an area of uncertain rainfall. Very frequently corn growers in South Dakota do not know whether they will have a crop or not because of the deficiency of rain. If there were a marketing quota, instead of an acreage-allotment system, the farmers would have the privilege of marketing a certain amount of their crop in a given season. If the rainfall was sufficient to enable them to reap a normal crop and anticipate their marketing quota, they could store it or carry it over. If in the next season the crop was short, they could perhaps benefit from a more normal marketing, and in that way have a normal income.

When acreage allotments under rigid controls are applied, and the allotments are cut successively 11 percent, or even as much as 30 percent, as happened in some of our counties in the past few years, the farmers are so restricted in their acreage that they do not have enough total production, even in a good year, to carry the cost of the equipment which it is necessary for them to have if they are to produce corn or wheat.

Therefore I have felt that it would be more humane and much fairer to apply

a marketing quota system instead of an acreage allotment system. Each farmer could then carry his own ever-normal granary, so to speak, and have a normal income during the year.

Mr. WATKINS. There is considerable merit to the argument of the Senator from South Dakota. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the remark of the Senator from Utah that marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. WATKINS. That may be, but that happens to be my opinion after studying the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask one other question, which goes to the question of tying soil conservation practice payments to crop production allotments.

In my State soil conservation payments are tied to some specific program, such as the building of a dam or terracing or the planting of trees or the planting of legumes in place of crops. To do any work of that kind a farmer must necessarily make an investment himself. He must put some money into the operation, and also some effort. He sacrifices the prospect of immediate returns in the form of the production of a crop by devoting his land or his money or his effort to conserving water or conserving soil, from which he will get no monetary return. Therefore why should he not be encouraged to engage in such conservation practices, instead of being subject to the second penalty of being denied any cooperation on soil conservation practices if he exceeds his acreage allotment?

Mr. WATKINS. There is a very simple answer to that question. All the farmer has to do is obey the law which provides for the acreage allotment to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obey the law?

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obey the law, or obey a regulation?

Mr. WATKINS. A regulation which is authorized by law and which the farmers accept voluntarily.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Why does the Senator believe 60 percent of the corn growers of South Dakota—and although South Dakota is not entirely a corn-growing State, a considerable quantity of corn is grown in the eastern and southeastern areas of the State—refused to sign up last year? It was because the repeated cuts in the acreage allotted to them had so reduced their crops that they could not get a sufficient return to carry the investment in their land and machinery.

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

Mr. WATKINS. That is likely to happen under the program we have today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not know who controls the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. I control this time, and I do not know how much time the Senator from Florida wants me to take. Perhaps I am trespassing on the time of another Senator.

Mr. THYE. Will the other side of this question give me 1 minute so that I may make a brief statement? Will the other side allot a minute to the Senator from Utah so that he may yield to me on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor under the statement by the Senator from Florida for as much time as he may desire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order to comply with the request of my distinguished senior colleague, I am willing to yield a few minutes for that purpose.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, who is being charged with the time that is now being taken in this colloquy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time now being used is under the control of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Approximately 20 minutes of that time has been used.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to know whether the time that is now being used by other Senators is time that has been allotted to me.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield time for a question by the Senator from Minnesota, provided that we will be reimbursed for that time by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes for that purpose. Let us be brief.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already yielded to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish me to yield to him so that he may answer a question of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THYE. I should like to make a brief comment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I believe a comment might well be made at this point on the subject under discussion between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from South Dakota. A small producer who intends to feed most of his crop, whether it be corn or wheat, is not concerned at all about his acreage allotment, because he would not seal up any corn. The acreage-allotment provision would concern him only if he were to seal up any of his grain.

Since the so-called Holland amendment, or section 348, which we are now considering, was enacted, any good farmer in the diversified farming area who planted more than his allotted corn crop was disqualified from benefiting by the payments for soil conservation practices which are so desirable and necessary, if future generations are not to have land which is eroded and depleted.

All I am concerned with here is whether our soil conservation practices are to be continued. If they are, there is need to provide incentives to assure their continuation. The Extension Service which has existed for many years was trying to educate American farmers in good farming practices. However, many of those practices were not followed until an incentive program was established under the Agricultural Act.

I believe the proposed amendment contains more dangerous defects from the standpoint of damaging soil conservation practices than anything I can imagine. That is why I should like to have section 348 in the present act repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. The whole theory of the price support program and the acreage allotment system is to bring supply and demand into balance. It has not been brought in balance up to the present time, and it looks as though greater incentives will be needed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We are not providing any way by which it may be done. We would be doing precisely the opposite, if the pending amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. WATKINS. That is not the way in which I view it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A double penalty is involved.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, but the Senators to whom I yield wish to make speeches.

I have no further time, unless the Senator from Florida desires to yield it to me. I have finished what I had to say.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The issue in this matter is whether to change the present law which provides for acreage allotments and is supplemented by a provision to the effect that if a farmer knowingly exceeds his acreage allotment he shall thereby be deprived of the largesse extended by Uncle Sam, and of receiving money from Uncle Sam under the ACP program.

We come down to this stage: During the past year I have heard many Senators say, "We believe in the rigid price-support program. We know perfectly well that a part of it involves strict acreage allotments. We believe in those strict acreage allotments and we believe in strict enforcement. The question is, Is the Senate of the United States when saying all those good and high-sounding things, going to put its tongue in its cheek but at the same time refusing to accept one of the methods which is so effective in causing the farmer to live up to his acreage allotments? Are we in earnest about reducing the great agricultural overproduction which we have had, or are we merely saying we want to reduce it and, at the same time, propose so to cripple the Administrator and so to weaken the law that overproduction will continue?"

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak quite so early this

afternoon, but I shall do the best I can under the circumstances.

Last year section 348 was inserted in the Agricultural Act of 1954. It was approved by the majority of the conferees of the House and the Senate. The provision was placed in the law in order to bring the other basic agricultural commodities under the same regulation under which the cottongrower had to operate for the past 15 years.

The provision was put into the act in an effort to find a way to enforce compliance with the law by those persons who had asked for the very law which some of them show every indication of violating, or encouraging the violation of, at the first chance they get.

Section 348 of the 1954 act had some defects. The Holland amendment is an effort to remedy those defects.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida would do these things:

It would exempt from the provisions of section 348 wheat growers who produce less than 15 acres of wheat. It is definitely an effort to assist small farmers who might be expected not to understand the law too well.

The amendment would exempt corn for silage. This would cover the situation referred to by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], where farmers plant more than their allotment of corn. The amendment would permit them to put the corn grown on the excess acreage into the silo without incurring a penalty. In fact, I do not think silage corn should have come under the law any more than red clover, alfalfa, or other legumes and proteins.

The Holland amendment would do away with the necessity of the State committees of the respective States sending questionnaires or forms to every farmer, whether he produces basic crops or not. That is one of the nuisances resulting from the 1954 law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only 10 minutes.

This amendment would also relieve from the penalty the producer of those crops as to which controls had been voted down. That should be of particular interest to the wheat grower this year, in view of the rumors we hear that controls over wheat may be voted down. I am not expressing any opinion on that point.

If the Senator from South Dakota has a short question, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was there not an exemption of peanuts?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, of peanuts to be "hogged off." If a planter raises more peanuts than his allotment, then, instead of digging them, he can turn the hogs in to the field.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the same thing apply to corn that is "hogged off."

Mr. AIKEN. It would apply under the proposed amendment to silage corn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say for the information of the Senator from South Dakota that as the law now stands

and as it has always stood, peanuts solely for fattening purposes have never come under acreage allotment. The purpose of this exemption is to protect the farmer who has no acreage allotment and who does not want to sell under the price-support program, but raises enough feed for his own operation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is undoubtedly aware of the complaints of dairy farmers because the law places ensilage corn under controls. The amendment which is now proposed removes controls on corn raised for the silo, and I am sure it would be gratefully received by the dairymen of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Illinois, and other States. It really liberalizes the law.

Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Florida, however, a slight modification in his proposed amendment. In March the Senate passed without objection Senate Bill 46, which exempted from control wheat producers who used all their wheat on the farm who did not sell any at all, but used it for feed or for seed, and received no supports at all.

On page 2 of the amendment, line 8, after the word "acres," I would suggest adding the words "harvesting wheat for use as feed or seed on the farm where produced." Those words would be inserted to cover that type of crop, in the event the House should pass S. 46 which has been before it for the past 2 months. I do not know whether the Senator from Florida will accept that modification.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to accept that modification, and I call attention to the fact that the very proposal of the insertion of the provision suggested was to take care of the problem facing the farmers, regardless of whether the House passed the other bill or not.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say, Mr. President, that the amendment does very well take care of the small farmer. It does not give the corporation farmer or the large farmer who cultivates from 100 to 10,000 acres the right to violate the law willfully without incurring the penalty provided by section 348.

By the vote on the amendment, Mr. President, we shall be able to ascertain whether those who in the past have said, "Give us these high supports and we will control our crops" meant what they said, because if the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators shall be rejected, it can only result in encouraging widespread violations of the law on the part of the corporation farmers and the large farmers who are not covered by the so-called Holland amendment.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator from Vermont realize that the amendment affects, to any degree, only the Midwest States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin? They are the States which would be hardest hit by the amendment. The amendment would have little effect on North Dakota or the other major wheat-growing States.

Mr. AIKEN. I am satisfied that there is pretty good compliance with the law in North Dakota. It could not be otherwise, because North Dakota is principally a one-crop State. I believe the benefits to Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana would be very marked, indeed, if only by reason of the elimination of silage corn from the penalties.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Vermont said that North Dakota was a one-crop State. North Dakota is one of the most diversified farming States in the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that my own State also is largely a one-crop State, because three-fourths of the agriculture income is derived from dairy herds.

I believe that 52 percent of the income in the Senator's State of North Dakota, agriculturally speaking, comes from price supported crops. The income in North Dakota from that source is among the highest in the Union, in that respect.

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

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As best I can see, those who would profit from the rejection of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida would be those who intend to violate the law. If they simply overplant, the 1954 act provides that they may correct their acreage. For instance, section 374 of the 1954 act reads:

The Secretary shall provide, through the county and local committees, for measuring farms on which corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, or rice is produced and for ascertaining whether the acreage planted for any year to any such commodity is in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such commodity for the farm under this title.

Paragraph (c) of the same section provides:

If the acreage determined to be planted to any basic agricultural commodity on the farm is in excess of the farm acreage allotment, the Secretary shall by appropriate regulations provide for a reasonable time prior to harvest within which such planted acreage may be adjusted to the farm acreage allotment.

That would give farmers time in which to cut off their extra planting of corn and to put it in the silo. It would give them time to curtail their acreage, so that they would not incur either the penalty provided by section 348 or the penalty of 50 percent of the support price, which is found elsewhere in the law.

I should say that if the proposed amendment should be rejected, then we should only be giving a green light to those who willfully and knowingly intend to violate the law.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I shall not ask for additional time now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota; and if

he needs more time, I shall be happy to comply with his request.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from North Dakota can speak as objectively on the proposed legislation as can the sponsors of the amendment. The amendment would have little effect on North Dakota. Practically all our wheat farmers are in compliance; and North Dakota has only one county in the commercial corn area.

The States of four sponsors of the amendment, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]—are all outside the commercial corn area, so they are not affected at all in that respect. Some wheat is produced in those 4 States, but 2 of the States are outside the commercial wheat area and not affected by the pending amendment.

The amendment exempts the farmer who produces only a few acres of wheat.

All of us who have spoken thus far today are pretty much outside the area which would be hardest hit by the amendment. On the basis of last year's compliance with quotas and acreage allotments, this would be the effect:

The State hardest hit would be Illinois. 32,352 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. 150,356 corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

The modified amendment does fairly well by wheat producers, so many of the farmers who were out of compliance last year would now be in compliance. But the amendment would do little to change the corn situation, according to the top officials of the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, to allow farmers to harvest a few more acres of corn to fill silos would change very little the figures of noncompliance last year.

The State which would be the second hardest hit would be Iowa. The amendment would have little effect on its 695 wheat farmers who were out of compliance. But Iowa had 122,381 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The State which would be third hardest hit is Indiana. Indiana had 36,112 wheat farmers and 114,434 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year.

Nebraska would be hard hit. It had 7,024 wheat farmers and 53,146 corn farmers out of compliance last year.

Wisconsin, Minnesota, and South Dakota would be hard hit, so far as the corn farmers are concerned. In these States hundreds of thousands of farmers would be ineligible for soil-conservation payments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from North Dakota have the figures with reference to the total number of corn farmers in South Dakota who would be affected?

Mr. YOUNG. In South Dakota, 638 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. Most of them would be in compliance under the modified amendment. Twenty-nine thousand seven

hundred and forty corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty corn farmers is a pretty sizable proportion. I think that number is probably more than the 60 percent I suggested.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The very fact that a farmer is denied soil-conservation payments takes away the inducement for him to comply with the corn allotments or the wheat quotas. A corn farmer can raise additional corn and make far more money than he can by receiving a small soil-conservation payment, which does much in a State like Massachusetts to help bring about better soil conservation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not bring a corn grower into compliance; it merely induces him not to do anything with respect to soil conservation in a cooperative plan.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from North Dakota have the figures as to noncompliance on the part of wheat and corn farmers in Kansas?

Mr. YOUNG. In Kansas, 9,787 wheat farmers would be out of compliance on the basis of last year's figures. But, again, most of them, under the modified amendment, would be in compliance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Kansas would have 18,397 corn farmers out of compliance.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a rather interesting figure. I am in accord with the Senator's view that the wheat farmers would largely be in compliance under the Holland amendment. I have a grave question about the 18,397 corn farmers, because in a few counties in Kansas, in the commercial corn area, corn is not used for silage, except in certain instances. It is grown to feed cattle, and is not sold. So that is an important item in the bill, and I appreciate receiving the figures.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should not a corn or a wheat grower, producing grain for commercial use, comply with the law, whether he be in Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, North Dakota or any other State? Why should he not comply?

Mr. YOUNG. I think every farmer, taking advantage of price supports, should comply, and it is to his best interest to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. They would not lose anything under the ACP payments if they complied.

Mr. YOUNG. I think many corn farmers feel it unnecessary to comply. There were nearly 1 million corn farmers who did not comply last year, but still we do not have a surplus of corn this year.

Mr. AIKEN. Why not take them out of the program?

Mr. YOUNG. Why destroy the soil conservation program to get even with some farmers?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota is making a reasonable and sound explanation of the entire question. Suppose I were a corn producer, growing 100 acres of corn in northern Iowa, and I were feeding 400 head of steers. I would feed them all of my corn, and probably buy some from other producers. Under the particular amendment before the Senate, if such a farmer in any sense should grow more corn than had been allotted to his farm, even if he did not intend to sell a bushel of it, he would immediately be disqualified to receive payments for good conservation practices, such as taking care of an eroding ditch or taking care of some of the contour in the rolling countryside of western Iowa. He would be absolutely disqualified from coming under any phase of the program. Yet he does not ask for a cent from his Government in the way of price supports, because he feeds every bushel and acre of corn he produces.

We have that kind of farmers in Minnesota. That is one reason why the greatest number out of compliance so far have been in Nebraska, Iowa, Indiana, and Minnesota. Most of the producers there grow their crop to feed their own cattle, or use it for other feeding operations. The only reason why they concerned themselves at all with the program was their desire to carry out what was advocated as a sound conservation program to preserve the fertility of the land for future needs.

I say section 348 in last year's agricultural act had a tendency to stifle and spottily to destroy good soil conservation practices. That is the reason why I am opposed to that section.

I am fully aware that the Farm Bureau is supporting the amendment, so I am in opposition to an organization with which I have worked for years. But when one applies the results of the operation of the section to the Nation as a whole, he will see that it makes soil conservation practices spotty. Any producer who stepped out of line to get the feed he needed for his feeding operations would be denied the right to participate in payments for soil conservation practices, whether they be technical, or liming for the purpose of getting a good stand of legumes.

I say there are times when we walk ourselves into difficulty, and dislike to turn around and get ourselves out of it. The amendment before the Senate is a proposal to modify something we should not have done last year.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] for his appropriate remarks. He has been a farmer all his life and is a farmer now. I know of no man better qualified to speak on the

subject than the senior Senator from Minnesota.

I have always believed that the soil-conservation program was tremendously important. I thought it was good enough to stand on its own legs. I should dislike very much to see the program destroyed by making farmers ineligible for its benefits because they had not complied with some other program which probably was not nearly so important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the chart from which I just read, which was prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

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

Number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

State	Wheat	Corn
Maine.....	42	
New Hampshire.....	2	
Vermont.....	65	
Massachusetts.....	13	
Rhode Island.....	14	
Connecticut.....	20	
New York.....	12,441	
New Jersey.....	1,341	2,262
Pennsylvania.....	24,744	33,101
Ohio.....	49,106	97,352
Indiana.....	36,112	114,434
Illinois.....	32,352	150,356
Michigan.....	28,547	50,480
Wisconsin.....	3,491	59,192
Minnesota.....	3,699	78,357
Iowa.....	695	122,381
Missouri.....	35,460	77,466
North Dakota.....	559	1,178
South Dakota.....	638	29,740
Nebraska.....	7,024	53,146
Kansas.....	9,787	18,397
Delaware.....	175	3,941
Maryland.....	2,161	10,632
Virginia.....	15,108	4,962
West Virginia.....	1,591	
North Carolina.....	24,036	31,345
South Carolina.....	11,694	
Georgia.....	7,336	
Florida.....	255	
Kentucky.....	7,504	33,119
Tennessee.....	11,293	16,868
Alabama.....	1,618	
Mississippi.....	854	
Arkansas.....	2,227	5,421
Louisiana.....	171	
Oklahoma.....	8,153	
Texas.....	7,953	
Montana.....	1,547	
Idaho.....	5,934	
Wyoming.....	449	
Colorado.....	2,232	
New Mexico.....	307	
Arizona.....	78	
Utah.....	3,745	
Nevada.....	215	
Washington.....	484	
Oregon.....	2,527	
California.....	590	
United States.....	366,389	

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a chart, also prepared by the Department of Agriculture, showing how many tobacco farmers were out of compliance and would be ineligible for soil conservation payments. The total for the United States is 30,839.

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

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

TOBACCO	
Alabama.....	61
Arkansas.....	2
Connecticut.....	40
Florida.....	142

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment—Con.

TOBACCO—CON.	
Georgia.....	631
Illinois.....	6
Iowa.....	0
Indiana.....	529
Kentucky.....	10,240
Maryland.....	500
Massachusetts.....	10
Minnesota.....	2
Missouri.....	22
New Hampshire.....	0
North Carolina.....	7,583
Ohio.....	629
Pennsylvania.....	1
South Carolina.....	2,914
Tennessee.....	5,218
Texas.....	1
Vermont.....	0
Virginia.....	1,883
West Virginia.....	386
Wisconsin.....	39
Total.....	30,839

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing how many cotton farmers were out of compliance last year. The total number in the entire United States was only 11,197.

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

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

COTTON	
Alabama.....	3,108
Arizona.....	144
Arkansas.....	210
California.....	103
Florida.....	58
Georgia.....	1,221
Kentucky.....	8
Louisiana.....	207
Mississippi.....	778
Missouri.....	242
New Mexico.....	67
North Carolina.....	1,200
Oklahoma.....	619
South Carolina.....	784
Tennessee.....	1,604
Texas.....	793
Virginia.....	51
Total.....	11,197

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the average 1953 ACP payments, or soil conservation payments, made to the farmers of the respective States. Again, for the benefit of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I should like to say that table shows that the State of Kansas received the highest average payment under the soil conservation program, \$151. New Jersey was the second highest, with average payments of \$107. The average payment in North Dakota was \$82.

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

Average 1953 ACP payment	
Arkansas.....	\$94.00
Delaware.....	109.00
Illinois.....	72.00
Indiana.....	57.00
Iowa.....	54.00
Kansas.....	151.00
Kentucky.....	56.00
Maryland.....	84.00
Michigan.....	63.00

Average 1953 ACP payment—Con.

Minnesota.....	\$54.00
Missouri.....	81.00
Nebraska.....	70.00
New Jersey.....	107.00
North Carolina.....	47.00
North Dakota.....	82.00
Ohio.....	54.00
Pennsylvania.....	79.00
South Dakota.....	93.00
Tennessee.....	67.00
Virginia.....	69.00
West Virginia.....	51.00
Wisconsin.....	54.00
1953 appropriation, \$250 million.	
1954 appropriation, \$195 million.	

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a table showing the estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment with respect to peanuts be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Estimated number of farms harvested in excess of 1954 allotment

PEANUTS	
Alabama.....	300
Arkansas.....	25
California.....	1
Florida.....	159
Georgia.....	750
Mississippi.....	1
New Mexico.....	25
North Carolina.....	2,000
Oklahoma.....	400
South Carolina.....	50
Tennessee.....	4
Texas.....	1,000
Virginia.....	950
Total.....	5,665

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the Holland amendment and will pass the Humphrey bill which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the arguments used by the proponents of the Holland amendment is that if we repeal section 348 we will be condoning breaking the law, and we will be giving the green light to farmers to overplant and violate the law. Those arguments are fallacious, and, what is more, they do not stand even the test of logic.

First of all, the soil-conservation program was never intended as a punitive measure.

Secondly, the thing that is wrong about section 348, and the reason it should be repealed, is that it is out of harmony with control mechanism in the matter of corn production.

I should like to use an analogy. What the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and their colleagues are saying is that if the driver of an automobile speeds, using the parlance of a traffic violator, he should lose the right to have safe driving lessons. In other words, here is a violator who is subject to prosecution for speeding under a certain law, to be hauled into court, to be subject to the jurisdiction of the court, and to be

finer, or to be sentenced to the workhouse. But the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Florida say that it is not sufficient. Of course, the promoters of the safe driving program which has been sponsored by the schools as a public service contend that a violator of the law who comes before the court should be subject not only to fine or the possibility of imprisonment, but he should be required to take safe driving lessons.

I use the analogy because the soil-conservation program is designed to help farmers to produce better and to conserve their land. The soil conservation program was not designed to be a club or a stick to discipline farmers into compliance. The soil-conservation program was designed to protect the fertility of the soil.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator has time to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am trying to get the picture of the situation which is presently before us. The proposal before the Senate would repeal that section of the law which penalizes the farmer by taking away from him conservation rights if he violates production limitations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have always assumed that the farmer, who is a victim of the seasons, did not violate the law or regulations intentionally.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, let me say that section 348 says "farmers who knowingly."

Mr. BARKLEY. That is simple enough.

What does the Holland amendment do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Perhaps I should rely upon the sponsors of the Holland amendment to explain it, because I have had a little difficulty in determining exactly what its result will be. But I can say that the Holland amendment makes special provision for wheat farmers who grow wheat on 15 acres or less, and it also makes some special provision for ensilage.

At this time I yield to the Senator from Florida, so that he may tell us what the other provision is.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are two other provisions, one is in case a price-support program has been voted down by the farmers, so that such a program is not applicable; and the other is in the case of peanuts, where the farmer is planting peanuts for seed only or for the fattening of hogs, by turning them into the field. In such case the peanut farmer is allowed to raise enough peanuts so that he will have sufficient seed for the next year.

There is also a provision allowing the Secretary of Agriculture some latitude in the regulations, so as to prevent much of the paper work which at the present time is required.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank both Senators. However, I am not yet quite clear as to the effect of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to help the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have felt for a long time that it was quite unfair to penalize a farmer who had slightly overproduced because nature had stepped in and played its part. It has seemed to me that a farmer who is the victim of such circumstances should not be denied his soil-conservation payments on that account. So I am in favor of repealing the section which would penalize the farmer in that way.

I do not understand clearly how the amendment of the Senator from Florida would modify that section.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall let the Senator from Florida speak on the amendment in his own time.

At this time I wish to say that the point attempted to be made by the proponents of the Holland amendment is that the repeal of section 348 will encourage law violation. Let me say that if section 348 shall be repealed, there will be no such law to violate. Section 348 is bad law, in the first place, and never should have been included in the bill of last year. It was not in the bill when it was passed by the House of Representatives, but came into the bill as the result of the conference. I may remind my colleagues that a substantial number of the Members of the Senate voted against all parts of the bill which came, last year, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, soil conservation stands on its own right and has its own privileges and responsibilities. We have provided severe penalties for violating marketing quotas, and we have provided penalties for violations of acreage allotments. If a farmer violates his acreage allotments, he receives no price supports; and that means that he will not receive a loan upon any crop he may have to store, in order to wait for a better market. That penalty is in effect. Why use soil-conservation payments—which never were supposed to operate as a penalty—as a further club or disciplinary weapon over the farmer?

My distinguished colleague, the Senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], pointed out very aptly what happens. Large numbers of farmers, particularly corn farmers, never take advantage of the price-support program. Instead, they feed to livestock the corn they produce. However, if such a farmer exceeded by one-tenth of an acre or one-half of an acre or 1 acre his corn allotment, he would be denied soil-conservation benefits, even though he would never sell 1 ear of corn in the market, and even though he would not seek a loan, and even though he would not go into the market at all, to sell any of his product.

It is true, Mr. President, that we wish to have production quotas and acreage allotments enforced. But soil-conservation benefits should not be used as a means of enforcement. There is other provision of law for such enforcement.

Soil conservation payments are to be used by farmers in a cooperative relationship with their Government. As a matter of fact, the average soil-conservation payment from the Government to the farmer is approximately \$50. Let us be frank about this matter, Mr. Presi-

dent. If soil-conservation benefits or payments are canceled, certainly there is no punitive effect in respect to preventing a farmer from overplanting, for if he overplants only a little, he will receive a greater benefit from the overproduction than the total amount of his soil-conservation payments. The result is that many farmers overproduce; and if thereafter the farmers' soil-conservation payments are denied them, with the result that they do not engage in soil conservation, the resultant situation operates to the detriment of the land and to the detriment of future generations.

Mr. President, soil conservation is needed, regardless of whether there is a price-support program. Soil conservation is long overdue, regardless of whether we ever dream of having a cropland and crop-storage program.

All I can say about section 348 is that it never should have been in the law in the first place. Yet the proponents of the Holland amendment say, "The repeal of section 348 will result in violations of the law."

Mr. President, in the District of Columbia there are some ordinances which are antiquated and outmoded and ineffectual; and day by day various persons violate them. In that case, the thing to do is to repeal such antiquated laws. Today we do not tell people that they must drive down Pennsylvania Avenue only 5 miles an hour with a team of horses. Instead, we repeal any such antiquated law. That is what I recommend that we do in this case.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture reported to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that section 348 is ineffective, is difficult of administration, is retarding soil conservation, and is not controlling crop production. So why should such a provision be retained in the law?

The fact that we made a mistake once does not mean that we have to compound it by now adopting the Holland amendment, which only would put a new suit of clothes on an old frame which long ago should have been discarded.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to myself.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the objections the Senator from Minnesota has raised, is section 348 enforceable?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; it is not enforceable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Department of Agriculture so reported?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Department of Agriculture has recommended the repeal of section 348. The Department says section 348 is administratively difficult to handle and to enforce, and the Department sees no particular benefit to accrue from section 348.

Furthermore, last week two national conferences of soil-conservation officials—one in St. Paul, Minn., and the other in Memphis, Tenn., where the chairman of the committees and other officials met—expressed their concern

because Congress had not yet repealed section 348. They are concerned because of the serious interference of section 348 with a large number of farmers in their participation in the 1955 soil-conservation program.

We suffer from wind erosion and drought. Yet the farmers who may have overplanted corn, wheat, or other supported crops are finding themselves denied the benefit of soil conservation at a time when they need it the most.

Mr. President, how ridiculous can we get? It means to me that we have a moral obligation—for the good of the entire future of agriculture—to rectify an existing error in the law.

I know of very few organizations in the Nation which are interested in soil conservation and production control which are not in favor of the repeal of section 348.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the Senator from Minnesota follow me in a brief description of a situation I have in mind, so as to see whether I correctly understand this matter. I understand that if a farmer desires to engage in soil-conservation practices, the Government wishes to encourage him to do so; and because such practices are expensive, and because when he engages in soil-conservation the farmer must devote some of his land to the building of dams or to the building of terraces, and because such practices do not pay immediately, with the result that temporarily the farmer has to sacrifice some of his income, the Government says to him, "If you engage in this practice, we will share the cost with you."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is done as a means of encouraging the farmer to participate in the soil-conservation program.

In addition, the Government says to the farmer, "If you reduce the production of certain crops, we will provide you with a high support loan."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the case of some farmers who were not able to comply with the acreage allotment now, because of the Holland amendment of last year, the Government says, "If you do not comply, we cannot go along with you on the soil-conservation program." So the effect of the pending amendment, it seems to me, would simply be to reduce farmer cooperation in the soil-conservation program. Furthermore, I do not believe the Holland amendment will persuade a single farmer to be in compliance with the acreage allotments or production quotas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota has stated the argument succinctly, concisely, and persuasively. He is exactly correct. I say that the proponents of the Holland amendment or the proponents of section 348 can bring to the Senate no evidence which would indicate that if we were to keep section 348, as now written in the law, or as modified by the Holland amendment,

it would promote any further compliance with acreage allotments and marketing quotas. It would not have such an effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not have such an effect; and on the other hand, so far as soil conservation is concerned, it would be definitely a destructive measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota is correct and I thank him.

The other specious argument which has been raised in support of a political and economic ghost is that a repeal of section 348 will help the corporation-sized farms. Let us take a look at that argument. Nothing could be further from the truth. Is a farmer who grows 6 acres of corn to feed his livestock when he has only a 5 acre allotment a corporation-type farmer? Is a farmer who grows 16 acres of wheat a corporation-sized farmer when he has an acreage allotment of only 15 acres? Such farmers and all others in the family-size farm category would be ineligible for ACP payments under the proposed substitute, just as they are under the present section 348.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that I understand that some of the farmers of Vermont grow a little tobacco. They may grow an acre and a half or 2 acres of tobacco. I would hardly call them corporation-size farmers. Under the present program, because of section 348, or under the Holland amendment, if they should exceed their allotment by 0.1 or 0.2 of an acre, they would lose all possibility of soil conservation benefits for their land under the ACP program.

I feel that our responsibility is clear-cut. We happen to have a bad provision, among other bad provisions in the law. Here is an opportunity to take some remedial action.

This has nothing to do with flexible price supports or rigid price supports. That is a non-germane, extraneous argument. Whether price supports are 50 percent of parity or 75 percent of parity, or whether they flex like an old rubber band makes not a bit of difference. The truth is that both under flexible price supports and rigid price supports acreage allotment and, in some instances, market quotas, all imposed for production control.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 1 more minute.

If the argument advanced were sound, it would make no difference whether the price support were 110 percent of parity or 20 percent of parity. If a farmer violates his acreage allotment, he loses his ACP payment. So let us not bring in the argument of price supports, to see if we cannot muster some flexible price supporters against the repeal of section 348, or muster some rigid price supporters for the repeal of section 348. The two are unrelated. They are not even close cousins. They are not even kinfolk. They live in different parts of the political atmosphere. I suggest that we stay with the issue.

Do we wish to provide for further soil conservation, or do we not? Do we wish

to restrict the soil conservation program by making soil conservation payments a club and a punitive measure for rigid price support enforcement, or do we wish to progress on the basis of conserving the soil and cooperating with the farmer and the Government in a relationship which has been established for almost 15 years?

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to yield some time to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I merely wish to ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. I think the Senator has covered my point in his argument, but I should like to ask a specific question.

Is there not sufficient penalty under the law now to punish for overplanting, if section 348 is repealed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed there is.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any connection between denying a farmer soil-building payments if he engages in soil-building practices, and punishing him for overplanting, which is an entirely different matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any connection between denying a farmer soil-building payments if he performs soil-building practices, and punishing him for overplanting, which is a different subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no relationship whatsoever.

Mr. THURMOND. Should there ever have been a combination or merging of those two subjects in the same provision of the law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There should not have been, particularly when we consider only acreage allotments. If we are considering marketing quotas, it is easier to enforce production controls, but acreage allotments are not quite so easy to enforce.

Mr. THURMOND. Would not the repeal of section 348 tend to stimulate soil building rather than to discourage those practices?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the view of the Soil Conservation Service. It is the view of those in the Department of Agriculture who are responsible for soil-conservation programs under the ACP program. It is the view of the State committees on soil conservation. It is the view of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is the view of the Grange, and of the National Farmers Union. I know it is the view of several State farm-bureau organizations.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there anything more important we can do for this generation of farmers and the future than to encourage soil-building practices?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that one of the great moral, economic, and social responsibilities of this generation and all generations yet to come is to protect, with all the force and power at our and their command, the

fertility of our soil. That is a great resource which belongs to the people. It is the basis of a strong American economy. For the life of me—and I say this most respectfully—I cannot see why we should want to tie in a constructive, forward-looking program like soil conservation as a club or punitive measure to enforce price-support regulations. That would be like denying a child the opportunity of going to Sunday school because he had stayed out late some night during the previous week. The fathers and mothers of America have other means of disciplining delinquent children. They usually encourage them to go to Sunday school if they break the rules of the household. But that is not true in this instance.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in his amendment says, in effect, "If you stay out late, not only will you be spanked, but we will not let you go to Sunday school." What good does that do? It seems to me that the spanking ought to be enough, and that the Sunday school is long overdue.

If a farmer violates his acreage allotment and production quota, he gets the penalty of no price supports. He gets the penalty of no crop loan. He is left on his own, with no help from the Government to enable him to obtain a fair price for his commodity. That is ample penalty. But we should not compound that penalty by saying, "Not only shall you suffer that penalty, but we will also deny you the right to take good care of your soil. We will also deny you the opportunity to work with the Government of the United States in a great program established for the public good."

I cannot understand why we even hesitate. I do not think we shall. I am ready to vote now. I am sure that logic, reason, and prudent judgment are on our side.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not true that all the bill does is to eliminate the penalty provided by section 348?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota has a minute I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the price support program is a year-by-year program?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be continued or it may be terminated in any year by a two-thirds vote of the farmers. They decide whether or not they want it. On the other hand, soil conservation is a long-term program, not limited by years or by decades. It is a program for the future as well as for the present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Its design and purpose was long-range, from decade to decade and from generation to generation. One of the reasons we have provided these payments is to encourage farmers to engage in the early practice of soil conservation, to help them to help themselves. We have done this all around the world, for other people. It seems to me that we ought to do it at home.

Mr. BARKLEY. Two decades ago we woke up to find that about a third of our rich soil had washed away and been eroded, and that if that process were to continue we might, as our population increased and as our soil fertility decreased, find ourselves in the situation in which many other countries are, namely, overpopulated and underproductive. Therefore the soil-conservation program is a long-term program, which has no connection whatever with the year-by-year program of price supports for the various crops included in the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator's observation. Now that the proponents of the Holland amendment are recommending a very slight modification of the objective of section 348, I want them to produce one scintilla of evidence that section 348, as written, or section 348, as modified by the Holland amendment, has any effective relationship to price supports and production controls. In other words, does it operate to control production? I believe the answer is obvious that it does not, because where this program is most desirable and where it is needed the most is in the great midwestern area, in the corn-producing States, in which are found probably the largest number of farmers who are not in compliance with their quotas. They will not be in compliance with their quotas, I say respectfully, for a benefit payment of \$25 from the Federal Government. They will not do it. If we want to pass soil-conservation legislation, let us pass that kind of legislation. If we wish to have price supports, we should legislate price supports. We should not mix the two. When we mix the two or set either up as a yardstick or as a disciplinary weapon, we destroy the whole effectiveness of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The first thing I wish to do is to answer the challenge of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to whether section 348 will work or can work. The best evidence of the fact that it will work and can work is the fact that in the cotton industry, to which it has applied continuously for many years, there is the highest degree of compliance that is found in any large agricultural industry of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has put into the RECORD some figures which are pertinent. My recollection is that he said the number of cotton farmers in the Nation who were out of compliance last year—and that was planting out of compliance, and those farmers could still comply before harvest time, as most of them did—was only 11,000. That is 11,000 out of more than a million cotton farmers in the Nation.

In other words, about 1 percent were out of compliance in their planting. Under the provision of last year's act, which became applicable for the first time this

year as to other commodities, but which was applicable last year to cotton—

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not wish to yield at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the provisions of that law, which allowed farmers to come into compliance by harvest time, very nearly all of the cotton farmers were in compliance by the time of the harvest.

That fact is incontrovertible, and the Senator cannot and need not try to controvert it. The cotton producers of the Nation are the ones who have been in closest compliance with these programs all the way through.

The reason why they have been in such close compliance is that a similar but stronger provision was made applicable to them through these programs. There cannot be any better evidence than the type of performance we have had, and Senators know that the cotton industry is a complying industry.

Listening to the arguments of the opposition, one would think that it is almost a crime to comply with the acreage limitation restrictions of the act. The purpose of the act is to protect the farmers. It offers them a chance to control their production. The world knows and our people are keenly aware of the fact that we are producing more than we can consume. The warehouses are full of agricultural commodities. Ships are full of them. Every place we can find to store such commodities is full.

Last year we passed a law in the hope of putting some brakes upon overproduction. Now come distinguished Senators who try to take off one of those brakes. It is a brake which has shown its effectiveness in the cotton industry. It is a brake which will show its effectiveness in other industries, if it is given a chance to operate. It has not been given a chance, because it has only become effective this year for the first time.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I decline to yield at this time. Are Senators fearful that the same degree of effectiveness will prevail in the other agricultural industries that has already prevailed in the cotton industry? Are they afraid to allow a year's experience on this restriction, which would encourage compliance? Or are they simply pleading, like angels with trumpet tongues, for a violation of the law?

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator speaks about making it more necessary for the wheat farmer to comply with the program. Under the modified amendment of the Senator, the wheat farmer is almost entirely out of it, and the amendment affects almost entirely the corn producer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator could not be more mistaken. The only wheat farmers who are out of it are those who produce up to 15 acres of wheat. The

Senator has stated in his able argument that there were so few affected farmers in his own State that the provision hardly applied to his State. The fact is that the only farmers who are taken from under the act are those who are already out from under it, in decency and equity, because of the provision of the price support act which is already in effect, that when a farmer plants up to 15 acres, he is exempt. However, in order to have no question raised on this point, the pending amendment was offered by myself and three other Senators. That amendment makes it clear that a wheat farmer can plant up to 15 acres not only under the price restriction provision of the act, but also under the other provision.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I have the assurance of Mr. Ritchie, of the Department of Agriculture, that the Holland amendment, as modified, would put most wheat farmers into compliance, and that the most pronounced effect would be on the corn farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact is that it would put most of those who violated the provision in compliance with it. No one wants to hold them to one standard of compliance under one provision of the act and to a different standard of compliance under another provision of the act.

Those who are opposing the amendment would like to eat their cake and have it too. They are trying to get full advantage of the price support program for farmers even when they overplant, and at the same time draw benefits from a generous Government for conservation practices. They are something like a man I once knew when I was practicing law. He always wanted to trade with one hand and fight with the other. That is not the practical way to do things. The farmers who have the advantage of this beneficent program should do no less than comply with acreage allotments.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, able as he is, make a statement to the effect that corn would not be brought under this provision, and that corn was not particularly affected because so many corn farmers do not sell their corn under the price support program. We have known that all along. We have known that so long as no penalty is imposed on a farmer who does not sell his corn, there is no chance to bring him into line. The question arises whether we will have one provision in the law which gives some chance of bringing the corn producers into line, and whether we will have one provision in the law which provides that the important segment of our agricultural industry which produces corn shall have to obey the law in order to get the benefit of it. I believe we should have this provision in the law.

Those of us who are pleading for the amendment know that Senators who have spoken against it are those who were opposed to the price support provisions in the bill last year. They are in favor of continuance of overproduction

and overstimulation without any brakes at all being applied to payments that farmers receive from the Government.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot yield, unless I am granted further time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes the Senator from Florida allotted to himself have expired. The Senator from Florida has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we have 22 minutes left on this side of the argument. I should be glad to have the Senator use some of those minutes so that I would not be trespassing on his time. So, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask a question.

The Senator stated that the cotton producer was mostly in compliance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I stated that the cotton producers had made the finest record of compliance of any great agricultural producing group.

Mr. THYE. This is the question which I should like to ask the Senator. How would a cotton producer use all his cotton if he did not put it through commercial channels? It can be made into textiles or put to whatever commercial use can be made of it. If his cotton is put through commercial channels his compliance is positive. The farmer who sells his wheat will be in compliance. The farmer who wishes to feed a few bushels of wheat in his general dairy-mix will grow a few acres of wheat for that purpose and use it in that manner. But in the general operations in the great corn-growing areas of the Nation, when the corn is grown strictly for feeding purposes, we should encourage the type of farming which puts the feed into livestock and markets the product in the form of pork, dairy products, or beef. No one will deny that that is the kind of practice we wish to carry out. What we are trying to do is to provide for sound conservation practices which will assure future generations fertile lands to till.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was glad to yield for a question, but—

Mr. THYE. Any time I take comes from our side, and then the Senator from Florida will have free time to go on with his speech.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. The first thing I wish to say—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, just a moment. I am in charge of the time, and I should like to know where we are. Are we charging it up thus far to my good friend from Florida? I am willing to yield whatever time is necessary for the presentation of the senior Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that the Senator from Florida had 14 minutes remaining. At the present time he has 11 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yielded for a question, and I expected it to be asked, but I had to call a halt because my time was ebbing away. I called my distinguished

friend's attention to the fact that he was using my time without asking a question.

The first thing I should like to call to the attention of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is that the remarks he has made with reference to the cotton farmer apply to the small cotton farmer. They do not apply at all to the great cotton farmers of the Southwest, to the great cotton farmers of the Mississippi Delta, and many other cotton farmers who are also alined with exporters, ginners, processors, and others who handle large stocks of cotton from year to year. Before the law providing for controls was passed there had always been a very heavy carryover of cotton. Improvements in merchandising on the part of those who handle our cotton crop have improved that situation. I do not think I need to remind Senators of the tie-in of Anderson-Clayton with the great cotton production of this country. Cotton is storable indefinitely, and the cottonseed meal, cottonseed oil, and other products coming from it are salable. Once the cotton is ginned those products are available for any purpose for which they may be used.

Some of us have been speaking as if we are not concerned about corn, as if we are perfectly willing to have the corn producers overproduce. They can double, triple, or quadruple their acreage, and, apparently, it makes no difference to our friends who are opposing this particular amendment. That is one of the troubles we are having in connection with the whole program, and the very figures presented by my distinguished friend from North Dakota show that compliance in the corn industry is the worst of any that can be found.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

I wish to remind Senators that corn production is linked inseparably with barley, oats, rye, and other grains. The Senate will remember that last year when we were debating the bill which was then before the Senate, the junior Senator from Minnesota was asking a special kind of consideration for and special inclusion in the law of small grains because they should be given the same sort of treatment which was given corn and be given the same sort of chance to prosper. Those of us who were on the floor during that long debate will remember perfectly well that that was the case.

One of the things causing the most trouble is that in the case of the corn industry the violations have been so numerous, the impact upon the use of small grains has been so violent, and the impact on the whole picture has been so great, that we have not been able to bring order out of chaos.

An effort is being made to remove the only chock we have under the wheel although we see piling up in ever more mountainous lots corn which is produced not in compliance with the allotments made by a generous government as representing production to which the corn farmer is entitled.

Mr. President, we have got to get down to brass tacks and decide whether we want compliance completely or whether

we do not. I think agriculture must realize that if it continues to follow this irresponsible course, if distinguished Senators continue to urge this path of irresponsibility, there is just one answer, and that is the loss of the whole very valuable price-support structure. There is no way to escape from that.

The thing we must do is to find out whether the average decent farmer who will comply will have his hands upheld, or whether those who want to take advantage of others are going to be encouraged in their ever-increasing violations so that production will be much in excess of the allotments.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not a fact that in spite of considerable noncompliance on the part of corn farmers, there is little surplus of corn? The Secretary of Agriculture set corn supports at 87 percent of parity for 1955 because he believed there was little or no surplus. I think that fact belies the statement made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I dislike to disagree with my friend, but in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he has several times called attention to the fact that price supports on small grains have been reduced unduly, and that the reason for it is the overproduction of corn.

Mr. YOUNG. That was not the reason.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from North Dakota will, of course, admit, I feel certain, that several times he has called attention to the fact that, in his judgment, the price support for small grain has been too greatly reduced.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to read a telegram I have received from Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and to ask the able Senator from Florida if Hassil Schenck has an understanding of his amendment. Mr. Schenck's telegram reads:

Senator HOLLAND has amendment to H. R. 1573 striking section 348 of 1954 act which denies ACP payment to anyone knowingly harvesting more than allotment. HOLLAND is proposing amendment to retain section 348 but modify it to permit harvesting (1) wheat up to 15 acres, (2) corn for silage, (3) peanuts for seed for hoggins-off—

Evidently Mr. Schenck means "feed for hoggins-off."

Mr. HOLLAND. No; "seed for hoggins-off."

Mr. CAPEHART. I continue:

(4) above allotted acres on basis if quotas voted down. Also applicants need not certify have not exceeded allotments in areas where allotments not applicable. Would appreciate your support Holland amendment.

HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Does Mr. Schenck properly describe the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HOLLAND. He does, with complete propriety. Also, there has been one more factor added today, of particular value in areas with acreages of wheat produced for poultry and other

feed, completely in line with the purposes and objectives of the bill.

While I do not know the gentleman who signed the telegram, he certainly has a clear understanding of what is being attempted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Schenck is president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not happen to know the gentleman.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I understand, the amendment is designed to aid the small-size farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my judgment, the amendment removes every handicap that could have been imposed upon the small farmer by the strict enforcement of section 348.

Mr. CAPEHART. Particularly the marginal farms.

Mr. HOLLAND. The large farms and the marginal farms are included in the compliance. I am sure the Senator from Indiana will be one who will say, that when we have a system such as this, a farmer who does not comply, is not entitled to any sympathy, much less to be accorded aid in his evasion by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. It sounds good to me. I think I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have heard this afternoon that there were a million violators among the corn growers last year; 11,000 among the cotton growers, and more than 30,000 among the tobacco growers. But if the violators among the wheat, rice, and peanut growers were included, there would probably be a million and a half violators among the 3 million commercial producers in this country.

If 50 percent of the corn growers were violators, it is a fact that those violators came under the rigid 90 percent support program, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly is.

With reference to the tobacco growers, because I do not think they should be brought into the picture, the larger part of their noncompliance was in the burley field. That situation has been frankly faced by the Senators who represent the States where that kind of tobacco is produced.

Last year Congress was asked to "up" the penalty to 50 percent, as I recall, and this year to a higher percentage, in an effort to continue to bring the greater and greater pressure toward compliance.

Shall we reverse that stand? Shall we reverse that kind of operation by reducing the pressure that calls for compliance?

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not also true that thousands of tobacco growers in Maryland voted last year against the control program?

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that in Maryland, compliance as to that particular variety of tobacco was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, those farmers would have no quotas to comply with.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I resent the statement by the Senator from Vermont which questioned the figures I presented this afternoon. They came from the Department of Agriculture and its Secretary is Ezra T. Benson. They are authentic figures.

Furthermore, I cannot understand the motives of those who are sponsoring the amendment. If they really want to attack the surplus problem, then why is it that they have offered an amendment which would take care of most of the wheat producers, outside of the established wheat-producing areas while penalizing the corn farmers?

The actual fact is that just a very few of the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation never have thought much of the soil conservation program known as ACP. They have appeared every year to reduce the appropriation for that program.

I know of no better way in which to destroy the ACP program than to agree to the Holland amendment. I think the farmers all over America would disagree almost entirely with the viewpoint expressed today by the four Senators who sponsored the amendment.

I think it is rather significant that the four Senators who have sponsored the amendment come from States outside the area which is affected.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I come from a State which has more farms than has any other State in the Union. Many persons do not realize that. A great number of those farms are small ones, as the allotments on the various crops will show.

North Carolina this year, I regret to add, because we do not like to advertise ourselves in this respect, stands 44th among the States in income, but we stand about fourth in the amount paid to the Federal Government in excise taxes.

Among those in the lower income group, most of them are in the farm group.

The amendment under consideration will affect approximately 109,000 farm people in 91 counties. I should like to remind the Senate that North Carolina has had 3 severe drought years. In addition, we experienced Hurricane Hazel, which was the worst hurricane we have known in our lifetime.

Furthermore, we have sustained the most severe late spring freeze we have ever had. I had the opportunity to be in the Carolinas early this morning. I saw wheat and barley which were damaged. But I saw the farmers cutting hay and going ahead, doing the best they could. I saw whole fields of barley which were damaged.

By daylight early this morning, I saw people working in the tobacco fields, trying to make the best of an extremely bad situation.

I see no reason why ACP payments should be tied to crop compliance. There is no relationship. We are but the tenants of the Almighty. We are charged with the responsibility of determining how we shall use land which the Lord has given us to work with. We are doing the best we can. We need no handicaps.

I am reminded of the story of a man who met a neighbor across a rail fence. The first man saw an animal disappear into the ground, and he went after it. The neighbor, coming up to him, said: "John, that is nothing but a groundhog. You don't eat groundhogs, do you?"

The first man said, "No; but we need meat at our house, and I am glad to have the meat."

That is the situation we are in. We do not need the helping hand of the Government in the way in which it is said the amendment would help.

ACP payments should not be in any way tied in with compliance with the crop-control program in one way or another, especially when it gives advantages to peanut growers in some States, but penalizes the corn growers in about 25 counties in my State simply because they follow exactly the same principle which is carried out in the contingent-feed programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject. I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

Most of the opposition that has been expressed to H. R. 1573 is based on the argument that section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 discourages farmers from overplanting acreage allotments.

It is argued that if farmers are deprived of their ACP payments for overplanting allotments, then the end result will be that farmers will plant within their allotments.

It is also argued that this has been the case in respect to cotton. Since 1938 farmers who overplanted their cotton allotments have lost ACP payments.

In respect to cotton there are a few facts that should be brought out. Cotton acreage allotments were in effect from 1938 through 1942—a period of 5 years. Then there were no cotton acreage allotments again until 1950, a period of 7 years. There were acreage allotments on cotton in 1950 and 1951. Then came another period of 2 years, 1952 and 1953, when there were no cotton allotments in force. Cotton allotments were restored in 1954 and are again in effect for this crop year.

Consequently, in using cotton as an example, it must be taken into consideration that cotton acreage allotments have been in effect only 4-crop years since 1942, a period of 13 years. On the basis of these facts it makes it impossible to get a clear picture on just what effects overplanting cotton have on the ACP payments.

On the basis of information from Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation officials in North Carolina it is found that 23 North Carolina counties are classified as commercial corn counties. In these 23 counties there are 54,000 farms that produce corn. In all there are 240,000 farms in North Carolina and almost without exception, each one of these farms produces corn for one purpose or another. On a vast majority of farms in North Carolina corn is produced

solely for livestock feeding purposes. According to ASC officials very little corn is sold in the commercial market. In most cases the corn is harvested in the fall of the year, then stored for use as livestock feed through the winter months. In other cases corn is hogged-off. This is largely true in the eastern counties of the State where most of the swine is produced. The State produces about 60-million swine a year and a large percentage of the corn production goes into feeding these hogs.

If the amendment proposed by Senator HOLLAND is passed, it will mean that and farmer in the commercial corn counties who overplants his corn allotment regardless of what he uses the corn for—will lose his ACP payments. Farmers who are outside the commercial corn counties can plant all the corn they please and still get their ACP payments. This is gross injustice. It means simply this:

A man in a commercial corn county with a 10-acre allotment of corn could plant 11 acres and lose his ACP payments. The man on the adjoining farm, if he is outside the commercial belt, can plant a thousand acres of corn if he so pleases and still get his ACP payment. Situations of this sort would exist all over the State if the Holland amendment becomes law.

As for wheat, most of this production in North Carolina is for home consumption, and 95 percent of the wheat farms in North Carolina grow less than 15 acres of wheat. In all there are 53,000 wheat farms in North Carolina with wheat acreage allotments in 98 counties. In most cases wheat is grown for hay and milled for livestock feed and home consumption. The majority of the wheat growers of North Carolina are in the 5-acre bracket. They grow a few acres of wheat and have it ground and mixed at the milling plants for winter livestock and poultry feeds. Under the Holland amendment wheat farmers would be allowed to harvest up to 15 acres of wheat—if their allotment is anywhere under 15 acres—without losing their ACP payments.

In practice the amendment would have this effect:

A farmer with a 5-acre wheat allotment could harvest up to 15 acres of wheat—planting 10 acres above his allotment—and still get his ACP payments. This same farmer, if he has a corn allotment and is in a commercial corn county, will lose his ACP payments if he plants any corn over his allotment. It would simply mean that a farmer could grow wheat above his allotment for livestock feed and home consumption without being penalized while he would not be able to grow corn above his allotment. He would be penalized for overplanting corn, but he would be within the law for overplanting wheat.

In the case of a farmer who has 50 hogs and raises corn above his corn allotment to feed these hogs, the Holland amendment would require him to purchase corn in the commercial market if he continued to receive ACP payments. A farmer who gets, for example, \$75 a year in ACP payments and would have to purchase \$200 worth of corn to feed his hogs through the winter, would have no other financial choice than to forgo his ACP payments and raise the necessary corn to feed the hogs.

In North Carolina particularly, as a result of the drought, Hurricane Hazel and the recent freeze, many farmers are being forced to diversify their operations. If a farmer has never raised hogs before and decides to do so this year, and wants to plant corn to feed them, then he may find himself ineligible to take part in the ACP projects. Consequently, if the Holland amendment becomes law, it is conceivable that many, many farmers not only in North Carolina but throughout the country will find themselves handicapped in going into swine or livestock production as a means of replacing income

that they have lost as a result of drought and other weather conditions.

If there is a real desire to reduce the overplanting of acreage allotments in corn and grain, then there is a much more effective way to go about it than the means proposed in the Holland amendment.

Take tobacco for example:

As a result of recent legislation, tobacco farmers who overplant their acreage allotments this year will have to pay a penalty of 75 percent of the parity support price on the tobacco that they produce above their allotment. In practice this means that a farmer must pay 40 cents per pound penalty on tobacco he produces over his allotment. When the average market price of tobacco is between 55 and 60 cents a pound—as it was last year—then a farmer cannot afford to pay 40 cents a pound penalty on that tobacco he produces over his allotment. If there is any way to keep a farmer from producing above his allotment then such a penalty as this is the way to do it.

In the case of cotton there is a stiff penalty, but it is not as rigorous as that on tobacco. Farmers are required to pay 50 percent of the parity loan rate on all cotton they produce over their allotment. In practice this means that a farmer must pay 16 cents per pound penalty on all cotton he produces over his allotment if the support price is 32 cents a pound.

If there is any one reason for cotton farmers staying within their acreage allotments, the penalty provision of the law is the reason—not the loss of ACP payments.

If there is a real desire to keep farmers from overplanting corn and wheat allotments, then the proper and effective way to go about it is working out a penalty program that is stiff enough to force farmers to lose money on the wheat and corn they sell above their allotments.

In the case of wheat the current penalty is about \$1.12 a bushel. In the case of corn there is no penalty because of the fact the Secretary of Agriculture has not declared marketing quotas for corn.

The effect of section 348 as it now reads can be seen in the following figures by North Carolina ASC officials:

At this time last year about 25 percent of the farmers in the commercial corn area of North Carolina had made application to participate in the ACP program. This year so far only about 6 percent of the farmers in the same area have made applications to take part in the program. This means that 75 percent of the farmers in the affected areas who took part in the soil conservation program last year have abandoned plans to do so this year. The reason is clear. The farmers in this area must have feed for their own livestock, and they will continue to grow their livestock feed, even if it means losing their ACP payments. Consequently, section 348 has not kept the farmers in these areas from overplanting. They have been overplanting in past years, and they will continue to plant to fill their needs. It does mean, however, that they are being forced out of the soil conservation program.

The soil conservation program is reaching only about 50 percent of the farmers in North Carolina now that it reached only 2 years ago. Because of the new regulations and changes in the program, only about 60,000 North Carolina farmers took part in the soil conservation program in 1954. In 1953, 112,000 North Carolina farmers took part in the program. In 1952 the number was even larger.

Thus, the trend is toward fewer farmers taking part in soil conservation. Instead of increasing the number of farmers who are taking part in the ACP, we are losing them year by year. If the Holland amendment becomes law, we will lose even more.

If the trend continues and steps are not taken to bring more farmers into the ACP,

then the entire program could well die on the vine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. How much time does the Senator desire to have?

Mr. THYE. I do not think I will take more than 3 minutes, or thereabouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am holding in my hand the report on H. R. 1573, calendar No. 218. On page 2 of the report there appears a letter addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In the letter will be found various places where the Under Secretary of Agriculture refers to the particular amendment before the Senate, but the most interesting and striking sentence of the letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse is:

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

The letter is dated February 9, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter of Under Secretary True D. Morse printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, because there have been so many statements made to the effect that we who are opposed to the amendment are trying to destroy some phase of the farm program.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 9, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in partial reply to your letter of January 19, 1955, requesting reports on certain bills relating to agriculture. We are herein reporting on S. 494, S. 517, and S. 532. These bills are identical and would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. This section which was amended by section 311 of Public Law 690, 83d Congress, provides that any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm, which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of the farm acreage allotment, shall not be eligible for any ACP payment. All persons applying for any ACP payment are required to file with the application, a statement of facts showing eligibility under this provision.

The Department approves of this proposed legislation. At present the only ACP payments made are for cost-sharing with respect to conservation practices carried out on farms, and these payments represent only a share of the cost of performing the conservation measure. There was a direct relationship between acreage allotments and a portion of the payments made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, prior to 1944, but it no longer exists. Also, the present average ACP amount of cost-sharing of less than \$100 is not large enough to be a strong incentive for farmers to comply with acreage allotments.

The principal effect of this restriction on ACP assistance will be to discourage conservation on family-type farms. Since it is expected that most farmers will comply with marketing quota provisions, the eli-

gibility requirement of section 348 will affect principally farmers with corn allotments and farmers with less than 15-acre wheat allotments. Under marketing quota requirements a farmer with a wheat allotment less than 15 acres is permitted to grow and harvest 15 acres of wheat without incurring a marketing quota penalty. This exemption, however, does not apply to the ACP eligibility requirement of section 348.

Based on past experience it is estimated that there will be about 750,000 farms with a 1955 wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres. A high percentage of these farms is expected to take advantage of the 15-acre limit and thereby become ineligible for 1955 ACP assistance. It is estimated that there will be 1,600,000 farms with a 1955 corn allotment. Based on the compliance obtained in 1954 it is likely that up to 60 percent, or almost 1 million farms, will have excess corn acreage in 1955 which would make them ineligible for 1955 ACP payments. Even though some farms with small wheat allotments also grow corn and would be included in both of the foregoing estimates, it is likely that substantially more than 1 million farms would not be eligible for ACP payments, due to the provisions of section 348.

Elimination of this entire requirement of eligibility is desirable. Its repeal would not require additional appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on page 3 of the report appears another letter addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. It is dated March 10, 1955, and is signed by Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary. Let me read one sentence:

With respect to the effect of this bill on section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, this Department recommends that the entire section 348 be repealed. The proposed bill would repeal only that part of the section which was added by Public Law 690, 83d Congress.

Mr. President, can you imagine what we are arguing about, when True D. Morse, the Under Secretary, proposes and advocates the repeal of section 348, and when the Acting Under Secretary, Earl L. Butz, proposes its repeal? I think that in itself should eliminate any question as to whether I am right when I urge the repeal of this particular section of the law, or whether the proposal to modify a provision of law the Department of Agriculture wants stricken out entirely is sound.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of March 10, 1955, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and signed by Mr. Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 12, 1955, for a report on S. 139, a bill to repeal the amendments to sections 348 and 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which were made by section 311 of the Agricultural Act

of August 28, 1954 (Public Law 690, 83d Cong.).

With respect to the effect of this bill on section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, this Department recommends that the entire section 348 be repealed. The proposed bill would repeal only that part of the section which was added by Public Law 690, 83d Congress. If S. 139 is enacted, the provision that a person comply with his cotton acreage allotment would remain in effect. It is the view of this Department that ACP's eligibility should not be conditioned on compliance with any of the acreage allotments. The principal effect of such restrictions is to discourage the carrying out of needed conservation work. This Department therefore favors the elimination of the entire eligibility requirement imposed by section 348 rather than elimination of the requirement for only a part of the crops with acreage allotments. More details of our recommendation are contained in our report to you with respect to S. 494, S. 517, and S. 532.

The Department recommends against the provision of S. 139 which would repeal the 1954 amendment to section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. That amendment directed the Secretary to provide a method by which a farmer who overplants any basic crop allotment may adjust the planted acreage to the farm acreage allotment. S. 139 would restore, in place of this provision, the last sentence of section 374 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was similarly worded except that it applied only to cotton.

Since the passage of Public Law 690, farmers have been expecting to be permitted to adjust their planted acreage to come within the allotment on each basic crop if they so desired. To change at this time, with respect to the 1955 crop, would lead to much dissatisfaction, misunderstanding, and administrative difficulty in connection with some crops, particularly corn and rice.

The Department believes that the provision for adjusting the planted acreage to the allotment should be applicable equally to all the basic commodities. In our opinion the provision in the present law should be retained.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the farmers of New York State do not raise a great quantity of grain, since New York is primarily a dairy State, but with respect to the grain which they do raise, they are not at all interested in support prices, since they sell virtually none of their grain in the market.

The grain which the farmers of New York raise is fed to poultry and other animals on the farms. The farmers have no interest whatsoever in price supports, but they have a very vital interest in soil conservation.

Soil conservation is practiced, and has been for a number of years, to the great advantage of the farms and the rural areas of the State. Within my lifetime I have personally seen the tremendously beneficial effect that soil conservation and reforestation have had on the farms and countryside of my State.

I do not want to see anything done which would take from the farmers of my State the benefits of soil conservation, in which they are deeply interested,

as are the farmers, I believe, in almost all other States.

Because of that fact, I shall vote against the Holland amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received scores of telegrams from farmers and from social clubs, all opposed to the Holland amendment. More particularly, the telegrams have made the prediction that we are due, either this year or next year, to have another dust-bowl area. Therefore, they, as well as businessmen, are interested in seeing that the soil conservation program is maintained.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think we can bring the debate to a conclusion with a few final observations I should like to make. The points have been made in substance, by those who have participated in the debate. I am particularly grateful for the arguments made here by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and other Senators who have expressed their views. I desire to leave none out. I think they have stated the case clearly.

One claim the Holland amendment proposal advocates take unto themselves as conclusive evidence in favor of the adoption of the proposal, is that when there is overproduction there must be penalty provisions to keep farmers in line so that they will not violate acreage allotments.

The interesting point was made this afternoon that the greatest amount of overproduction is in wheat, and it is the one commodity which the Holland amendment eliminates. I think the principle of divide and conquer has been used. That is, a special exemption has been made as to wheat farmers, and wheat is a commodity of which there are surpluses, and no exemption, which is meaningful, has been made with respect to corn, of which commodity there are no surpluses, or small surpluses.

I say the Holland amendment, instead of controlling production, would encourage it, and at the same time would do damage to soil conservation.

I have heard further comment today that farmers ought to comply. Of course, farmers ought to comply, if they can make a living; but one reason why farmers have not complied with acreage allotments is the high cost of farm operation and the reduced income from farm production.

It is perfectly true that the factor which is most controlling to a farmer is his personal economic situation. Therefore, many farmers have not complied with acreage allotments because they were not designed to benefit him or his family; nor did compliance make it possible for him to pay his bills.

I think it is most important that those who have complied with the acreage allotment laws are those who are basically

feeders, who are using their corn or grain for feed, and not for commercial uses in the normal channels of trade.

The Senator from Florida has emphasized the fact that the growers of cotton are in compliance. I think we owe a great deal of gratitude to the cotton farmers. In fact, if it were not for them we would not have had the price support program. They led the way and pointed the way. They not only have acreage allotments, but marketing quotas.

As has been stated on the floor, when there are in effect both acreage allotments and marketing quotas, compliance is enforceable. Farmers do not eat or feed cotton; therefore, the temptation or the necessity for going beyond the acreage allotment is not present.

We have been accused of following an irresponsible path by proposing repeal of section 348. I listened attentively as the distinguished Senator from Florida said that those who oppose the repeal of section 348 are following an irresponsible path. The distinguished Senator surely includes a great many people. The Secretary of Agriculture and the whole Department are recommending the repeal of section 348. The committee heard two witnesses who were sent by the Department of Agriculture, and who recommended the repeal of the section.

Mr. President, Representative HOPE, of Kansas, a Republican Representative, and an ardent champion of agriculture, is the author of the bill, now before us, to repeal section 348. The National Grange, one of the truly great farm organizations of the Nation, has recommended the repeal of section 348; and the Iowa Farm Bureau has also recommended the repeal of section 348. I do not believe that these great and steadfast people are following an irresponsible course of action.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that during the debate today I have heard it said again and again that in favoring the repeal of section 348, we favor a course of action which would promote law violation. It is interesting to me to note that the substitute proposal is not only one which would not require compliance, but that it has been amended a little so as to say, in effect, "Do not comply occasionally." In other words, the Senator from Florida is opposed to sin on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday; he skips Friday; but he is in favor of sin on Saturday and Sunday, because the Senator from Florida would permit escape for corn for ensilage purposes and for peanuts and for wheat. He would provide all kinds of escape hatches; but the trouble is that the escape hatches he would provide, and which would permit this economic sin to occur, do not help the people who need to be helped to escape. The escape hatches the Senator from Florida would provide do not provide for soil conservation.

Mr. President, I conclude my argument by saying that if we need more law on the statute books, so as to have acreage allotments enforced or so as to result in compliance with acreage allotments or marketing quotas, then let us write such a law, just as we did in the

case of certain kinds of tobacco. We did not say that the way to get the tobacco farmer to comply was to double the penalty, in terms of a denial of soil-conservation payments. If we need more law, in order to compel the farmers to obey and to comply with the acreage allotments and the marketing quotas, then let us write such a law. But let us not use the constructive, positive, progressive program of soil conservation as a stick or club or punitive measure to enforce a law which relates to price supports and crop loans.

Mr. President, the great tragedy in this debate, if it can be termed such, is that some Senators are trying to use the soil-conservation payment program as a weapon or a club with which to enforce acreage and marketing quotas in the price-support program. However, soil conservation and the price support program are not tied together.

Mr. President, I repeat that if we never had a price-support program on the statute books, we would still need soil-conservation payments. I regret to see Senators who have done so much for agriculture mislead themselves and attempt to mislead others by advocating a proposal which would weaken the soil-conservation payment program, which has constituted a great forward movement in the effort to provide a constructive policy with respect to the use and production of the great land resources of the Nation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Minnesota will join me in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and, following a quorum call, I shall suggest that the Senator from Florida and I join in requesting the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let us make that request now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the Holland amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has all the time under the unanimous-consent agreement been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the proponents of the amendment has been completely used; and the Senator from Minnesota has just yielded back the remainder of the time available to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. 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. HUMPHREY. 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 on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], on behalf of himself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "Nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "Yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "Yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "Nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF and Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would each vote "Yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—35

Alken	Frear	Payne
Allott	Goldwater	Potter
Anderson	Gore	Purtell
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bennett	Holland	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Schoeppel
Bush	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Kuchel	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Chavez	Millikin	Williams
Cotton	Pastore	

NAYS—49

Barkley	George	McCarthy
Bender	Green	McClellan
Bible	Hayden	McNamara
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Butler	Hill	Morse
Carlson	Hruska	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Daniel	Kerr	Scott
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Dworschak	Lehman	Thurmond
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Young
Ervin	Malone	
Fulbright	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—12

Beall	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Jenner	Murray	Wiley

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by Mr. HOLLAND, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the Senators in control of the time for debate prepared to yield back the time on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has expired. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 1573) was passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate has concluded its business today, it stand in recess until next Thursday at 12 o'clock noon.

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

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials published in various newspapers throughout the country dealing with the President's road plan.

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

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Morning Tennessean of January 19, 1955]

MR. BYRD HITS SHAM ROAD PLAN

"Thoroughly unsound" was Senator HARRY F. BYRD's verdict on the multi-billion-dollar highway program formally proposed to President Eisenhower last week by his advisory committee for a national highway plan.

The contemplated procedures, he added, would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." With a good deal of restraint he avoided the obvious word, "sham."

First among the Virginian's targets was the proposal to set up a Federal corporation to sell \$20 billion in Government-guaranteed bonds at 3 percent interest. The bonds would be retired from revenues from the 2-cents-a-gallon gasoline tax, and \$5 billion more would be raised by taxing filling stations and motels along roads.

This bond issue would cost taxpayers more than \$11.5 billion in interest, which would mean every dollar borrowed would eventually cost \$1.55. But to make matters worse in Senator BYRD's opinion, it is proposed that the bonds not be included in the regular Government debt figure. This would mean keeping two sets of books and pave the way for endless outlays for other building programs under the same formula of financial ledgerism. Furthermore, it is predicted, the bonds will probably not be paid

off at maturity, in keeping with the current idea on debt retirement.

Having had long experience with road building in his own State, Senator BYRD proposes an alternate plan.

First, he suggests that the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it. Secondly, the present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, should be continued on a long standing basis. This amounts to \$535 million. Further, the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued, and finally a 1/2-cent-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax be imposed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly would be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

"Under this plan," it is declared, "States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; \$11.5 billion would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

By comparison, the Byrd program stands out as a forthright approach to a major problem without an effort at financial trickery and misrepresentation of the kind that has been offered to Mr. Eisenhower. And as such, it is recommended reading for Gen. Lucius D. Clay, head of the presidential advisory committee, whose voice carries so much weight at the White House. Its importance is already conceded by the Democratic Congress.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel of January 17, 1955]

MR. BYRD WARMS UP

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a preliminary appraisal of the \$101 billion highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say:

"Legerdemain . . . thoroughly unsound . . . a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's Commission says among other things that if a Federal corporation is set up, and if that corporation sells \$20 billion worth of 30-year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Mr. BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that will mean the buyers must be paid back their \$20 billion plus \$11.5 billion in interest. And who will be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that isn't adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle, the whole setup looks about as sound as a chain letter.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of January 21, 1955]

GOLD BRICK HIGHWAYS

Senator BYRD has a plan for financing the \$100 billion, 10-year highway program proposed by the President's advisory committee. Instead of the gold-brick scheme devised by the committee, which would hike the

Federal debt without acknowledging it, the Senator suggests:

Repeal the two-cent Federal gasoline tax so the States may reimpose it and pay for their own highway construction. Use a Federal tax on lubricating oil and a new one-half cent tax on gasoline to finance the present Federal aid program for roads.

This, the Senator estimates, would save loading the cost of the program on future generations—with an additional price tag of \$11.5 billion for interest on the debt.

In the Senator's own State of Virginia, a first-class highway system has been built and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis—which makes it cheaper and doesn't indulge in the sleazy trick of passing on to the children our own obligations. What's wrong with Virginia's way?

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of February 25, 1955]

THEY'RE BUILDING ROADS AND BRIDGES

From all that is being said on the subject one might get the impression that road-building in the United States has come to a standstill.

But is the situation so bad that President Eisenhower's hundred-billion-dollar highway program should be put down as a must?

The fact is that throughout the United States, year after year, new roads and bridges are being built and the Nation's highway network is steadily expanding. This expansion may not be all that is desired, but it is taking place and as years go on the system of arterial and local routes will accommodate more and more traffic. It is costing vast sums of money, and it is a question whether the huge 10-year outlay so urgently recommended by President Eisenhower is advisable.

Under this 10-year program the Federal Government would provide about 31 of the \$101 billion, with the remainder coming from the State governments. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, pronounces it "just pure pork barrel" and says it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator BYRD's judgment to accept his verdict as confirming our own suspicions.

Either of its own volition or as a result of high pressure the administration is calling for programs that mean heavier and heavier Federal financial commitment—for roads, schools, and the like. It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an alarming scale, along with more demands upon the taxpayers. There ought to be a halt to it.

Should the administration's highway program be rejected it would not mean the cessation of roadbuilding. It might mean a longer time to reach the goal of entirely adequate highways, but it would proceed largely according to the needs and wishes of the various States.

All sorts of arguments are being advanced for this hundred-billion-dollar program. Some of them are specious. Most of them are answered by what is actually being done in the way of expanding the country's highway network.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of February 23, 1955]

ONE HUNDRED AND ONE ROAD BILLIONS

The President sent his mammoth highway-construction program to Congress yesterday, where it seems destined to stir one of the major controversies of this session. Some of the opposition already developing is deeply political, some is in sincere doubt over the fiscal formula and the inclusion of toll roads in the national-traffic plan.

The magnitude of the plan almost staggers imagination. Mr. Eisenhower recommends a 10-year building schedule which would em-

brace expenditure of \$101 billion in Federal, State, and local funds. Such a network of highways and streets would give America the greatest road system in the history of the world. It would be a tremendous prime for the country's industrial and economic group, a potent factor in raising the gross national product from around \$365 billion to the goal of \$535 billion in 1965.

Before submitting his recommendation to Capitol Hill, the President held a long conference with Democratic and Republican leaders of Congress. This was the first bipartisan meeting the White House has held with the legislators on a domestic issue. The gathering was friendly, but it ended with Democrats challenging several facets of the plan and promising a fight.

Senator CHAVEZ declared the proposal full of holes. Senator GORE, who has his own highway bill before Congress, objected to the financing setup, as did Senator BYRD, normally a pro-Eisenhower Democrat. Their criticism was mainly aimed at Ike's scheme for funding the Federal share of the huge program—about \$31 billion—through issuance of bonds, which would be retired over a 30-year period from taxes on gas and oil, and similar commodities.

The Gore bill would keep the present system of road financing, raising the Federal contribution from \$875 million to \$1,600,000,000 a year—less than one-fifth of the President's building program. Senator BYRD contends the bond interest would raise costs to Federal taxpayers about 55 percent. The American Automobile Association also opposes the fiscal plan, arguing it would force States to build toll roads or suffer loss of toll-road subsidies.

Although both parties have executed pledges to bar politics from the road program, inevitably Congressmen will feel the hot breath of political opportunism in a vast program involving billions on billions of tax dollars. The Clay report, which Mr. Eisenhower's proposition closely follows, would seek to guard against anything resembling pork barreling, and so, of course, would the President.

But the danger is inherent and will require many barriers. There is also the element of Democratic repugnance for so enormous a public-spending project, sired by the GOP administration, and likely to be well under way by 1956 elections.

One good portent, however, is that a general realization seems to exist in Congress regarding the need for a dynamic highways plan. Whatever conflicts arise over different features of the road prospectus, probably this Congress will launch a giant road-building venture. For its industry, economics, transportation, and strategic development, the Nation needs a highways blueprint similar to that envisaged by the President. It needs far more than the Gore measure offers.

No doubt the President expects some changes will be made in his imaginative plan. He observed in his message that inescapably the vastness of the highway enterprise fosters varieties of proposals which must be resolved into a national highway pattern. Presumably he expects amendment, alterations of his far-reaching recommendation. But a new, immensely more comprehensive road system looks to be in the works.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

WHICH ROAD IS RIGHT?

President Eisenhower's new highway message to Congress has this in common with a new highway: the citizen has to proceed to the end of it to make sure of the destination.

The first section of the message deals with the need for better highways in terms of common knowledge: traffic fatalities on un-

safe roads, high-cost transportation on slow roads, inadequate communications for defense. Most citizens will concur with the President that "action, comprehensive and forward-looking is needed."

Mr. Eisenhower then deals at length with the outline of a 10-year road program offered earlier by a special commission under Gen. Lucius D. Clay. This program calls for Federal-State expenditures of \$101 billion, and the core of the proposal is for the Federal Government alone to spend \$25 billion on the interstate-highway system.

Only in the last paragraphs of his message, however, does the President deal with the question which threw the Clay report into controversy. That is how to pay for this expanded Federal share in highway building. On this point Mr. Eisenhower is not nearly as specific as the Clay report.

General Clay's commission suggested establishing a Federal corporation to issue 30-year special road bonds at 3 percent interest. The bond debt would not show up in the Federal budget, yet the Government would be obliged to pay off the bonds.

Now Mr. Eisenhower says that "I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues," but he does not commit himself specifically to the Clay proposal. He appears to add a suggestion which the Clay group rejected: namely, that Congress earmark revenues from gasoline and other highway taxes to pay off bonds.

Since the President and his special commission seem to be in some disagreement as to just how to pay off a special highway bond issue, this aspect of the program is bound to cause some guesswork in Congress.

But congressional criticism of the Clay report has already shown that the main issue will not be how to finance bonds, but whether to issue special bonds at all.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, quoted in today's Mirror of Public Opinion, objects that such special bonds would be a subterfuge. Issued outside the budget, they would evade the debt limit and make the budget appear closer to balance than it really is.

Aside from that, this type of bond financing is far more expensive than the traditional pay-as-you-go method of highway appropriations. Senator BYRD estimates that in 30 years every dollar borrowed through bonds would cost the taxpayers \$1.55 because of interest payments.

One related question also has arisen to the bond proposal. Why is the administration willing to issue \$20 billion for a 10-year road plan, but has proposed to underwrite no more than \$900 million in school bonds, and has offered a health reinsurance plan of just \$25 million? Necessary as new highways are, should they have such great precedence over school aid?

Rumblings in Congress about these questions were not quieted by the last-minute White House conference with congressional leaders. This was the first time the administration had called in Democrats on a domestic program. But Presidential assistants said no major changes would be permitted in the program, so the purpose of the meeting was not consultation but a preview.

Since Congress had nothing to do with forming the road policy, that policy is bound to face critical examination as it goes before Congress. The Nation does not have to be told that it needs new highways. It ought to be told how it can get them economically, and that at least should mean keeping Federal highway costs in the Federal budget.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette of February 23, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending \$101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about \$25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for \$25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, February 23, 1955]

BIPARTISAN ROADS

Divided highways and divided politics flock together, if this week's Washington doings are any criterion.

On the one hand, for the first time outside of foreign affairs matters, a president took the unprecedented and praiseworthy step of calling in members of both parties to help solve our national highway crisis.

Simultaneously, Democratic Congressmen fell all over each other in their efforts to take potshots at the President's program and to develop makeshift, sectional, and partisan plans falling far short of needs.

In view of all the furor, it is not difficult to understand why Mr. Eisenhower gave the once-over lightly to the two most controversial aspects of his road blueprints, based on extended studies of the Clay Commission. They are:

Establishment of a Federal highway finance corporation to raise \$25 billion over 30 years (entailing additional 3 percent interest costs of \$11,500,000,000).

Reimbursing those States which have already built toll highways fitting into the national interstate system.

The President said only that he felt it sounder to finance the program by special bond issues rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations. This bumps head on into the objections of Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who cannot stomach what he terms legerdemain financing.

BYRD argues that we cannot saddle these road debts on our grandchildren because it is a violent assumption to predict the highway bonds will be retired upon maturity—no other long-term United States bonds have been within the past 25 years.

Be that as it may, roads are a matter of expediency. Right now we are wasting \$5 billion each year because of deaths, wear and tear, time loss, and other factors tied to a wholly inadequate highway system. Does the American public really care about the financial technicalities in such a pressing situation?

On the toll road score, helpful as it might be to Ohio to be repaid in part or whole, we think such a feature unfair to other less populous and wealthy States. In effect, this saddles State governments with excessive control over private businesses such as gas stations, restaurants, or motels, the necessary fixtures of limited access superhighways. Indeed, must motorists everywhere become the captives of bondholders?

Some unusual questions of constitutional law will also be raised by the President's highway recommendations. He suggests that the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gas tax be earmarked to retire the highway bonds. But can one session of Congress obligate succeeding sessions to continue any appropriation?

Regardless of the complications—and how silly it would be if the whole program fell by the wayside because of details or differences over methods—there is at least healthy agreement over objectives of the program.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of February 26, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending \$101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about \$25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for \$25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. They are falling farther below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) News of February 23, 1955]

HIGHWAY DEBT CANDOR

President Eisenhower's delayed highway message to Congress stated the case for a massive road-building program in dramatic and compelling terms, but glossed over the all-important subject of financing.

No one who has traveled the Nation's highways is likely to quarrel with the President's contention that a massive construction program is essential to business health, to the defense effort, and to the safety of human life.

By devising a \$30 billion Federal spending program designed to trigger another \$70 billion in outlays by the various States, the President's advisers have come up with a plan adequate to the need.

The difficulty is in finding a financial formula that will get the job done and still

suit congressional economy advocates, one that will build highways and yet square with the President's avowed aim of avoiding deficit finance. No such formula has been devised, nor is it likely to be. To attempt to mask Government borrowing by setting up new Federal agencies, as recommended by the Clay report, is pure sophistry and HARRY BYRD was justified in tagging it as such.

Rather than try to get something for nothing, the better course would be for the President to lay his plan frankly and honestly before the people with the candid concession that it will require an increase in the Federal debt. Then, with enactment of Mr. Eisenhower's proposed use taxes through increases in gasoline and diesel levies, the borrowed money could be retired at a lower interest rate than if it were borrowed by a dummy agency as proposed in the Clay report.

This is the honest and open way to do business, in full candor with a citizenship which time and again has demonstrated its willingness to meet needs once their urgency was made clear.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Times of February 11, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional \$25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra \$25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the "other side" of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed \$20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another \$11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal aid program as it is today to primary, secondary, urban road systems, on the longstanding matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) News of February 23, 1955]

CONGRESS MAY COMPROMISE PRESIDENT'S HIGHWAY PLAN

Congressional controversy over President Eisenhower's proposed highway-building program will center on the method of financ-

ing, for there is no reasonable question but what the size of the program is geared to urgent and clearly foreseeable needs.

The plan's scope was developed by Federal-State cooperation led by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The best highway and traffic thinking in the country went into that planning.

Briefly, the proposal is for a 10-year, \$101 billion new construction program, with the Federal Government financing \$31½ billion and State and local governments the remainder.

Distribution of projects would be \$37 billion urban, \$64 billion rural, which would give a deserved break for financially strained cities. Distribution of cost would be roughly a third for each level of government—Federal, State, and local.

Though a heavier load would be placed on State and local governments for matching outlays, the proposed increase in Federal aid would be far greater. The Federal share of overall highway work would be hiked from the current 9 percent to 30 percent. And the \$31½ billion proposed Federal aid over 10 years is estimated to be about four times what the Washington Government has spent for that purpose since its aid program was begun in 1916.

It is apparent that an expanded highway-building program of such magnitude could not be financed from highway-and-car-use taxation at current rates. President Eisenhower believes that source should shoulder the cost burden.

But, to avoid higher tax rates, the President joins the Clay committee in recommending financing with \$25 billion in 30-year bonds, not tax free, managed by a new Federal corporation and retired by pledging current and expanding billion-a-year revenues of related Federal taxation to that purpose.

After a backstage row among Presidential advisers and congressional leaders, the President tread lightly on that financing plan in his highway message. He thus virtually invited compromise, which seems the only salvation of the program in face of rising opposition.

Texas on the House Public Works Committee, to which the proposal will be referred, are all against bond financing, and they include a liberal Democrat, conservative Democrat, and Republican. That is a significant indication of Texas opinion.

Representative BRADY GENTRY, of Tyler, former chairman of Texas Highway Commission, objects that bond financing would add up to \$11 billion in interest to cost estimates. And he says that it would inflate highway-building prices to add further to total cost.

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, long-time Treasury watchdog, has denounced (1) the fiction that the bonds would not add to the national debt, (2) the impropriety of any Federal financing outside the regular national budget, and (3) the illusion that added highways can be had without added taxation. This, he argues, could set off a new wave of "something for nothing" Federal spending in other fields. And congressional opposition will center around his objections.

Texas should note that their State's mandatory pay-as-you-go financing would be hard-pressed indeed to match Federal bond-financed and tax-fund outlays. Other States constitutionally prepared to match such Federal spending with bond issues of their own might get a lion's share of the aid.

Likely prospect is that the Eisenhower highway plan will be scaled down to what can be met by moderate increases in highway-car-use taxation. That prospect could be altered only by the President throwing all his personal popularity vigorously into a fight for the bond plan, which appears most improbable.

[From the Mechanicsburg (Pa.) Local News of February 21, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional \$25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The Committee proposes that the extra \$25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The Committee would finance this project by borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting \$5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed \$20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another \$11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary secondary urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of February 23, 1955]

BILLIONS FOR HIGHWAYS

No long argument is needed to prove that the American people could make good use of \$101 billion worth of new highways. Present traffic jams and increasing number of motor vehicles prove the need for more and better road mileage.

President Eisenhower has added another reason for faster action on highway improvement. He points to the danger of deadly congestion in the event of atomic warfare and the need for rapid evacuation of large urban areas. The accident and death toll would be lessened if safer conditions obtained on the Nation's many thousands of miles of roads, Congress was told in a statement that came from the White House on Tuesday.

It costs money, said the President, to drive automobiles over poor roads. Higher transportation costs are reflected in the price of goods moved along the highways, said the President, so the consumer pays either way and it would be much better to spend money for new highways than to have it go to meet the higher costs occasioned by inferior road surfaces.

In the Eisenhower plan is provision for an outlay of about \$30 billion. States would provide twice that amount for a 10-year program. This vast expenditure would be financed by a bond issue and the debt would

be serviced and retired through Federal gas and oil tax revenue and, in some instances, by tolls. The proposal, in the main, follows the recommendation by a special advisory committee of which Gen. Lucius D. Clay was chairman, in which the country was urged to spend \$101 billion during a decade for highway construction.

At present there is a 2 cents per gallon Federal tax on gasoline and the greater part of that money is returned to the States as Federal aid for roads. The Eisenhower program is intended to be a supplement to what the States, with Federal assistance, are now doing. The National Government now refuses aid for roads on which tolls are charged. Connecticut is one of the States that have asked justifiably for a change in that policy. The Clay committee backs the critics of current practice.

Many Congress Members, Democrats and Republicans, like the idea of Federal aid for highways but they want the Government to raise all the money for such projects. A large proportion of them wouldn't mind if the national debt was thereby increased. This bond-issue idea is something else, especially since an independent agency is provided for to sell highway bonds and, it is insisted by the administration, such indebtedness would not become a part of the national debt. Economy exhorters, like Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, will claim that the bond plan seems to be an attempt to get around the constitutional debt limit.

Basic in all this discussion is the question as to how far American Government should go in financing capital improvements through the issuing of self-liquidating bonds. States have been doing that for some time. In Connecticut hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on roads, bridges, and buildings with debt retirement provided for through collection of tolls or other fees. Adequate income is probable in prosperous times, but there can be trouble ahead if the total of revenue bonds climbs to dizzy heights and national income dips.

Federal and State gasoline tax income and State motor vehicles fees yield huge sums for highway construction, but the total is inadequate. It is easy to suggest that such levies be raised to retire road bonds and the resistance of motorists might not be bitter so long as take-home pay includes a margin for those extras.

Debt is debt, though, whatever the euphemisms that prompt us to think of the new roads instead of the bonds. The Eisenhower proposition calls for bond-retirement payments over a 30-year period. Long before final expiration date we shall need even better and much more expensive highways. It would be better to plan repayment in terms of a decade at a time rather than a third of a century. And Connecticut, which in recent years has earned a splendid reputation for getting its money's worth from highway expenditures, might discover under a huge Federal program that many billions were being spent on debt charges and administration rather than road building.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Dispatch]
THE PRESIDENT PRESENTS HIS \$101 BILLION ROAD PLAN

The highway program as presented to Congress by the President is the program as recommended by his special advisory commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. It calls for the expenditure of \$25 billion more in Federal funds in the next 10 years than is now being spent, and \$54 billion more in all funds than the \$47 billion Federal-State expenditures under the present system. The objections to this program are not removed by the President's explanation and his emphasis upon the need for an expanded national highway system as a measure of defense.

One of the basic objections to the President's plan is that it would fan the flames of inflation. Though there would be no compulsion on the States to increase their expenditures to the amounts suggested by the Clay Commission, unquestionably they would be under pressure for large-scale increases in outlays. This would mean inevitably a large-scale increase in taxes in one form or another.

Another basic objection is one that has been raised by Senator BYRD. It is the objection to the manner in which the proposed Federal expenditures would be financed. The President, and the Clay Commission, have suggested that the expanded highway system would of itself increase traffic and produce additional revenue from the tax on gasoline and oil. The President proposes that special bonds be issued for the Federal expenditure, and that they be retired by these increased gasoline and oil tax revenues, and in some instances by tolls.

This would mean in the course of 30 years the expenditure of about \$11.5 billion in interest. And certainly there is no assurance that the bonds would be paid off at maturity. In any event, it would therefore mean a cost, not of \$25 billion, but of more than \$36 billion for this Federal project.

This plan would plunge the Federal Government deeper into a function which, essentially, belongs to the States. Like the proposed Federal aid program for education it would be an increased invasion of State functions. All such projects call for additional spending that means additional debt, or additional taxes, which is the same thing. It means more inflation, with its attrition upon the national economy. The road program is a good place, we think, for Congress to put its foot down on high and wide Federal spending.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of February 23, 1955]

AN INCLINATION TOWARD BONDS

Just about everyone agrees that highways across the Nation are dangerously inadequate for today's traffic.

So the question for public consideration is not whether to embark on a major building program but how to pay for it.

The Commission appointed by President Eisenhower to study the problem came up with the conclusion that \$101 billion ought to be spent in the next 10 years, of which the Federal Government should contribute about \$30 billion.

In passing these recommendations on to Congress yesterday, the President said:

"I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues, to be paid off by the above-mentioned revenues (taxes paid by highway users) which will be collected during the useful life of the roads and pledged to this purpose, rather than by an increase in general revenue obligations."

Assuming that a continuation of appropriations at the present rate would provide about \$10 billion in 10 years, the Commission suggested a month ago that a Federal highway corporation be created with authority to borrow the other needed \$20 billion.

This brought an immediate blast from Senator BYRD, who said, "such a procedure would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

Obviously, this was embarrassing to President Eisenhower and the Republican administration. BYRD's criticism was probably the reason for a 3-week delay in passing on the program to Congress and for the President's rather tentative approach to the bond proposal as evidenced by the words "I am inclined . . ."

As has been observed by others, there can be no doubt that if a Democratic admin-

istration had advanced such a financing plan, the Republicans would have jumped on it with both feet.

However, there is nothing partisan about the need for roads. Republicans and Democrats alike travel the highways. The traffic toll knows no party lines. Citizens of all parties will have to help pay for better roads—if and when they are built.

The public aversion to higher taxes being what it is, it is safe to assume that the extra expense involved in an accelerated highway building program is going to have to be financed with borrowed money.

That can come from either of two sources: (1) Special bonds as suggested by the President's commission, or (2) an increase in the public debt to take care of the increased deficits caused by larger highway appropriations.

So long as Congress and the public go into it with their eyes open and acknowledge the fact that the money is being borrowed, we, like the President, are inclined to go along with the bond program.

It seems to us to have the advantages of putting the highway building program on a more stable basis and at the same time keeping the debt in a more conspicuous position where it can be less easily ignored.

It would be a national tragedy if a stalemate over financing should result in failure of Congress this year to take any action to speed up construction.

Let the experts figure out the best way to raise the money. But, by all means, let's start building more and better roads.

[From the Massena (N. Y.) Observer of February 21, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Nobody will argue with the President when he says that the United States is "caught in a traffic jam." But several objections are being fired at the details of the White House \$100 billion program to get the Nation out of the jam.

Very shortly the President will send his program to Congress for action. Motorists, bus riders—just about all of us—have a stake in this Federal highway program, so let's take a short look at it and some of the objections.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is part of the President's proposal. The New York State Automobile Association says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should go ahead and spend the proposed \$750 million agreed on by both parties at Albany, says the NYSA, making sure that any increase in motor-fuel taxes is used to pay for better roads.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Virginia Democrat who now heads the Senate Finance Committee, also has an objection. He doesn't like the idea of tying up the revenues from Federal taxes on motor-vehicle fuel to pay for highway bonds. The Senator suggests that these Federal fuel taxes be cut so that the States can raise their own taxes on gasoline and diesel oil. That way, he says, the States can build these roads and control them. His idea is undoubtedly good, so far as it goes, for the bigger, more populous State. But will the smaller States be able to pay for their share of the roads we will need to carry the 80 million vehicles that will be crowding them within 10 years?

Even Senator BYRD and the group that support his distaste for the financing plans of the President's program do not come out flatly and say we do not need a national net of superhighways. That would be something like saying we do not need peace on earth. There seems to be recognition that we as a nation have committed ourselves to living on wheels. The problem is bigger than the ability of the separate States to cope with it. Whatever is done in this Congress to the

President's program, if the alterations result in putting off the solution, may be regretted by the whole Nation. Details may be altered, but some national program should be started.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of February 25, 1955]

ISN'T WASTE INFLATIONARY?

The administration's road program has been getting some dead cats thrown at it from various directions. Senator GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, has said it seems to be a \$25-billion program rather than a \$101-billion program—and he calls President Eisenhower's suggested financing plan "irresponsible." Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has called it "just pure pork barrel" and will oppose it as inflationary. Nor are theirs the only strident voices raised in criticism.

But those who, like the President, think there is a need for a major attack on this problem can take comfort in what the critics are not saying. They are not saying that the roads are not needed. Nor are they taking issue with the President's main argument, which is that the country cannot afford to do without a road system capable of carrying traffic efficiently now and in the future.

What does it cost not to have adequate roads? In his special message the President pointed to the 36,000 deaths that occur on our streets and highways each year. He said that to the home where the result of a traffic accident is a tragic gap in the family circle the monetary worth of preventing that death cannot be calculated. But "reliable estimates" put the money cost of traffic accidents at \$4,300,000,000 a year.

Then there is the increased cost of operating vehicles when a highway system is inadequate. According to many estimates, the President said, this burden is as high as a cent a mile. At that rate, we are paying around \$5 billion a year in tribute to inefficiency. What the cost will be when in 1965, when 180 million Americans will be operating 81 million motor vehicles, he did not predict; but it is obvious that the figure is bound to keep rising unless we build a system to do the job.

We are paying now, somehow, for our failure to keep pace with the problem. What can be more irresponsible than a refusal to come to grips with it? Can an investment that would cut down the cost of accidents and inefficiency by billions of dollars be called inflationary? Senators will have a hard time coping with those questions.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald of February 24, 1955]

FINANCING IS THE HURDLE

The President's 10-year, \$101 billion highway program met the expected reception on Capitol Hill.

There was accord with the administration on the need for a long-range, well planned, cohesive and integrated nationwide road program for the defense needs of the atomic age and to gear highway transportation to the national motor-car economy.

There was, however, opposition—which crossed party lines—to the President's plan of financing his recommendations.

The road building message was scheduled to go to Congress on January 27. On January 11, the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program was made public. It immediately provoked opposition because of its financing methods. The President wisely delayed sending up his message until he could analyze the objections.

The President stuck by the committee's report. Yet he did not insist on the financing method, to which the Democrats sharply

object and which many Republicans do not find to their liking.

He did not back down. He simply said he was inclined to favor the committee's money-raising plan.

The committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, proposed that a Federal highway corporation be formed. Its purpose would be to float \$20 billion of bonds. These securities would not be considered part of the Federal budget. They would be retired from the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. An additional \$5 billion would be raised from fees paid by gasoline stations, motels and other roadside businesses.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, argued that the scheme would completely destroy the budget and the Federal debt limitations:

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

The Senator's fears are not unfounded. After the weeks of discussion between the formal submission of the program and the publication of the Clay committee's report Congress should by now fully understand that the financing, which the President is inclined to favor is a historic and drastic departure from the country's past fiscal policies.

The country stands in immediate and in some ways critical need to modernize the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways.

Those who do not approve the suggested financing, should concentrate on producing an acceptable policy that will remain within traditional fiscal methods, yet provide the improvements that the President urgently recommends.

[From the Madison (Ky.) Messenger of February 5, 1955]

TRAFFIC JAMS IN BIG HIGHWAY PROGRAM

People in our area who have been reading about the vast highway program which has been proposed in Washington—and about the vast outlay of billions of dollars which the vast program entails—are aware that U. S. 41, which is of a lot of consequence here, is not included in the plans.

As we have said before, maps which show the routes under consideration by the President's advisers stress, so far as Kentucky is concerned, a mighty proposed highway between Louisville and Nashville. Apparently the route leaves Kentucky and enters Tennessee at Franklin, Ky., or thereabouts.

We are told from Washington that the Nation must more than double its spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic. White House advisers on the subject have placed the cost at about \$101 billion, but as usual in such cases there are critics.

For instance, a sharp attack on one phase of the program has been made by none other than able, influential Senator BYRD, of Virginia, whose ability with a sharp pencil is questioned by no one. The feature which the Virginia Democrat criticizes is the \$20 billion 30-year 3-percent-bond issue recommended by the administration, together with the proposed Federal corporation which would float the bonds. Pressure groups for and against the vast highway plan are choosing up sides, and Washington expects plenty of fur to fly when the mighty project gets to the debating stage.

Another point of criticism which the Messenger has seen in the papers is the proposal to continue the Federal gasoline tax as one major source of Federal revenue. This is favored by such interests as the railroads, which argue that highway should be self-supporting through use charges. However, as is pretty well known repeal of the Federal gasoline tax is being urged by farm and truck spokesmen, who insist that collection of gas taxes should be left to the

States, which are having their own financial troubles, too.

As another phase of the big dispute which is shaping up over this vast new road program, some of the States are already worrying about how they are going to dig up their share of the \$31 billion provided by the White House program. Some have been building roads on a pay-as-you-go basis, since their constitutions forbid issuing bonds for the purpose. Others have gone into debt for roads already built or now being built, and in general the States are spending all they take in, already, and some are spending more.

With schools, hospitals, and other public agencies and services badly in need of billions of dollars, too, it becomes that a controversy over details of the highway plan is shaping up—a controversy that will match in size the vast building program itself. Already those specialists who have highways as their principal concern are becoming convinced that although the need for roads is one of our present big needs, mighty traffic jams are going to develop when Congress gets down to studying the Eisenhower program.

We are a long way, in other words, from a hundred billion-dollar outlay for highway construction.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1955]

MEETING THE NATION'S NEEDS

It doesn't take too much imagination to see that in a dynamic and growing country like the United States it will be necessary to spend many billions of dollars in the next generation in building anew the facilities by which we live.

The list of things to be done will include highways, schools, houses, electric power facilities, hospitals, and airports; indeed the list is almost endless.

Thus when President Eisenhower says that this country in the next few years is going to require a vast expansion in its roads, he is speaking of a need that is very real and plain to see. When he puts the cost at a hundred billion dollars he may even be underestimating; in any event it will be a very large sum.

The question is not of need but of the best way of meeting it. The best way of seeing that we get the right kind of roads in the right places. The best way of paying for them.

And it is here that Mr. Eisenhower's highway program, as he himself suggests by the tentative way he puts it forward, raises some very serious questions.

For this is a proposal that says, first, that this is a need which can be met only by another vast Federal spending program. And secondly, that the Federal cost should be met by some hocus-pocus bookkeeping that would hide from the people the nature of what is being done.

Senator BYRD and others have already had something to say about this bookkeeping. The proposal is for the Federal Government to borrow some \$25 billion from the public, spend it on roads, but then pretend that it has added not 1 penny to the Federal debt. It would do this by setting up a Highway Authority which would do the actual borrowing but whose debts would be guaranteed by the Treasury just like any other Federal debt.

This would simply be a bit of shenanigans to get around the legal limit on the Government's debt. And if it can be done for highways then of course it can be done for those other things, schools, hospitals, and the like. This would open the way for a Federal bookkeeping system that would be essentially dishonest because it would offer the pretense that a debt isn't a debt.

Yet there is more to this program that ought to be looked at than the bookkeeping.

For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the planning and paying for the Nation's roads a Federal responsibility.

It offers the plea, in effect, that if the Federal Government doesn't provide us with the new roads we won't get them. And this in the face of the fact that the roads we now have were built by the cities, counties, and States with but the smallest participation of the Federal Government.

At the end of the First World War there were barely 387,000 miles of paved highways in all the United States. The total amount spent in 1919 on highway construction was only \$429 million.

Today our highway system covers 3,366,000 miles and represents an investment of nearly \$50 billion. The expenditure of States and other local authorities for new roads is some \$3 billion a year and steadily rising. And all this without benefit of any grandiose Federal bureau and, indeed, with very little money from the Federal Treasury. In 1952 Federal aid amounted to only \$45 million out of \$2.8 billion spent on roads.

Certainly the building of our future highways will be a stupendous job and there is much the Federal Government can do to help—one thing would be to take less from taxpayers so that the States would not be so hard pressed for funds.

But to say the Nation's needs can be met only by Federal planning and Federal taxes is to deny both our tradition of local government and the history of its success.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the junior Senator from Minnesota to the motion I am about to make.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 217, S. 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment. On page 1, line 11, after the word "years", to insert "The Administrator shall, within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving central station electric service.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That (a) section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903), is amended by striking out subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years. The Administrator shall, within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving central station electric service."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 3 of such act is redesignated as subsection (d).

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 904), is amended by striking out "the provisions of sections 3 (d) and 3 (e) but without regard to the 10 percent limitation therein contained", and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator's amendment a substitute for the entire bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator that it is not in order at this time.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is now in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsections (c), (d), and (e) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903 (c), (d), and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service. The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 75 percent of such annual sums shall be available for rural electrification loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unob-

ligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator during the balance of such fiscal year and in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 percent" and inserting "25 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment would prescribe a different formula from that which now exists and which was originally adopted in 1936.

The present Rural Electrification Act has a very strict formula which was designed at the time of the passage of the act to insure that there would be funds available for each and every State in the Union for purposes of REA loans. The present act provides that 50 percent of the annual sums made available and appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in proportion to the total number of farms in the United States not then receiving service.

Then the present formula goes on to provide that the remaining 50 percent shall be available "without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as in the opinion of the Administrator may be effectively employed for the purposes of the act."

What my amendment does is to change the formula from a 50-50 ratio to a 75-25 ratio.

Mr. President, I should like to yield to the sponsor of the proposed legislation, my senior colleague, but may I say, first, that it was felt by the Rural Electrification Administration and the rural electrification cooperatives that the rigid formula which was established by the act of 1936 was no longer operative or effective. In fact, the rigid formula of 50 percent being available to the States on the basis of the number of unelectrified farms in those States placed a burden upon REA in terms of not providing adequate funds for the kind of rural electrification program we need today, with new generating plants and firming up of power lines.

The formula which I have suggested will give the REA Administrator 75 percent of all funds for his discretionary use to carry out the purposes of the act, as compared with the former formula of 50 percent. The amendment would provide 25 percent of the funds appropriated in a special category to be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of nonelectrified farms as related to the total farm population.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no fixed objection to the amend-

ment which the Senator from Minnesota is offering, but may I inquire whether this change was brought before the committee and discussed in the committee at all?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was not. But I respectfully suggest that I have discussed it with several members of the committee, including the chairman of the committee. There has been a feeling amongst some of our colleagues who are deeply concerned about the program that a formula such as was originally contemplated might very well leave certain States without adequate services. Furthermore, I consulted with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Electrification [Mr. RUSSELL], and both of them felt that there should be some formula of the kind suggested. In fact, they advised and counseled that it would be extremely difficult for the Appropriations Committee to do the job required of it unless there were such a formula.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no particular quarrel with that point of view, although it seems to me that in the normal course of legislating it might have been preferable, at least, to have the proposed amendment laid before the committee so there could have been some discussion of it, because we have today what appears to be a rather substantial amendment, which was read, but which has not been printed, and which is not available for study by Members of the Senate. I am not constrained to ask that the matter go over, but I think it is a fairly substantial amendment to be presented without any copies of it being made available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Basically I agree with the Senator's observation. I reported from the committee a bill which removed all the restrictions; in fact, it was that particular bill which I favored. However, after not only 1 day, but many days, of consultation with Members who were deeply concerned about the matter, and also after consultation with representatives of the Rural Electrification Administration itself, as well as with representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, it was agreed that some formula which would give more leeway to the Administrator would be acceptable.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say to the Senator from California, if he will give me his attention, and to other Senators that the proposal to abolish entirely the money distribution formula came from the committee. But I was one who opposed the outright abolition of the formula, not only as it might apply to my State of Mississippi, but also because it took the Committee on Appropriations entirely out of the picture.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had somewhat the same viewpoint, as did the chairman of the subcommittee. No one opposed the modified formula.

The amendment which has been offered is along the same lines as the committee bill, except that it does not change the present law so much. The amendment, therefore, is more conservative, by a considerable degree, than is the committee bill, and is not a departure from the standards which have been approved for 20 years.

In that respect, the amendment is a proper one to be offered now, although I am opposed to the bill entirely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is the principal sponsor of the bill which was reported by the committee, and also the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is likewise a sponsor of the bill, possibly would like to make known at this time their views of the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 153 because I believed that the earmarking or restricting provision in the act allocating certain sums of money was having the effect of actually impounding funds which were never used, and that there was great need of funds in some areas where there was an inadequate supply of energy, or in areas where there should be generating plants, or an expansion or enlargement of facilities in order to provide an adequate supply of electrical energy.

We did not interfere with the funds impounded in certain States which were allocated or earmarked for those States. We felt that what should be done was to retain the earmarking provision in the act, and to trust to the good judgment of the Administrator of the REA to allocate the funds wherever approved REA projects existed.

In the first place, a project must be developed by a user; and if it is an economically feasible project, and is approved by the Administrator of the REA, the funds are then made available.

I think the Nation has been plentifully covered with REA associations. There are now only isolated areas which need to be taken care of, and they are being taken care of whenever it is economically feasible to extend transmission lines to them. For that reason, I have thought that the act itself had really reached its maturity.

We have never questioned the amount of money which has been requested and for which need has been shown. Whenever a project was proved to be necessary, Congress appropriated the funds for it. There has never been a misuse of the funds. I think the REA has the best record of any governmental activity with respect to the expenditure of funds, and also as to the benefits it has conferred, and the services it has rendered in the development of the various REA associations.

I became apprised only in the last 30 minutes of the amendment which has just been offered. I do not know what the attitude of the REA would be with respect to it. I have not had an opportunity to examine the amendment sufficiently to know whether it would con-

tinue the restrictive measures which were recognized as being undesirable. However, in the case of a State which still has a number of farms which are not electrified, I can foresee that there might be concern with respect to the percentage of the annual appropriation which is earmarked for that State.

But, in the main, I believe the fears are unfounded. I do not believe any member of the Committee on Appropriations or any official of the REA would deny to any community the right to funds with which to construct REA lines, if it were proved that the project would pay its way and pay for itself.

Therefore, I think the amendment offered by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may not be necessary. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, I would be willing to go on record as saying that at any time the committee had before it a request for a regular or a deficiency appropriation, and if it could be proved that there was a community anywhere in the United States which was qualified to receive an REA line, but a question of funds was involved, such an appropriation would be favorably acted upon.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], is concerned, and rightfully so, about some areas within his own State. I commend him for his concern. I think possibly he had much to do with the offering of the amendment, because I know he objected when the bill was called up for consideration on the unanimous-consent calendar.

I know of the great concern of the Senator from Mississippi for the farmers and others in his State who might at some time desire to become affiliated with an REA association. That is all to his credit.

But I believe the REA has grown up. I do not believe the proposed restriction is necessary. If there is any intention of voting on the question this afternoon, I would urge that a vote not be taken until I have had an opportunity to get an expression of the views of the REA in the matter.

I do not want to see continued a restrictive measure which in the past has proved to be unwise. I know that thousands and thousands of dollars have been earmarked to different States which could not suggest a project. They had nothing to propose, but they simply wanted to have a generating plant.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the bill and his understanding of my concern in the matter.

Under the terms of the amendment, is it not true that 75 percent of the money appropriated would be invested entirely in the discretion of the Administrator of the REA, subject only to one limitation, namely, that he could not spend more than 25 percent of the 75 percent in one State? That is the purpose of the amendment now before the Senate.

The other 25 percent would be subjected to the formula for 6 months only. If it was not used or applied for by the

States within a 6 months' period, the money would then revert to the general fund and could be used only in the discretion of the Administrator.

That is going far by way of compromise to meet the terms of the Senator's bill. It leaves only a fragment of a formula under which Congress can make an appropriation. Otherwise, there would be no restraints, no restrictions, and no control whatsoever. Congress would appropriate money which could be used in the discretion of the REA.

Frankly, I think we would be going backward, at least by one step, to abandon the entire formula. So the amendment is more acceptable, in that it retains at least a fragment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, my reply to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is that the money was earmarked in the first place because there was such a crying need in every area of the United States. Then a question arose as to whether a State was a little tardy in developing a project. The question of who would use the money was not involved, because no other State would be given the funds.

We have gone through that stage. We are no longer in that development period. For that reason I believe we could trust any administrator of the REA, because he has to come before the Appropriations Committee at the next regular appropriation session, which is no more than 12 months from any particular date. If the Administrator had been in error in the manner in which he had been in error in the manner in which he had administered the program the previous year, we could always write restrictive measures into the law.

I have not had a chance to study the amendment, but on the surface of it, if the restriction of 6 months were adopted, I am wondering whether, in controlling the operation for 6 months we would again be imposing a restriction which would be administratively unwise. If the REA could examine the proposal overnight, then at the next session of the Senate, which will be on Thursday, as I understand, we could determine whether we desired to act on it.

I have no pride of authorship of the bill. I merely took the Department's recommendation and embodied the recommendation into the bill. I introduced it, and it went to a subcommittee. The subcommittee studied it, and it is now on the floor with its recommendation. The bill came up on a call of the calendar. It was objected to. This afternoon there is before the Senate what is absolutely a substitute proposal. I have not had a chance to look at it.

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

Mr. THYE. I shall conclude my remarks with the statement that it may be that the Department will accept the proposal as one under which it will be administratively possible for them to do a good job. If that is the case, it is perfectly all right. The Department may say it is not what it hoped for, or what it thought should be done. I should like to have a report from it. All I ask is that the proposal go over

until we may obtain a report from the Department. It may turn out to be perfectly acceptable to the Department.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is not trying to push the passage of the bill; the Senator from Mississippi is against the passage of the bill.

Mr. THYE. I know the Senator is.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is against the bill, but as a matter of getting the question settled, I agreed not to oppose the amendment. That is my position. I shall speak at length upon the wisdom, as I see it, of retaining the formula.

Mr. THYE. I answer my good friend, and I say "good friend" with all sincerity, in this manner: If there are funds earmarked here and there throughout different States, as the act now provides, and if a generating unit is needed in a certain region, which might comprise 3 or 4 States, funds are impounded under a restrictive provision in the act. One area might have a deficit of current, and there would be no way the administrator could recognize that there was a deficit, and administratively take care of it.

If the State of Mississippi needed 25 percent of an allocated sum of money for a 6-month period I would not deny that to Mississippi; but the restrictive provision in the act makes it impossible to meet the needs, when for instance, the greater problem might be that of increasing the capacity of rural lines or providing more generating capacity in an area comprising perhaps several States, because there was not available either the current to meet the load demand or there was not in existence a line which could carry the load it was required to carry in order to serve users on that line.

Most of us who put electricity in our homes 20 or 30 years ago thought we would probably use only a few thousand kilowatts. Now we find ourselves using 7, 8, 10, and 100 times what we anticipated we would need. It means the lines have to be increased in their carrying capacity.

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

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say first I fully agree with the position just taken by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] to the effect that the amendment should lie over until we can all examine it. Certainly, I particularly agree with the position taken by the Senator from Mississippi, to the effect that this is something which requires all of us to be extremely cautious.

As I understand the matter, the bill as reported would permit the Administrator of the REA to funnel the whole amount available under an appropriation into 1 or 2 or 3 States.

I cannot imagine anything more potent or more tempting, from the political standpoint, to cause REA to be made a political plaything, which of course it has not been, and I hope the Senate will see fit to let the matter lie over.

By way of one additional comment, if I may put it in the Record, I should like to say this bill was reported by the com-

mittee apparently on the same day the bill the Senate just acted on was reported. I was unable to be present. I have never heard of it before. As I understand the content of the proposal, it would completely destroy the formula under which we have lived very happily, and would ignore the fact that replacements of weak lines of a distribution system by stronger ones are needed everywhere, even in those States electrified to a very high degree.

I certainly hope we can come up with a sound formula rather than a weak formula, because it would tend to make the whole system subject to political control and manipulation, if such desire were present.

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator believe that before we act on the proposal we should have a report from the department?

Mr. THYE. That is my position. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would like to permit the act to remain as it has been, and I can appreciate his views. For that reason, it is not a question whether the Senator from Mississippi desires to have the proposal acted on or not. I personally want to have an opportunity to look at the amendment which is before the Senate, and should like very much to have a departmental report on it. I am in no hurry. All I wished to do by introducing the bill was to try to help the REA function more efficiently and do a better job in the various States and areas of the Nation which are affected. That was my only concern. So I hope we can let the bill go over to a later date.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am unable to express an opinion on the proposed amendment, because I have never seen or heard of it until this afternoon. The original bill was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota and two of his colleagues last January, and was referred to a subcommittee, which held hearings, at which time anyone who was interested could appear and express his opinion on the bill. As I recall, the farm organizations were in agreement on the bill, including the amendment, which was included by the subcommittee, and it cannot be too bad when the Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers Union advocate the same provisions. However, the bill went to the full committee; and, as I recall, was reported without opposition, although no doubt not all members of the committee were present at that time.

The purpose of the bill is to get away from exorbitant appropriations which would be necessary in order to meet the needs of each State under the old allocation law. For instance, last year it was impossible to meet the requirements of Colorado and Illinois; it would have been necessary to have appropriated \$450 million in order to give them what they really needed under the formula.

So it is generally agreed by those who have been interested in rural electrification work—and as I have said, the farm organizations, the National Rural Elec-

tric Cooperative Association, and all other groups in this field take the same position—that at this time the formula is a drawback, rather than an asset, as regards carrying on the work of the REA.

However, I do not know what would be done by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. It is proposed, I assume, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota did not offer it in his own behalf, I take it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield at this point?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, the Senator from Vermont knows that I happen to agree with the bill, as it was reported from the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, I wish to say it is one bill regarding which we had no opposition from any witness.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose in offering the amendment, Mr. President, is to give the Senate an opportunity to review the effect of such a formula, as compared to what I call an open-end authorization, as provided by the committee.

I have no doubt in my own mind that the REA administrators, whoever they may be, will "play it square" under this arrangement. Certainly we have nothing to indicate to the contrary. I felt that with the REA associations and the Farm Bureau and other interested groups getting together on the bill, it must be a rather good one.

Let me say it is not my view that we should attempt to have the Senate act on the bill tonight.

As to the amendment, I think it is an equitable one; if a formula is desired, I think the amendment proposes as good a formula as we can find. But I believe we would be derelict in carrying out our responsibility if we were to attempt to hold the Senate in session tonight and to have the Senate act on the bill tonight. I believe the Senate should take a recess until Thursday, by which time we can obtain word from the REA associations and other interested groups in our respective States; and then we shall be in a much better position to legislate on this subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement that the REA administrators have been absolutely fair and square; and certainly that statement applies to Mr. Cooke and to Mr. Wickard and to Mr. Nelsen, who is following in the steps of Mr. Wickard. I have no complaint at all about them. I cannot conceive that any administrator of this great agency would be unfair to Mississippi or to any other State. In fact, I would be surprised if some States, and possibly Mississippi is one of them, would not fare much better under the bill, rather than under the present formula.

However, we should know what is in the amendment, which is in the nature of

a complete substitute. We should hear from the Rural Electrification Agency and from Mr. Nelsen, as to whether the amendment contains any administrative bugs; and then we can determine what we wish to do about the matter.

But I believe we should amend the law, so that we shall not have to make enormous appropriations of funds, possibly as large as \$500 million, in order to give one State what it needs under the formula, whereas otherwise \$150 million or \$175 million a year would suffice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to underscore and emphasize what the amendment provides, so the RECORD will be crystal clear for those who will study it during the next few days.

The amendment provides that 75 percent of the total appropriation shall be within the discretion of the Administrator. The other 25 percent, which will be allocated under the formula, will be restricted by the formula for 6 months; and if during the 6 months' period the States which are entitled to participation under the formula have not used all their funds, as thus allocated, then the total sum thus remaining will revert to the 75 percent fund, which could easily mean that the Administrator during at least 6 months of the year would have 100 percent discretionary authority, complete control, over the entire appropriation.

The purpose of the formula—which, by the way, was discussed with representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has felt very strongly about this matter—was to protect the States which as yet have not been able to catch up with the full development of rural electrification, and to give them the consideration they justly deserve.

The second purpose of the formula was to make sure that out of the total appropriations, there would be reasonably controlled distribution, thereby limiting any one State to not more than 25 percent of the total appropriation. I think that is a rather fair limitation.

Previously, I said that I, personally, felt that we could well support, and could do so with honor and validity, an open-ended authorization, so to speak, by which I mean removing all restrictions; and that is what was requested by the former Administrator of the REA and also by the present Administrator.

But there are those who feel that for the purposes of controlling the appropriations, it would be desirable to have a formula which would relieve the Administrator of any necessity to pass judgment on each and every project contemplated, because the formula will provide that authority for the REA Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill, as reported, as I recall—having read it here on the floor, since it was called up—provided that any unused or unallocated funds appropriated might go over to a subse-

quent year or subsequent years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment, as offered by the Senator from Minnesota as I have read it hastily, does not so provide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; because at the end of 6 months, if any unallocated funds are available, they will revert to the general fund.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, they will revert to the 75 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the 75 percent may go over to a subsequent year or years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and the 25 percent, if not used during the 6 months' period, can also go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, whatever is left at the end of the year, out of the total amount, can go over to a subsequent year or years. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the amendment, whatever is left from the 25 percent will go to the 75 percent, and then will go over to a subsequent year or years, will it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. So, Mr. President, under the discretion of the Administrator, the fund may very well build up, at least if anything from the year's appropriation is left over. In other words, if the appropriation for the fiscal year 1956, let us say, was not used under the 25 percent limitation of the formula, any of the 25 percent thus remaining would go into the category of the 75 percent of the total appropriation under the discretion of the Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. The original bill sounded a little simpler.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because it did not provide for the 75-percent and 25-percent categories. I believe those categories are responsible for a little of the confusion which has developed in the minds of Senators.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I was profoundly in support of the original REA Act, and I believe it has provided one of the greatest programs for the benefit of agriculture. I would not wish to have anything in its operations restricted beyond a reasonable extent. Therefore, I believe it is wise for this matter to go over until Thursday, so that Senators may study it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the modified formula, as presented, does more for the farmers, under the REA, than the present formula could ever do. The modified formula, as presented, will release millions of dollars of locked-up funds, and will provide the Administrator with almost unlimited authority to use the funds for developmental projects, but at the same time with insistence, in the best meaning of the word—in other words, with a cautious concern on the part of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]—that the program

be deemed desirable. That is why the amendment was submitted.

There are Senators who felt that the Senate should have a choice between a well-considered formula and an open-ended authorization to the Administrator, with no formula.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. How is it proposed, between now and Thursday, to obtain reports from the administrator and the farm cooperatives whose views are to be sought?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the amendment which was presented was developed in cooperation with the representatives of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. That is the national association.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am familiar with that association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have not had an opportunity to take this particular amendment up with the National REA Administration under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I wish to say, however, that I have consulted by telephone with one of the officers of the REA, and while the REA officials have not given their approval, they have not given a negative reaction. I feel that it is the duty of the subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be chairman, to consult the REA officials in the Department and obtain their views, as well as the views of any other agency interested. I shall certainly do that between now and Thursday, and present those views to the Senate.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and other Senators who have contributed to the substitute, which provides some sort of legislative standard. I was very apprehensive about the original bill, which provided for a lump-sum authorization. It is all well and good to say, "We know that the Administrator will not do this, or will not do that." That is the kind of argument which brings about government by men rather than government by law.

It is the function of the Congress to provide some kind of standards, if possible to compose a standard, which will give some measure of protection to every section of the country.

It has been almost the unbroken history of Government that lump-sum authorizations, which call for lump-sum appropriations, without the benefit of budget estimates as to breakdowns, have brought about earmarking by the Congress. It is much better to have some simple standard at the outset than to bring about a wild scramble on the part of the members of the Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress to try to have their own particular projects earmarked.

I have handled appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration for

18 or 20 years. It is my opinion that it is much better to have certain standards, simple though they may be, and even though they may be accompanied by escape clauses to permit the funds eventually to be channeled at the discretion of the REA Administrator, than to appropriate \$150 million to \$160 million out of hand, and say to a particular individual, "Here it is; allocate it as you see fit."

In the long run I think it will serve the interest of all those who are interested in promoting the work of this agency, which has, perhaps, in some respects been the greatest accomplishment of the so-called New Deal, and which has brought about more permanent good than any other agency, to have it operate under certain simple standards. Certainly, that could interfere with the administration of the agency in any way, but such standards would serve to protect us from a situation in which the Congress undertakes to earmark funds in years to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Those are reassuring words. There is no more staunch advocate or friend of the REA in the Congress than the Senator from Georgia.

As the Senator knows, I respected his judgment in this matter, and sought his counsel and advice, as I did that of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I feel that between now and Thursday, if we have an opportunity to look the situation over, we can reconcile any differences there may be, and report a bill for the good of REA. That is what we are really interested in. We want the REA to move ahead, and not be in any way encumbered with standards or formulas which will restrict its operations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], we had another schedule for Thursday. It was our understanding that the pending bill would be acted upon today. It was the opinion of the majority leader that an agreement had been reached between the two Senators from Minnesota and the Senator from Mississippi. Now we are confronted with a problem. It may very well be that the conference report on the reciprocal trade extension bill will soon be ready. We have assured other Senators that proposed legislation in which they are interested will be considered on Thursday.

Is it the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee that much time will be consumed on this subject on Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that the junior Senator from Minnesota has had a most difficult assignment with this particular bill. I have been trying to reconcile some of the conflicts of opinion in the Senate. I felt, and still feel, in view of the expression of some of our colleagues, that it would be a bit unfair to a number of them to try to remain in session and force a vote upon this particular issue before they have had an opportunity to read the printed record and

obtain an expression of views from any persons they may wish to consult.

Therefore I respectfully request of the majority leader that the pending bill be made the first item of business on Thursday, if he can so arrange it, unless a conference report or some other privileged matter intervenes. I am sure that my senior colleague [Mr. THYE], who is the principal author of the original bill, will wish to expedite action, as will the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I can assure the majority leader that my debate on the question will certainly be limited. All I wish to do is to determine whether anyone objects to the restriction which would be imposed by the proposed amendment. I wish to give the REA Administration in the Department an opportunity to examine the amendment and submit a report on it. The reading and explanation of the Department's report will constitute any argument I desire to advance.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as one of those who have worked on this subject, and as one who does not wish to delay action merely for the purpose of delay, I feel compelled to serve notice that I oppose the bill as reported by the committee, and that I reserve the right to oppose it without limitation.

However, I think there should be some modification of the present formula, and I would approach the subject with that view in mind. I am willing to try to agree on a proposal which I think meets the requirements, as reflected by the present amendment. I, too, believe that under the circumstances it would be well to postpone consideration of the bill for the purposes suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no desire to rush the Senate into action on this bill or any other bill. I wished to inform Senators that we had made certain plans for Thursday. I hope those plans will not have to be entirely laid aside because of the necessity of spending the day on this bill. If Senators who are interested in the bill can utilize tomorrow, while the Senate is in recess, to obtain the information they need and come to an agreement, we can spend a reasonable amount of time on Thursday discussing the bill and trying to have action taken upon it. If not, we may have to keep our commitments to other Senators and to proceed to the consideration of other measures.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

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

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the recess following today's session, duly enrolled bills passed by the two Houses.

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

DEDICATION OF PORTIONS OF INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I can save time on Thursday by placing certain material in the RECORD at this time. I shall require approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. President, at the joint suggestion and invitation of the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, a United States delegation left Washington on Thursday, May 5, to participate in ceremonies held on the Nicaragua-Costa Rican border marking the opening of a link in the Inter-American Highway from Santa Cruz, Costa Rica, to the Nicaraguan border. The delegation consisted of—

Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative TOM STEED, member of the Subcommittee on Roads, House of Representatives.

Representative WALT HORAN, member of the Department of Commerce Subcommittee, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives.

Representative WALTER NORBLAD, member of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and related agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was delegated by Hon. CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to accompany the delegation.

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Wilson, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Mr. Frank Turner, Assistant to the Commissioner, Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Oscar H. Nielson, Budget Officer, Department of Commerce.

Mr. Norman B. Wood, Chief, Latin American Office, Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. Charles P. Nolan, Officer in Charge, Transportation and Communications, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State.

Our group left Miami by air on the morning of May 6. En route to Managua, Nicaragua, the plane stopped at Habana, where the group was very courteously received by Ambassador Arthur Gardner, and at San Salvador, El Salvador, where the Chargé d'Affaires of the American Embassy, Mr. Chadwick Braggiotti, and the members of the em-

bassy staff were at the airport to extend to us their kindly greetings.

Our group reached the capital of Nicaragua at 3:30 on the afternoon of May 6. Upon arrival at the airport at Managua, most of the United States delegation immediately took off by helicopter for a 2-hour trip along the Rama Road. This proved to be highly interesting and an excellent means of evaluating the very great importance of the Rama Road to Nicaragua and indirectly to the United States.

After spending the night in Managua, our delegation left by automobile on Saturday, May 7, for the Nicaragua-Costa Rican border. This drive took about 2½ hours over the Inter-American Highway. The border was the site of a colorful ceremony which marked the opening of a link in the Inter-American Highway from Santa Cruz, Costa Rica, to the Nicaraguan border. Eloquent statements were made by the distinguished Foreign Ministers of both Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the occasion, copies of which I am putting into the RECORD. They highlighted the advantages to both countries, which will accrue from the completion of this important link in the highway. On behalf of the United States delegation and surrounded by all members of it, I delivered a short address appropriate to the occasion. At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks but at the end of same, translations of the body of the eloquent speeches, following their salutations, made by the Foreign Ministers of Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the remarks which I made on the occasion on behalf of the United States delegation.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, after an informal picnic luncheon a short distance within Costa Rica, the United States delegation continued 2 hours by automobile to Liberia, Costa Rica, where we stayed at the Bureau of Public Roads camp. The United States delegation was honored that night by a dance given by Senor Carlos Alfaro, Governor of the Province of Guanacaste.

It may be interesting to note that for the first time in many months many Costa Ricans and Nicaraguans crossed their borders, using the highway; in fact, it was reported that over 500 Costa Ricans spent the night of May 7 in Managua, Nicaragua. I also wish to point out on the same day that the new Inter-American Highway link was open, a car from California and one from Texas crossed over into Costa Rica. These are small indications of what this highway, when completed, will do for promoting travel of citizens from adjoining countries as well as from the United States along the whole Inter-American Highway.

On May 8, some of us drove by automobile from Liberia to San Jose, Costa Rica, a 5½-hour drive, completing the 300 miles or more of highway travel begun at Managua. The trip proved to be most scenic and afforded me an opportunity to obtain concrete evidence as to the value of the Inter-American Highway in the economic development of Costa Rica. On the afternoon of May 8, the United States delegation was received cordially by His Excellency President Jose Figueres of Costa Rica at the presidential palace.

On Monday, May 9, the United States delegation proceeded by plane to Guatemala City. Enroute the plane landed at Managua, Nicaragua, where the party was very courteously received by His Excellency, General Anastasio Somoza, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, at the Presidential Palace. General Somoza then went to the airport to personally see us off, which was a most gracious gesture.

We arrived in Guatemala City on the afternoon of Monday, May 9. At 6 o'clock that evening, the United States delegation was received by His Excellency, Lt. Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, President of the Republic of Guatemala, in the Presidential Palace. At the express wish of Colonel Castillo Armas, the United States delegation drove by automobile some 40 miles south of Guatemala City on Tuesday morning to Barberena, where Colonel Castillo Armas inaugurated a new fine strip of the Inter-American Highway completely financed by Guatemalan funds.

The United States delegation left Guatemala on Tuesday afternoon, May 10, arriving in Washington on Wednesday just after noon.

May I express, on behalf of the United States delegation, my warm thanks to the Honorable Robert F. Woodward, American Ambassador to Costa Rica, and Mrs. Woodward, to the Honorable Thomas E. Whelan, American Ambassador to Nicaragua, and Mrs. Whelan, and to Mr. Thomas C. Mann, Chargé d'Affaires of the American Embassy at Guatemala City, and Mrs. Mann, for the very cordial entertainment extended by them to the delegation at the respective Embassies. Our warm appreciation is also expressed to Ambassador Gardner and to Mr. Braggiotti for their kindly greetings.

The participation of the United States delegation in the ceremonies marking the linking of Costa Rica and Nicaragua on the Inter-American Highway was highly beneficial from all points of view to the United States. The visit of the delegation to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala was warmly received by officials of all three countries, and I believe that it made an excellent impression and will be productive of increased understanding and good will between our friendly neighbors in Central America and ourselves.

As a result of this trip and the opportunity I had to inspect portions of the Inter-American Highway in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, I am more strongly convinced than ever that it is very greatly in our national interest

that the Inter-American Highway be completed as rapidly as possible.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF SENOR DON MARIO ESQUIVEL, FOREIGN MINISTER OF COSTA RICA

This ceremony in which we have the privilege of participating today is the culmination of an old dream and long efforts. Although the noble ideal of a republic of Central America was checked 117 years ago, we must recognize that that happened because, although destined by providence to be a single entity and to live together, we were, in human terms, isolated from each other. We could not even communicate with each other. The very news of the independence attained at a glorious moment in history took a whole, long month to reach our old capital of Cartago. Under such deplorable conditions it was difficult to get to know each other, to establish the constant and necessary contact that would have convinced us of the necessity and advantages of living together closely. After more than a century the miracle of this highway again unites the people of Central America. This link between Costa Rica and Nicaragua was lacking and here we, the representatives of all the countries of the isthmus, have come to see how this idea has been put into beautiful reality. We deliberately wished that, together with the countries which formerly constituted with us the Central American Federation, a representative of Panama could share this happy occasion. During the colonial days the frontiers were traced by the sword or by a pen tracing greedily on a map. And it was thus that Panama was not included within the limits of the first Central American Republic which, at the beginning of its constitutional life, we had to create from the provinces of the then captaincy general of Guatemala. But Panama has been and is part of our ethnological orbit. It shares our troubles and our problems. There could today be no Central America which did not include it. We, ourselves, since we started to participate in foreign affairs 7 years ago, have been making every effort to have Panama form part of all Central-Americanist endeavors and we today hope that its formal entry will be self-understood, as is the common destiny of our peoples.

There have been many who have coordinated desires and efforts to the end that this highway which we are inaugurating today should become a reality. The Ministry of Public Works of Costa Rica was always able to count on the invaluable cooperation of the Public Roads Administration of the United States of America; and, in a common endeavor with the Ministry of Development of Nicaragua, these titans of work, with Marvin Harshberger at the head of the legions of work and progress, managed to fashion a new link between the two sister nations.

The Central American Embassies in Costa Rica were also a fruitful element of stimulus and solidarity; the diplomatic representation of the United States of America was an active, opportune, and indispensable element for the success attained.

It would be unjust not to take this unique opportunity to bring out properly the inestimable aid and the effort made for over 20 years by the Government of the United States in this matter and not to dedicate a few words of gratitude to the Vice President of that great Nation, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, who, after honoring our countries by his recent visit, returned to his country to devote himself with all the fervor of a citizen of America toward having the indispensable funds of his country's quota allocated to the successful completion of a project which would consolidate the way of life of continental Pan America.

But it was not only hope—now all converted into splendid reality—that Vice President Nixon left with us during his opportune and pleasant visit. We Costa Ricans also had the honor, on the one hand, of hearing from his lips and, on the other hand, of reiterating before him the repeated statements of our two governments which are today celebrating this territorial linkup that, with unshakable faith in the juridical system of America, and interpreting the mandate of their people and the desires of the governments constituting the continental charter, they will know how to live together peacefully as neighbors, as representatives of two countries which are united by nature and brought together by tradition, thus strengthening and invigorating by their example the principle in the legal doctrine of America that there is not, nor should there be, in our America any problem without a solution.

We are preparing duly to celebrate next year the centenary of a glorious action in which Nicaragua and Costa Rica united their efforts to rout a common enemy, showing thus how valuable the exemplary solidarity between nations can be and what heights it can attain. Today, a century after that heroic epoch, we find that there are many routes which, in devotion to the aggrandizement of our nations, we must follow together, many enterprises to undertake together, many Central American dreams to convert into reality, shoulder to shoulder with the other countries of Central America—for we must not defraud the permanent hopes of the nations, those nations which should be eternal and, having common problems, confront a destiny which is also common.

This very day there are meeting in San Salvador the ministers of economics of Central America. History and necessity showed us the path, and we are advancing with great strides toward economic integration. The plan for mutual investment of the reserves of our central banks is already going forward; the bilateral agreements on free trade, some of them being studied, some already being fully and successfully carried out, are other steps forward in our complementary economy, with larger markets and greater efficiency in stepped-up production. Perhaps it is not for us but possibly for our children to witness the political integration of the Isthmus; the human integration, the integration of the people, has always been a fruitful and generous reality which has never suffered any regression even in times of great hardship. The Nicaraguan in Costa Rica is no stranger, nor the Costa Rican in Honduras, nor the Honduran in Guatemala, nor the Guatemalan in El Salvador, nor the Salvadoran in Panama, nor the Panamanian in Nicaragua. Above the fragmentation, above the differences which may have occurred between the various countries in the course of our history as Republics, the confraternity of our peoples has predominated and survived safe and sound. The peoples of Central America can live together; our mission, our obligation is to demonstrate that fact to those who doubt, to take down the barriers wherever there are any, forget where we should forget, mediate where that is necessary, always coordinating our efforts; that is our duty, and I am sure that it is not a difficult task, for it will take place in fertile and fertilized ground.

Each time a link is formed there are the beginnings of a new era. Today with this highway which is bringing Costa Rica and its sister Republics closer together and is opening for them a path of hope and joy, there begins for all of us an era of fraternity and prosperity which can satisfy the longing of our peoples.

Each time a medium of communication is opened, there begins a new state in the relations of the peoples. Such a stage would

begin today even if we did not want it. But we do want it. We see it approach today with great emotion, and we see in this a day of jubilation in the history of the two peoples which today are being closely connected. Nature, which never really wanted to separate us, has been conquered by the effort of man. The inter-American juridical system, in guaranteeing by means of law the security and political independence of the nations of the hemisphere, is gradually converting barriers into imaginary lines and illusory boundaries. Let us hope that this border only a few steps from us here, will become just another line of points to show the student of geography that progress can destroy all barriers. Central America is decisively going ahead along that broad roadway of progress. From the Costa Rican point of view, and therefore from the American point of view, this highway is, my brothers from Central America, the carpet which we stretch forth to receive you with the demonstration of all the great friendship which lives inextinguishably in the heart of Costa Ricans. Men of America, here you have the highway. Welcome to this land, which is also yours.

(TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.—Applause, interspersed with shouts of "Viva los Estados Unidos" [long live the U. S.] and "Viva Costa Rica")

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS OF DR. OSCAR SEVILLA SACASA, FOREIGN MINISTER OF NICARAGUA

The establishment of inter-American communications has always been considered to be connected with the achievement of Pan Americanism, whose bases are found in the farsighted vision of the liberator, for international roads or communications not only bring about the development of the countries that they cross, helping their commerce and resources, but also bind the common interests and ensure peace among them.

Pan Americanism, at the new stage of its evolution determined by the international conferences, recognized in the first of such events held at Washington in 1890 that the railroad which links all or most of the nations represented at the conference would contribute powerfully to the furthering of the moral relations and material interests of their nations.

That concept was then reaffirmed at the Second International Conference held at Mexico City in 1902 and at the seventh which took place at Montevideo in 1933.

At the Sixth Inter-American Conference of Habana it was decided to recommend to the Pan American Highway Congress, which was to be held at Rio de Janeiro in July of that same year of 1928, that it consider and adopt agreements leading to the construction of a highway running the whole length of the hemisphere; and, at the Inter-American Conference for the Consolidation of Peace held at Buenos Aires in 1936, it signed a Pan American Highway Convention in whose preamble are made some timely remarks concerning the belief that direct and material contact between the American peoples would necessarily strengthen the bonds of friendship between the countries of this hemisphere and thus ensure continental peace.

But the establishment of international communications as a means of uniting peoples has been the desire not only of Pan Americanism but also of the Central Americanist movement, which is now and has been crusading for the fusion of all the countries of the Isthmus into one vigorous Republic.

As a matter of fact, at the stage of that movement which began with the Washington Conference of 1907 under the auspices of

the Government of the United States of America and of Mexico, there was placed on the agenda to be taken up by the Fourth Central American Conference of 1912 held at Managua a convention for the establishment of Central American communications in which nine of the signatory states obligated themselves to put their territory in communication with that of other adjacent countries, either directly by means of railways or by using the Gulf of Fonseca and the navigable lakes and rivers, for which purpose new routes would be constructed or the existing ones would be extended.

With respect to Nicaragua, especially, in 1943 we had only 10 kilometers of paved highways and 20 of all-weather roads. Now the government headed by the president, General Anastasio Somoza, has given so vigorous a drive to the construction of highways and roads that today my country has 339 kilometers of paved highways, 900 kilometers of all-weather roads, and 1,805 kilometers of dry-weather roads; this highway development, together with a wise credit policy, has achieved the surprising economic transformation through which my country is now passing.

In regard to the Nicaraguan sector of the Inter-American Highway, it is well known that it has been in service between our two northern and southern borders for some years.

In view of all the antecedents to which reference has been made, the inauguration of the junction of the Pan American Highway between Costa Rica and Nicaragua is cause for justified rejoicing not only for the two sister countries directly bound by ties of neighborhood but also for the other sister nations of the isthmus and for those of our American regional community that have stimulated the establishment of international communications as an effective means of strengthening the sentiments of American solidarity.

The Government of Nicaragua has viewed with keen satisfaction the execution of the work whose junction with Nicaragua we are inaugurating in this solemn ceremony, not only because it will contribute to the progress and prosperity of the sister Republic of Costa Rica but also because it will come to constitute a new bond of union between our peoples in facilitating a current of material and spiritual exchange, constituting furthermore a symbol of the cooperation and joint effort of Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and the United States of America.

Once the work is inaugurated, all that is lacking is the fulfillment of the aim which we all hope it has—that the goodwill made evident today in this simple but transcendental act will also give impetus to the transportation which, flowing over the highway like blood through the veins, will stimulate the exchange of interests, creating new bonds of permanent union between our peoples and burying prejudices and misunderstandings, in order that there may shine with noonday splendor the cordiality and good understanding to which our neighbors and other sister countries have a right above the passing contingencies that fate may have dealt to them.

May the permanence of the junction being inaugurated be a sign of the durability of the good relations between the two peoples.

Completely in accord with these sentiments of cordiality, President Somoza, in his last message read before the National Congress on April 17 of this year, referring to Costa Rica said: "I wish to express on this occasion the traditional sentiments of sympathy and admiration which all Nicaraguans and my Government have always professed for the noble people of Costa Rica, and the faith which I have in their glorious destiny."

In the name and in representation of my Government, I desire on this historic occa-

sion to make public the gratitude of Nicaragua toward the noble people of the United States of America and their illustrious Government, whose destinies are so worthily guided by his excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower, for the friendly cooperation which in the full Pan American spirit they have given to the work of the Pan American highway section in Nicaragua. My Government especially desires to express its gratitude for the presence on this occasion of the honorable mission of the United States of America so worthily headed by his excellency Senator SPESARD L. HOLLAND and composed of distinguished Members of the House of Representatives and officials of the executive branch.

I should also like to express my gratitude to the excellent and honorable diplomatic representatives and officials who with their presence have contributed toward giving special significance to this occasion.

Pray God that this event, which has taken place under such noble aims, may constitute the beginning of a new chapter of close and sincere ties in the relations between our sister countries.

EXHIBIT 3

REMARKS OF SENATOR SPESARD L. HOLLAND

I consider it a rare opportunity and privilege to be the spokesman for the several United States Government representatives who are taking part in this important ceremony, particularly for the six-man delegation from both Houses of Congress, including representation from both of our political parties, who stand here together on the platform at this moment.

Today we see the forging of another important link in the Inter-American Highway. Today we close another gap of what will soon be, I hope, an all-weather road stretching from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal. I like to think of this highway as more than just a good road. To me it is a means whereby the peoples of the Americas will surely get to know one another better. To me it is a carefully forged chain which binds together the destinies of all the Americas.

My present duties, as chairman of a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee directly concerned with the Inter-American Highway, have given me an opportunity to keep fully informed about the status of this important project. My interest in the highway, however, goes back many years when I was a member and later chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee which handled this project. In 1952, I attended, as a representative of the United States Senate, the special Pan American Highway Congress which was held in Mexico City. And last year I was present at the Sixth Pan American Highway Congress which was held in Caracas. At those congresses I learned firsthand of the tremendous interest and enthusiasm which exists throughout the Americas for the rapid completion of this important highway. This enthusiasm, I assure you, is shared by our Government. There can be no doubt that the prompt completion of the Inter-American Highway is a prime and established objective of United States foreign policy.

Recently, the President of the United States sent letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives urging the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to speeding the completion of this highway. This legislation is, at present, being considered by the Congress. Naturally, I cannot here today forecast what the final action will be, but I can state that the Congress realizes the importance—to the United States and to Central America—of completing

ing this Inter-American highway as soon as possible.

Today, Nicaragua and Costa Rica join the chain of neighbor countries linked by an all-weather highway in Central America which also includes Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. There are still gaps in the highway. But even as we gather here today work is going forward to eliminate those gaps and to make the completed highway a reality. When completed, it will be possible to travel by highway—in any season—from any point in the United States, through Mexico and Central America, to the Panama Canal.

The completion of this highway will bring important political, economic, social and cultural benefits to all the friendly countries, including our own, which it will link. Economically, the highway will mean increased trade and the opening of hitherto inaccessible markets. Already trade among the countries of Central America and between the countries of Central America and the United States has increased tremendously as a consequence of the completion of portions of this highway and this trend will be continued at an accelerated pace as work progresses on the road. Increased trade brings with it, inevitably, increased economic development and a higher standard of living for our peoples. And that, of course, is one goal toward which all of us are striving.

Another economic benefit to be derived from the completion of the highway will be an increase in the rate of economic development in the area. It cannot be denied that the lack of adequate surface transportation has seriously hindered and retarded economic development in Central America. With the completion of the highway will come feeder roads and the opening of undeveloped lands. This economic growth will result in the establishment of new markets, will enlarge opportunities for trade and will stimulate more rapid internal development.

In addition to increased trade and economic development, an all-weather highway will serve as a strong impetus to attracting tourist travel to these beautiful countries which, thus far, are known to only a few of my countrymen. This morning, for example, we traveled from Managua to this point on the border, through countryside that, I think, is equal to any in this world for its sheer beauty. And I know that the other areas through which this highway passes provide attractions which, when known and readily accessible, will result in increased tourism. Tourism, I should add, in addition to making an important economic contribution also serves as a means of allowing our peoples to know one another better. It is unfortunate that, because of the lack of cheap, reliable, adequate land transportation, the cultures of Central America, both new and old, are not well known in my country. And, conversely, I also think that it is too bad that the sowers of dissension have been able, at times, to spread successfully their misstatements about the people of the United States because the peoples of this area have not had adequate opportunity to know our fellow countrymen. The completion of this highway will contribute greatly to the elimination of this type of misunderstanding.

Early completion of this vital highway will be a significant step in our common defense effort for the Western Hemisphere, since it will provide overland contact and communication with the Panama Canal from all points in the North American continent.

The United States, together with the friendly cooperating countries of Central America, and Panama, has already made large expenditures toward the completion of the Inter-American highway. Our country is prepared to continue our role in this important cooperative venture. All of us see

here today part of the fruit of our joint labor. I look forward joyfully to being present before many years at a grand ceremony which will mark the closing of the final gap, the forging of the final link in the Inter-American highway—a network of friendship and freedom.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HOLLAND. In accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Thursday, May 19, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, O16225, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall, Trapnell, O16782, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Martin, O16802, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16993, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809, United States Army, for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Norman A. Kreckman, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y.