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early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became evident in his belligerent or perhaps withdrawn conduct.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.

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 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 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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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 Caiado;

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 Hernandes 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 Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath;

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 Pekin, China, in the Boxer Rebellion, to the bitter fighting at Cantingy 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—Pekin. 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 aloft 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 appropiations. 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 Fiume 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 NAVAHO 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 Navaho 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 the 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 Uyehara

"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 Uyehara, 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 Uyehara 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 Uyehara 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 Kiichi 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 aninversary 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 stanch 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 CHUMBRIS,
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 Nation 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 thier 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 immunization 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 meetings 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 alloted 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 3½ 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 nation, 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 approch 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 forbears.

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 establishs 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.

Lest 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, percentagewise, 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 $649,335 in 1953; the overall average was $1,731. The 5 largest wheat loans in Montana and Oregon that year averaged $176,000 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 nonrecourse 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 Curtice, 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 midwestern 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 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?

WHEELOCK-MARSHALL
FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
F. B. DANIEL, *President.*
WHEELOCK, 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 the factors which will have a great bearing on the outcome of this election are:

Increasing dissatisfaction among farmers who believes 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—tobacco, 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. Briggle 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 wtih 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 report 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 requirement 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 subpenas 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 subpena 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 subpena 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 Nonessential 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 Nonessential 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	Out 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	71,883	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	303,792	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	10,236,608	7,514,619	17,751,234	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	129,095	286,368	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	227,933
Department of the Post Office	365,576	126,500	492,076		492,076	276	149,212	149,489	342,587
Department of State	59,662	130,240	189,902	−6,341	183,561	14,409	64,215	78,626	104,934
Department of the Treasury [6]	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	[8] 98,419,630	50,994,877	149,414,507	[9] −1,804,893	147,609,614	18,183,461	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 nauralization 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.

My 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 Judiciary, 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 $250,00 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 SCHOEPPEL,
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 vaid 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 Committe 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 statement 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	11,965	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 Tokle 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,

FLOYD OFFICER.

SENECA, OREG.

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 traditions 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 Government, 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 variety. 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:

HOOVER 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 breakup 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 handpicked 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 Joppa, 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 discoveries; 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 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 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 cooperation 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 Adminstration 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 sumarizing 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.

[2] A 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 industry, 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. Fischelis, 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[3] 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, 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 intrastate 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

[3] Other than in the possession of "a retail, hospital, or clinic pharmacy, or a public health agency," where to be dispensed on prescription.

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 nonparalytic 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, is 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. Kreeger; Mr. Kenneth Williamson, associate director; Dr. Albert W. Snoke.

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. Heselton, 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. Korns, 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, becouse 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 yea-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 grassroot 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 nonrenewable-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 erosible 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, cr 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 affect 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 corngrower 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
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
	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
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

fined, 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. President. 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 crop-loan 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, diary 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 hogging-off."

Mr. CAPEHART. I continue:

> (4) above allotted acres on basics 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 bill 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 eligibility 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 recomendation are contained in our report to you wtih 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

Aiken	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
Dworshak	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 ledgerdemain. 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 ½-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 grid.

The magnitude of the plan almost staggers imagination. Mr. Eisenhower recommends a 10-year building schedule which would embrace expenditure of $101 billon 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 unsafe 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 25, 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 allout highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. The 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 $31¼ 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 $31¼ 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.

Texans 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.

Texans 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 administraiton, 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 abovementioned 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 administration 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 NYSAA, 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 tieing 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 ungrounded.

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 unobligated 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 amendment 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 continue 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 committee 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 Electric 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-end 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 subsequent 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-end 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 stanch 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 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 SPESSARD 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 SPESSARD 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 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, in the quiet of this noon hour, we are centering our thoughts upon the amazing greatness and grandeur of the Prince of Peace in whom we find our noblest incentives for right living and heroic service.

Grant that our own life may bear clear and unmistakable testimony that we are seeking to emulate and incarnate his spirit of love and good will and striving to deliver humanity out of the bondage of rancor and hatred and lead it into the paths of brotherly kindness.

Help us to feel that the hour has struck when the moral and spiritual forces must accept the leadership in dispelling from the hearts of men and nations all bitterness and prejudice.

Take away from us the moods of discouragement and defeatism, and may we believe that our longing for peace on earth is not merely an idle dream and a vague impossibility but a glorious, divine inspiration which someday will be a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BILL, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on 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 ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 590)

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," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 10 and 27.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 17, 19, 21, 25 and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,658,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,046,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not less than $250,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not less than $250,000 of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,144,300"; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment No. 24.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
WILLIS A. ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY
(per MILTON R. YOUNG),
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Research: Appropriate $37,800,000, instead of $37,000,000 as proposed by the House and $38,040,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminate House language earmarking funds for a special study of effects of acreage reductions. In view of the urgent need for research on basic problems, the conference committee insists that research projects of limited value, such as orchids of Guatemala, Flora of Dominica, differences in clothing of farm and urban people, population dynamics, rural sociology, methodology, and child-rearing practices,

and projects undertaken primarily for the benefit of employees doing graduate work, be discontinued in favor of more important work. The conferees are in full agreement that discontinuance of nonessential and nonproductive research projects, such as those listed above, will make it possible for the Department to cover all valuable and worthwhile research projects proposed in the budget. The final amount agreed to includes sufficient funds to provide for research projects inserted by the Senate and emphasized in the Senate report, including $100,000 for research on acreage reductions and $50,000 additional for the National Arboretum. The conferees are also in full agreement that the recent action of the Department decreasing attention to home-economics research should be reviewed and a portion of the funds transferred to human nutrition should be redirected to its original purpose, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriate $18,658,700, instead of $17,750,000 as proposed by the House and $18,758,700 as proposed by the Senate, and increase the fund for emergency outbreaks of insect and plant diseases to $1,000,000. The conferees have agreed to an increase of $308,700 for added plant quarantine inspection at major United States ports in view of (1) the increasing threat of importation of nematodes, citrus blackfly, fruit flies, Khapra beetle, and other plant pests from various areas of the world, and (2) the decreased quarantine inspection resulting from the gradual reduction in number of customs inspectors in recent years.

EXTENSION SERVICE

Amendment No. 5—Penalty Mail: Appropriates $1,650,000, instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 6—Conservation operations: Appropriates $59,300,000, instead of $58,612,579 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Authorize $22,800,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $22,500,000 as proposed by the House and $23,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide $4,320,000 for section 392 expenses, instead of $4,020,000 as proposed by the House and $4,520,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Eliminate language proposed by the Senate relative to the 5 percent transfer of funds for technical services required in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program, and restore language as proposed by the House.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriate $11,046,000, instead of $10,981,000 as proposed by the House and $11,096,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore House language providing for a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer, changing the amount named therein to $250,000. The conference committee is in full agreement that the July crop reports for popcorn and honey should be reinstated within the amount appropriated.

Amendment No. 13—Marketing services: Appropriates $11,960,000 instead of $11,810,000 as proposed by the House and $12,010,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Amendment No. 14: Restores House language providing for a special study of foreign agricultural production, changing the amount named therein to $250,000. In view of foreign expansion at the expense of American producers, the conferees agree that the bringing of statistics on foreign agriculture up to date is highly important to the success of the new program being inaugurated by this service and is basic to the formulation of agricultural policies.

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 15—Agricultural adjustment programs: Authorizes $6,000,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,165,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—Sugar Act program: Authorizes $1,575,000 for administrative and related expenses, instead of $1,440,000 as proposed by the House and $1,617,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 17: Changes code citations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes transfer of not to exceed $450,000 from the Farm Tenant Mortgage Insurance Fund, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Changes code citations as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21: Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $2,079,000 as proposed by the House and $2,164,000 as proposed by the Senate, and authorize transfers of $375,000, instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,144,300, instead of $2,116,000 as proposed by the House and $2,172,600 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Amendment No. 23—Limitation on administrative expenses: Restore language proposed by the House, changing the amount named therein to $1,000,000.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 25—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for transfer of wheat to Pakistan: Appropriates $69,385,831 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,273,881 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples: Appropriates $9,545,830 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,676,628 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27—Section 504: Eliminates the words "or apples" inserted by the Senate. The conference action is based on the fact that this matter is being handled by the appropriate legislative committees. The conferees do not approve of any forecast of apple prices by the Department during the coming fiscal year unless contrary legislative action is taken by the Congress. This restriction is not intended to affect other types of forecasts for apples.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
CHARLES W. VURSELL,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I would like to make it clear that in this conference report where you have stated:

> The conferees are also in full agreement that the recent action of the Department decreasing attention to home-economics research should be reviewed and a portion of the funds transferred to human nutrition should be redirected to its original purpose, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in the Senate.

That the conferees in this report do not agree that home economics as such be dispensed with by the Department of Research; is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will say to the gentlewoman that certainly that is our intent. We tried, in the language, to make it quite evident that that was our position. May I say that is as far as we knew how to go. The Senate amendment was hardly needed to get the job done, in that it took the place of what the House had in its report. We mentioned the Senate amendment to make it clear that by not including it—there was no need to include it—we did not need to change the intent of that amendment in the least. So, insofar as we could—and the conference report was unanimously adopted—we made it quite clear at least how the conferees felt about this matter.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I should like to ask the gentleman further, in general these departments have followed the intent of Congress; is that not true?

Mr. WHITTEN. In general I would say that the gentlewoman is correct. There have been exceptions, but if they do not, there is nothing that can be done other than to tell them what to do.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Then I would like to ask further, the amount of money that was appropriated originally contemplated that home economics research, apart from that in the nutrition field, would be continued; is that not so?

Mr. WHITTEN. We did not try to earmark a definite amount of money. We did say, and the Senate amendment provided, that not less than $40,000 be retransferred. In the opinion of the House committee, in view of the overall size of the appropriation for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, we seriously questioned whether that was an ample transfer. We feel that a substantial part of the work heretofore done by the home economics section should be restored. Insofar as pinpointing exactly how much, we have not tried to do that.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. But the amount of money that the Department asked was an amount sufficient to have carried on home economics research as it was originally set up; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the original amount was $1,426,000 and when this home economics work was cut out at the direction of the director, no money was returned to the Treasury, but all the funds were transferred to the work on human nutrition. So the full amount formerly carried for both lines of work

is retained. They are merely directed to reallocate or to give back a reasonable share of the money to the home economics work.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I thank the gentleman very much. In view of the fact that the gentleman has made it amply clear that it is the sense of this body that the home economics research, apart from that connected with human nutrition, is to be continued in this Department as it has been for the last 32 years, I withdraw my objection.

There should now be no doubt in the minds of Secretary Benson and others in the Department that the Congress intends for this worthwhile research program to be reinstated and continued.

Progress in any human endeavor results directly from impartial, objective research activities. The American home and family living should be given as much importance in the consideration of a balanced research program as any other matter.

One of the great contributions of home economics research by our Government is the fact that this work is not duplicated anywhere else. Our great home economics teaching programs, the work of home demonstration agents, and the progress of individual homemakers depends upon a continuation of a balanced research program within the Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 22, insert ": *Provided further*, That $934,914 of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate while the House is in session.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AUSTRIA IS FREE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Austria is free. The rejoicing of her people is understandable and moving. Yet strangely this freedom for much of Austria comes as an anticlimax. Actually the allied sections of Austria have been free in nearly all aspects since shortly after the end of World War II. Had not the Russians interposed endless objection all of Austria would have been fully free 5 years ago. Yet I fear that Russia now gets the lion's share of the credit in the minds of the Austrians for the freedom which finally has come to them. So cleverly did the Russians maneuver the final preparation and signing of the treaties that the Allies found themselves clambering to get on the bandwagon of Austrian freedom which the Allies themselves had long previously endorsed.

There is in this a very pointed lesson. Top-level talks are programed on peace and coexistence worldwide. I earnestly hope America's leaders do not find themselves again clambering to get on a bandwagon for the unification of Germany after Russia grabs credit with the Germans for putting it in motion. I hope our leaders are able to convince the world that we are the ones who have sought peace; the ones who have paid dearly from our own resources to help others; the ones who really believe in and practice freedom for others.

At this point the Russians are preparing to claim all these things as their own private inventions—and to brand us as the obstructionists who have prevented their realization. It will be interesting to see how much we have learned about dealing with the rest of the world. We have had some costly lessons. I hope the scheduled top-level conferences will not prove to be just another costly lesson.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated each year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission of Fine Arts to carry out its functions under this act."

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

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended by section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That there is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 to be expended in flood emergency preparation; in flood fighting and rescue operations, or in the repair or restoration of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, raising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood control. The appropriation of such moneys for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis, is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropria-

tions to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made. The Chief of Engineers is authorized in the prosecution of work in connection with rescue operations, or in conducting other flood emergency work, to acquire on a rental basis such motor vehicles, including passenger cars and buses, as in his discretion are deemed necessary."

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

ALASKA WATER RESOURCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4753) to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (1) of subsection (e) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "two years" and inserting "three years" in lieu thereof.

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

PURCHASE OF BONDS COVERING POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Postmaster General determines it to be to the best interests of the Government he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, purchase, out of appropriations or other funds available to the Post Office Department, such blanket position, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds as he may deem appropriate to cover any or all categories of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, and mail clerks in the armed services and the Coast Guard, required by law or administrative determination to be bonded. The bonds may cover periods not in excess of 4 years, and shall contain such conditions and be in such penalty as the Postmaster General may deem necessary to protect the interests of the Government. Nothing in this act shall relieve such postmasters, officers, employees, contractors, and mail clerks and their sureties from any liability otherwise imposed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 9, strike out "categories of."

No. 2. Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "contractors with the Post Office Department".

No. 3. Page 2, line 4, after "The" insert "premiums on any such."

No. 4. Page 2, line 5, after "four years, and" insert "the bonds."

No. 5. Page 2, line 9, strike out "contractors."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone could give us an explanation of the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. This resolution provides for the participation of the Congress of the United States in a NATO meeting in Europe. Ten or 12 NATO countries have already signified their intention of sending representatives there. We have an invitation from the Scandinavian countries and also, the United States has been urged by the other NATO countries, particularly Canada, to participate in this conference. The Executive department is anxious that the Congress of the United States get its viewpoint across in this conference. The resolution provides that 14 Members, 7 from the House and 7 from the other body be sent as delegates in July to the conference to be held this year in France.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from South Carolina understands that we already have the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. RICHARDS. We do not have any representation in the NATO conference at all. The Interparliamentary Union is an entirely different thing. This resolution was passed out of committee unanimously. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of this organization in addition to spending the taxpayers' money, let me ask?

Mr. RICHARDS. The purpose of the organization is to create better understanding and to draw closer together the parliamentary bodies of the NATO countries. As the gentleman knows, we have an alliance which may easily lead us to war. It is being handled by the diplomats of the several countries. We have guaranteed in case those nations are attacked, we will help defend them. It would, therefore, be wise for our parliamentary bodies to keep in close touch.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these countries are not represented in the Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. RICHARDS. I do not know about that. I just know that this organization is made up of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance countries. I believe we would be making a mistake if the Congress did not exert its influence and its viewpoint on that gathering.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that is what they have been saying about the Interparliamentary Union for a good many years. I am one of those who is completely unconvinced that the Interparliamentary Union has contributed a single thing toward our international relations. I think it is a first-class junketing organization and I am afraid that is what this organization is going to be. Until I can get some further information concerning this organization, I do not intend to permit this resolution to go through the House.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman feel it is very important that in our discussions with our European allies regarding the common problems that affect us in the NATO organization, Representatives of this Congress, who are closest to the American people, should be present in order to express to our allies the viewpoints we hear expressed almost daily here in the Congress?

Often times we hear the criticism that our delegations to international conferences speak only for the executive department and not for the American people and the Congress. Do you not think it would be better for our country to have these Members of Congress abroad to help our allies know what the American people think?

Mr. GROSS. You already have the Interparliamentary Union that takes a trip once a year to some European country. I suspect that all countries that are here represented will be represented in the Interparliamentary Union. Why this duplication and this additional expense?

Mr. JUDD. The Interparliamentary Union covers the whole planet. It involves general discussion of the problems that legislative bodies face. This conference will discuss and deal with the specific commitments, obligations, responsibilities, and duties of the NATO organization of which the United States is a member.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to take further time in connection with this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF PORTION OF CAMP MABRY MILITIA RIFLE RANGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 489) authorizing the transfer of a portion of the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range tract in the city of Austin, Tex., comprising 189.11 acres, to the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Texas 189.11 acres (together with all improvements thereon) out of the original 200 acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range tract in the city of Austin, Travis County, Tex., also referred to as the "Old Deison Farm," which 189.11 acres is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the 53-acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the 38.55-acre State tract numbered 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north 60 degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin tracts 1,113 varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract north 36½ degrees east, 1,139½ varas to a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract, from which an elm 20 inches in diameter marked "X," bears south 32 degrees west 10 varas and a small live oak marked "X" bears south 62 degrees east 10 varas;

Thence south 60 degrees east 613 varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Deison and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Deison and Thiele tracts and also the Deison and Reid tracts, south 168 varas to a point;

Thence south 57 degrees east 160 varas to a point;

Thence southeast 108 varas to a point;

Thence south 9 degrees west 100 varas to a point;

Thence south 10 degrees east 100 varas to a point;

Thence south 5 degrees west 86 varas to a point;

Thence south 3 degrees east 77 varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser 53-acre tract;

Thence north 60 degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, 147 varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south 30 degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, 640½ varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all 200 acres of land, less and excepting from this 200-acre tract above described, a tract of land containing 10.89 acres, more or less, described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of the 200-acre Deison tract;

Thence south 60 degrees east along the northerly boundary line of the Deison tract 466.2 varas for corner;

Thence south 30 degrees west 129.6 varas for corner;

Thence north 60 degrees west 478.8 varas to the northwesterly boundary line of the Deison tract for corner;

Thence along said boundary line north 36½ degrees east 130.68 varas to the place of beginning, containing 10.89 acres more or less, to be retained by the United States;

The land to be transferred to the State of Texas containing in all 189.11 acres more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original 200-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Deison, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82 to 84, inclusive, of the deed records of Travis County, Tex., after deducting therefrom the 10.89 acres more or less, to be retained by the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall execute and deliver in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the conveyance of such 189.11 acres: *Provided,* That there shall be reserved to the United States of America all minerals including oil and gas in the lands herein authorized to be conveyed.

(b) There shall be further reserved to the United States of America in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the 10.89 acres above described located immediately adjacent to and northwest of the property herein authorized to be conveyed. There shall be further reserved in said lands all rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, power lines, and such other utilities as now exist, or may become necessary to the operation of said 10.89 acres retained by the United States and excluded from the transfer.

(c) Such conveyance shall contain a provision that such 189.11 acres shall be used primarily for training the National Guard and Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the primary purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Texas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

(d) Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made by the State of Texas for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency and upon the cessation thereof plus 6 months said property is to revert to the State of Texas together with any or all facilities and improvements, appurtenances, and utilities thereon or appertaining thereto. Such conveyance shall provide that same is subject to any valid easements which may exist against the said property.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "189.11" and insert "200."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 4, line 23, strike out "shall be" and insert "are hereby."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 14 be substituted in lieu of H. R. 489.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, in and to the following-described land in Austin, Travis County, Tex., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres out of the original two hundred acres known as the Camp Mabry Militia Rifle Range Tract, also referred to as the "old Deison Farm":

Beginning at the southwest corner of the fifty-three-acre tract heretofore conveyed to J. J. Gasser by deed dated February 23, 1895, recorded in volume 129, page 347, of deed records of Travis County, Tex., said corner also being the southwest corner of the thirty-eight-and-fifty-five-one-hundredths-acre State tract numbered 2 surveyed March 30, 1934, by M. V. Homeyer, county surveyor;

Thence north sixty degrees west, with the original line dividing the Townes and Mabin tract one thousand one hundred and thirteen varas to a stone corner on the east line of the W. C. Phillips timber tract;

Thence with the east line of said W. C. Phillips tract, north thirty-six and one-half degrees east one thousand eight and eighty-two one-hundredths varas to a point; said point being south thirty-six and one-half degrees west one hundred thirty and sixty-eight one-hundredths varas from a stone corner on the south line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east along the south lines of the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel comprising five and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps, armory parcel comprising five acres, four hundred seventy-eight and eight-tenths varas to a point, the southeast corner of the said Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel;

Thence north thirty degrees east with and along the east line of the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, one hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths varas to a point on the southerly line of the Charles Thiele tract;

Thence south sixty degrees east one hundred forty-six and eight-tenths varas to an angle in the stone fence dividing the Deison and Thiele tracts;

Thence with said fence on the dividing line between the Deison and Thiele tracts and also the Deison and Reid tracts, south one hundred and sixty-eight varas to a point;

Then south fifty-seven degrees east one hundred and sixty varas to a point;

Thence southeast one hundred and eight varas to a point;

Thence south nine degrees west one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south ten degrees east one hundred varas to a point;

Thence south five degrees west eighty-six varas to a point;

Thence south three degrees east seventy-seven varas to the southwest corner of the Elanor Reid tract on the north line of the Gasser fifty-three-acre tract;

Thence north sixty degrees west with the north line of the Gasser tract, one hundred

and forty-seven varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south thirty degrees west with the west line of said Gasser tract, six hundred forty and one-half varas to the place of beginning;

Containing in all one hundred eighty-nine and eleven one-hundredths acres of land more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion of the original two-hundred-acre tract conveyed by deed from Eliza C. J. Deison, et al., to the United States of America, dated June 28, 1909, as same appears of record in volume 239, pages 82–84, inclusive of the deed records of Travis County, Tex., after deducting therefrom the five and eighty-nine one-hundredths-acre United States Air Force parcel and the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel above described, a total of ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres to be retained by the United States.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. There shall be further reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the above-described lands, rights of ingress and egress over roads in the above-described lands serving buildings or other works operated by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres referred to in section 1 of this act as the United States Air Force Reserve training center parcel and the United States Army Reserve, formerly the Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel, rights-of-way for water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, powerlines, and such other utilities as now exist, or which may become necessary to the operation of the above-described ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Texas shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 5. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon during its occupancy by the State of Texas, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Texas, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

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

Similar House bill H. R. 489 was laid on the table.

CI——406

CAMP DODGE, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 755) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Polk County, Iowa, together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land being formerly designated as Camp Dodge, Iowa:

Parcel one: Commencing at a point, the northwest corner of section 30, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian of Iowa and running thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-nine minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred two and four-tenths feet to a point on the Des Moines River, thence south seven degrees thirty-three minutes west a distance of four hundred eighty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south fifty-four degrees six and one-half minutes east a distance of four hundred sixty-one and eight-tenths feet to a point on the east side of the Des Moines River, thence south sixty-two degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of two hundred eighty-eight and two-tenths feet; thence south seventy-four degrees twenty-nine minutes east a distance of five hundred and seven feet; thence south no degrees thirteen minutes west a distance of one thousand one hundred and ninety feet; thence north seventy-one degrees thirty-four minutes east a distance of four hundred fifty and nine-tenths feet; thence south eighty-eight degrees thirty-eight and one-half minutes east a distance of six hundred sixteen and two-tenths feet; thence south four degrees fourteen and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence south four degrees four and one-half minutes west a distance of two hundred thirty-nine and two-tenths feet; thence south nineteen degrees no minutes east a distance of two hundred thirty-four and seven-tenths feet; thence south fifteen degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of three hundred two and six-tenths feet; thence south thirteen degrees twenty and one-half minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety-seven and six-tenths feet; thence south thirty-nine degrees two and one-half minutes east a distance of two hundred fifty-six and three-tenths feet; thence south eighty-four degrees twelve minutes east a distance of two hundred ten and five-tenths feet; thence north sixty-five degrees fifty-eight minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety and seven-tenths feet; thence north seventy-five degrees thirty-one minutes east a distance of nine hundred and ninety-one feet; thence north twenty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of seven hundred sixty and five-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-three minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred eighty and one-tenth feet; thence south no degrees twenty-two minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and twenty feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred and thirty feet; thence south no degrees six minutes west a distance of one thousand five hundred and twenty feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-four minutes west a distance of nine hundred and twenty feet; thence south five degrees forty six minutes east a distance of five hundred sixty-one and two-tenths feet; thence south twelve degrees one minute east a distance of four hundred and seventy-eight feet; thence south twenty-one degrees fifty-three minutes west a distance of five hundred thirty and three-tenths feet; thence south forty degrees fifty-five minutes west a distance of five hundred seventeen and one-tenth feet; thence south forty-nine degrees thirty minutes west a distance of nine hundred eighty-eight and three-tenths feet; thence north sixty-one degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence north fifty-two degrees forty-three and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred and twenty-one feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees fifty-three and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred thirty-six and six-tenths feet; thence north sixteen degrees twenty-six and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred seventeen and two-tenths feet; thence north two degrees twenty-nine and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred forty-five and four-tenths feet; thence north twenty-four degrees thirteen and one-half minutes west a distance of nine hundred and twenty-nine feet; thence north seventy-four degrees fifty-six minutes west a distance of two hundred sixty-nine and two-tenths feet; thence south sixty-five degrees nine and one-half minutes west a distance of two hundred fifty-seven and five-tenths feet; thence south twenty-five degrees forty-eight minutes west a distance of two hundred seventy-two and seven-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west a distance of one thousand seven hundred sixty-nine and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees ten minutes west a distance of one thousand three hundred seventeen and seven-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west a distance of six hundred ninety-seven and two-tenths feet; thence north no degrees forty minutes east a distance of eight hundred sixty-one and nine-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees twenty minutes west a distance of one thousand seventy-two and five-tenths feet; thence south no degrees forty minutes west a distance of eight hundred and seventy-five feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-eight minutes west a distance of nine hundred and ninety-five feet; thence north no degrees twenty-nine minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred fourteen and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-nine minutes east a distance of six hundred forty-three and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees thirty-nine and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-three and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees eleven and one-half minutes west a distance of six hundred seventy-nine and four-tenths feet; thence north no degrees twenty and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and eighteen feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees eleven minutes east a distance of one hundred one and six-tenths feet; thence south sixteen degrees forty-five minutes east a distance of fifty-eight feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of one-thousand two hundred eleven and eight-tenths feet; thence north no degrees four and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and seventy-eight feet.

Parcel two: Commencing at the west quarter corner of section 35, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian, Polk County, Iowa, runs thence north no degrees one and one-half minutes west of the north eighth line of section 27 a distance of six thousand six hundred twenty-nine and five-tenths feet; thence west along said north eighth line of section 27 to the east eighth line of section

27 a distance of one thousand three hundred thirty-eight and six-tenths feet; thence north no degrees five and one-half minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-one and nine-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees fifty-four and one-half minutes west a distance of one thousand three hundred thirty-five and nine-tenths feet; thence north no degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of two thousand six hundred forty-five and three-tenths feet to the center of section 22; thence north no degrees fourteen minutes west a distance of three thousand and fifty-three feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-five minutes east a distance of two thousand six hundred seventy-two and eight-tenths feet; thence north no degrees twelve minutes west a distance of two thousand two hundred forty-five and five-tenths feet to the east quarter corner of section 15, township 80 north, range 25 west; thence south eighty-nine degrees seventeen minutes east a distance of one thousand nine hundred forty-eight and six-tenths feet; thence south no degrees twelve minutes west a distance of six hundred seventy-two and eight-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight and one-half minutes east a distance of seven hundred and ten feet to the north south center line of section 14; thence south no degrees thirty-two minutes west a distance of six hundred fifty-two and seven-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees eleven minutes east a distance of seven hundred twenty and eight-tenths feet to the public highway described as highway No. 141; thence south twelve degrees seven minutes east a distance of eight hundred seventy and five-tenths feet; thence south twenty-one degrees eight minutes east a distance of four hundred eighty-four and four-tenths feet to the north line of section 23; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-seven and one-half minutes west a distance of four hundred and seventy-eight feet; thence due south nine hundred feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-seven and one-half minutes west a distance of three hundred feet; thence due south one thousand two hundred and seventy feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred and fifty feet; thence due south four hundred seventy-seven and nine-tenths feet to the east-west center line of section 23; thence south eighty-nine degrees twenty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of six hundred and seventy feet; thence south along the east eighth line of section 23 south no degrees twenty-five and one-half minutes west a distance of two thousand one hundred and twenty-two feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred and ten feet to public highway No. 141; thence south no degrees eighteen minutes west a distance of five hundred and seventeen feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of five hundred seven and eight-tenths feet; thence south two degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of four hundred eighty-four and three-tenths feet; thence south eighty-four degrees seven and one-half minutes east a distance of three hundred ninety-six and five-tenths feet; thence south no degrees forty-four and one-half minutes east a distance of seven hundred twenty-one and five-tenths feet; thence north eighty-nine degrees twenty-two and one-half minutes east a distance of five hundred seventy-one and three-tenths feet; thence south twenty-two degrees forty-seven minutes east a distance of one hundred sixty and three-tenths feet; thence south twenty-seven degrees fifty minutes east a distance of one thousand four hundred eleven and two-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-four minutes west a distance of two hundred twenty-three and nine-tenths feet; thence south no degrees twenty-two minutes east a distance of one thousand three hundred twenty-two and five-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-two and one-half minutes west a distance of one thousand six hundred thirty-eight and five-tenths feet to a point on the west right-of-way line of the Des Moines and Central Iowa Railroad; thence south twenty-four degrees eighteen minutes east along west right-of-way line a distance of two thousand eight hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet to the north eighth line of section 36; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-six minutes west a distance of four thousand seven hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south eleven degrees thirty-seven minutes east a distance of one hundred ninety-six and five-tenths feet; thence south fifty-four degrees fifty-three minutes east a distance of three hundred fifty-four and one-tenth feet; thence south four degrees one and one-half minutes west a distance of one hundred sixteen and nine-tenths feet; thence south thirty-five degrees twenty-six minutes west a distance of three hundred ten and four-tenths feet; thence south twelve degrees six minutes west a distance of one hundred ninety-eight and nine-tenths feet; thence south eleven degrees eight minutes east a distance of three hundred sixty-eight and two-tenths feet to the east-west center line of section 35; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of one thousand one hundred seventy-four and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning, except that parcel commencing at the northeast corner of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian thence west along the north line of said south half of southeast quarter of section 22 for a distance of seven hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet; thence in a southeasterly direction nine hundred and thirty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22, thence north along the said east line of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 22 for a distance of five hundred forty-one and eight-tenths feet to the place of beginning, said tract of land being further described as the town of Herrold, Polk County, Iowa, and containing four and forty-four one-hundredths acres; and further excepting a parcel commencing at the intersection of the west boundary of the right-of-way of the Des Moines and Central Iowa Railway and the south quarter line of section 22, township 80 north, range 25 west of the fifth principal meridian thence due south two hundred feet; thence west two hundred and sixty-four feet, thence north two hundred feet, thence east two hundred and sixty-four feet to the point of beginning, said tract being further identified as the Herrold School and containing one and twenty-one one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration, to the State of Iowa, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, Iowa, comprising one thousand eight hundred forty-eight and thirty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, and Polk County Target Range, Iowa, comprising seven hundred forty-two and thirty-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

"SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act are hereby reserved to the United States.

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made by the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall vest in tlhe United States without payment of compensation therefor.

"SEC. 4. The conveyance authorized by this act shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

"SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in section 1 of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of the act. The State of Iowa further agrees that

it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

"SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

"SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 148 be considered in lieu of the bill H. R. 755.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Iowa all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the Camp Dodge Military Reservation, located in Polk County, Iowa, comprising 1,848.32 acres, more or less, and Polk County target range, Iowa, comprising 742.34 acres, more or less, both together with all buildings and improvements thereon, and all appurtenances, easements, rights-of-way, and utilities belonging or appurtenant thereto.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Iowa shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States and, in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Iowa shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon during its occupancy by the State of Iowa, for the duration of such state of war or of such national emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Iowa, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

SEC. 5. In consideration for the conveyance of the lands described in the first section of this act, the State of Iowa shall agree to use for military purposes only and not to sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of all or any part of certain lands (hereinafter called State lands) and improvements thereon which are owned by the State of Iowa and are used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the improvements on such lands which are now being used by the State of Iowa for other than military purposes may continue to be used for such purposes so long as such use does not interfere with the utilization of such lands for military purposes. The State of Iowa further agrees that it will, prior to delivery of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 206 South 19th Street, Omaha, Nebr., a description of and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein. In the event that the State of Iowa at any time shall breach the agreement defined in this section, all right, title, and interest in and to the property conveyed to the State of Iowa by the United States under the provisions of this act shall revert to the United States without cost. The State shall further agree that in the event that the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, the use of the State lands and improvements thereon, or any part thereof, shall, upon request of the Secretary of Defense, be used by the United States during such emergency without cost to the United States.

SEC. 6. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to determine and enforce compliance with the conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in this act and any related documents.

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

Similar House bill H. R. 755 was laid on the table.

INTERCHANGE OF SUPPLIES BETWEEN THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4294) to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 640 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting the term "Air Force," immediately after the term "Navy."

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

CONVEYANCE FOR NATIONAL GUARD PURPOSES OF JACKSON BARRACKS, LA., TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5170) to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans and Saint Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training and support of the National Guard of Louisiana, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States; and such other reservations, restrictions, terms, and conditions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

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

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 653) for the bill H. R. 5170.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1952, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six one-hundredths acres, more or less, in Orleans and St. Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana and for other military purposes, and the conveyance to be made without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the reservation by the United States of all mineral rights, including oil and gas; the right of reentry and use by the United States

in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fail or cease to be used for the training of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and revest in the United States, and, in addition, all improvements made during its occupancy by the State of Louisiana shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 2. The costs of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Louisiana.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 5170) was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL THE FEE STAMP REQUIREMENT IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5841) to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of April 5, 1906 (34 Stat. 102), as amended (22 U. S. C. 1196), be repealed; and section 1728 of the Revised Statutes (22 U. S. C. 1194) be amended to read as follows:

"ACCOUNT OF FEES: CERTIFICATION

"Every consular officer responsible for the collection of fees, in rendering his account of fees received, shall furnish a full transcript of the register which he is required to keep, and certify that such transcript is an accurate and complete record of all fees received for the period shown."

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

REPEALING SERVICE CHARGE FOR MAKING AND AUTHENTICATING COPIES OF RECORDS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 213 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 166) shall be and the same is hereby repealed.

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

INCREASE OF FEE FOR PASSPORT APPLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4573) authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and other purposes, Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas or the United States applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferrred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR LOS EBANOS, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2984) authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and other purposes, E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and also subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possesed by bridge corporations for bridge purposes, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State of Texas.

SEC. 3. The said E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of the State of Texas or the United States applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, is hereby granted to E. B. Reyna, his heirs, or legal representatives; and any such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such public agency, international bridge authority, or international bridge commission.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

ROADS AND BRIDGES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 245) to amend the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to

provide for the construction and maintenance of roads, the establishment and maintenance of schools, and the care and support of insane persons in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322), is amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior, or such officer, or officers, as may be designated by him, shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, upon his own motion or upon petition, to locate, lay out, construct, and maintain highways, roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to and through any town, mining or other industrial camp or settlement, or between and through any such town, camps, or settlements therein, if in his judgment such highways, roads, trails, or bridges are needed and will be of permanent value for the development of Alaska; but no such highways, roads, trails, or bridges shall be constructed to and through any town, camp, or settlement which is wholly transitory or of no substantial value or importance for mining, trade, agricultural, or manufacturing purposes: *Provided,* That only such highways, roads, trails, and bridges, including access roads to military reservations and other Federal installations, as may be designated by the Governor of Alaska and approved by the Secretary of the Interior may be constructed and maintained through any town, camp, or settlement."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the third sentence of section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 322), is further amended to read as follows:

" 'The Secretary of the Interior, or such officer, or officers as may be designated by him, shall, upon his own motion or upon petition, locate, lay out, construct, and maintain roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to and through any town, mining or other industrial camp or settlement, or between and through any such town, camps or settlements therein, if in his judgment such roads, trails, or bridges are needed and will be of permanent value for the development of Alaska: *Provided,* That within incorporated towns only roads and bridges which are designated by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the through highway system of the Territory of Alaska may be constructed under this section: *Provided, further,* That no roads or bridges within incorporated towns shall be maintained under this section'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 322)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 603) to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act making an additional grant of lands for the support and maintenance of the Agricultural College and School of Mines of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091; 48 U. S. C., sec. 354a), is amended by striking out "nonmineral" and inserting after "in the Territory of Alaska" the following: "whether or not such land has mineral deposits therein."

SEC. 2. That section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "at the capital and in a newspaper of like circulation which shall then be regularly published."

SEC. 3. That section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "nor, in case of the sale of the land, less than a minimum price of $5 per acre."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of such act is amended by striking out "secretary of state" and inserting in lieu thereof "Board of Administration."

SEC. 5. That the proviso in section 6 of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. That references in such act and other acts of Congress to the Agricultural College and School of Mines in the Territory of Alaska shall be deemed to refer to the University of Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 1 of the act of January 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1091; 48 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 354a), hereafter referred to as the act, is amended by deleting the words 'nonmineral surveyed', and by inserting after the words 'in the Territory of Alaska' the words 'whether or not such lands contain mineral deposits.'

"SEC. 2. The following sections shall be added to the act as sections 3 and 4, and the present section 3 and all subsequent sections shall be renumbered accordingly:

" 'SEC. 3. That, upon the revocation of any order of withdrawal in Alaska, the order of revocation shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective during which the Territory shall have a preferred right of selection, subject to the requirements of this act, except as against prior existing valid rights or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation: *Provided,* That upon the subsequent disposition of any lands selected under this section, persons now or hereafter entitled to benefits under section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 748; 43 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 282), as now or hereafter amended, shall be afforded a 90-day period in which to acquire the lands upon the terms and conditions upon which the Territory has determined to dispose of the lands: *Provided further,* That the foregoing proviso shall be terminated or repealed by the termination or repeal of section 4 of the act of September 27, 1944, as now or hereafter amended.

" 'SEC. 4. That, following the selection of lands by the Territory and the approval of such selection by the Secretary of the Interior, but prior to the issuance of final patent, the Territory shall be authorized to lease and to make conditional sales of such selected lands.'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act as so renumbered is amended by deleting 'nor in case of the sale of the land, less than a minimum price of $5 per acre.'

"SEC. 4. Section 8 of the act as so renumbered, is amended by deleting 'secretary of state' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Board of Administration.'

"SEC. 5. The proviso in section 8 of the act as so renumbered is repealed.

"SEC. 6. All references in acts of the Congress to the Agricultural College and School of Mines in the Territory of Alaska shall be deemed to refer to the University of Alaska."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CLARK COUNTY, MO., TOLL BRIDGE CHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 625) to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the event that the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., shall issue toll bridge revenue refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding or redeeming its outstanding 4 percent toll bridge revenue bonds dated December 1, 1935, which were issued to provide funds for the construction of the bridge authorized by an act of the 72d Congress, 1st session, approved February 14, 1933 (Public Law 337), or in the event that the said district shall extend the maturity date or dates of said outstanding bonds, the rates of toll to be charged for the use of said bridge shall be so adjusted as to provide sufficient revenues to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a fund sufficient to pay the principal, interest, and redemption premium, if any, of such toll bridge revenue refunding bonds, or of said outstanding bonds, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not exceeding 30 years from the date of approval of this act, and such tolls shall be continued until such payments shall have been made. After such bonds and the interest thereon shall have been paid, said bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating said bridge, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5166) relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE DEPARTMENT TO CARRY FIREARMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5860) to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if somebody can give us some reason for arming State Department employees. Are these to be in foreign countries or this country?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 5860 is to authorize a small number of security officers of the Department of State to carry firearms when they are assigned to protect high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States, as well as our Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State.

When heads of foreign states and other distinguished representatives of foreign governments visit the United States at the invitation of the President, the responsibility for managing their visit falls upon the State Department. As a part of this responsibility, it is the duty of the Department to insure the safety of these visiting dignitaries. It is true that in every jurisdiction into which the visitor's trip takes him, State and local police are assigned to assist in giving him protection. However, as the visitor proceeds from one police jurisdiction to another, the State Department security officer is the person responsible for his constant protection. This officer is forced to assume a tremendous responsibility totally unarmed, as there is no existing authority for security officers of the State Department to carry firearms.

Prior to 1953 certain security officers of the State Department were permitted to carry weapons. However, when the question was raised as to whether or not there was authority for such practice, the legal adviser of the State Department determined that there was not. Warde M. Cameron, assistant legal adviser, Department of State, submitted the following memorandum dealing with this subject:

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO CARRY FIREARMS

There is no Federal law which specifically authorizes special agents and other officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms for protective purposes, such as protecting heads of foreign states and other high officials of foreign governments who are in this country as distinguished guests of the United States, and the Secretary and Under Secretary of State, and guarding classified material at international conferences. In the absence of Federal legislation on the subject, the right to carry firearms is regulated by applicable State, county, and municipal law, with which such officers and employees must comply.

WARDE M. CAMERON,
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Therefore, we now have the extremely dangerous situation wherein the persons with primary responsibility for the protection of the lives of distinguished foreign visitors do not have the full authority necessary to carry out their functions properly.

Certainly a serious situation could be created if any harm came to a foreign official while he was visiting in the United States. Not only have relations between friendly governments been strained often to the breaking point by incidents of this sort but in the history of the world such incidents have even been the sparks that set off wars. To date, our Government has not experienced an occasion when it would have been necessary to use firearms. We have indeed been fortunate in this respect. However, there is always a first time, and we should be prepared in the event that time arrives.

Although not specifically spelled out in the Constitution, it has always been accepted that the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States is a Federal function. Who can question that the protection of a foreign visitor, the guest of the President of the United States, is an integral part of the conduct of our foreign relations and clearly a Federal function? Under international law and practice it is the duty of a host state to insure the safety of officials of foreign states traveling or sojourning in its territory. As long ago as 1790, the Congress recognized this responsibility and its Federal nature by the enactment of a criminal law providing penalties for assaulting an ambassador or public minister in violation of the law of nations. There can thus be no question as to the authority of Congress to enact legislation enabling officers of the Federal Government to carry out a Federal responsibility.

The carrying of firearms is governed generally by the laws of states and local governmental subdivisions. In the absence of overriding authority in the form of Federal legislation, a Federal official would be required to comply with all local regulations, a manifest impossibility for one traveling through many jurisdictions, with many different types of laws and regulations. The Congress has recognized the need for such legislation in the case of other Federal officials. The Secret Service, with its responsibility to protect the President of the United States and members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President, as well as with its general police powers with respect to matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, is specifically authorized to carry firearms by section 3056 of title 18 of the United States Code. Similar authority is given to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by section 3052 of the same title, and to United States marshals and deputies by section 3053. Certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency are given this authority by section 403 (j) of title 50 of the code.

It may be asked why it is necessary to create a fourth category of Federal officials, exclusive of the armed services, who will be authorized by statute to carry firearms. The answer to this in my judgment is equally clear. The authority of these three agencies to carry firearms is prescribed by statute. The protection of foreign visitors is not one of their responsibilities. Furthermore, as the Federal agency concerned with maintaining relations with foreign governments, the Department of State is not only the logical agency for carrying out this function but is the agency that has long had this responsibility. The protection of visiting foreign dignitaries is so closely related to other duties of the Department of State as to make it thoroughly impracticable to give this responsibility to another agency.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the enactment of this legislation is essential if we are to enable this government to give to distinguished foreign visitors the same protection that we would expect our officials to be given when they are visiting in other countries.

Mr. GROSS. It is limited to a very few people?

Mr. SELDEN. Yes. I am advised that during the past year a total of 18 men were used on these assignments at various times.

Mr. GROSS. And does it apply both domestically and in foreign countries?

Mr. SELDEN. No. This measure applies only in this country.

Mr. GROSS. In this country only?

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct. The question of whether a State Department security officer can carry a firearm in another country is, of course, a matter to be decided by that country.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it not possible that these security officers could get permission to carry firearms the same as a private citizen when he shows a reason why he should?

Mr. SELDEN. This would hardly be feasible. These security officers accompany distinguished visitors on their visits throughout the United States and, in doing so, travel through many different police jurisdictions. It would be practically impossible to comply with all local laws and regulations as one passes swiftly from one jurisdiction to another.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, special agents and other officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service who have been designated by the Secretary of State, are authorized to carry firearms for the purpose of protecting heads of foreign states, high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Under Secretary of State, and official representatives attending international conferences, or performing special missions.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 4, strike out "special agents and other officers and employees" and insert in lieu thereof "security officers."

In line 6, after "State", insert "and who have qualified for the use of firearms."

In line 11, before "attending", insert "of foreign governments and of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OVER HIGHWAYS AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3825) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States hereby makes retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on concurrent jurisdiction over the following-described land:

Parcel "A": A parcel of land in the town of Harvard, comprising a portion of the original reservation of Fort Devens, shown on sheet numbered 1 of a plan on file in the Office of the Corps of Engineers, New England Division, at Boston, Mass., as number MED–PA–638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northernmost portion of said original reservation and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound in the boundary line of the aforesaid reservation marking a point of curvature in the southerly location line of the right-of-way of the Fitchburg and Leominster Street Railway and extending thence by said boundary southeasterly by a curve to the left of 1,025.00 feet radius 222.45 feet to a point; thence leaving said boundary line and extending north 83 degrees 32 minutes 58 seconds west 520.53 feet to a point on the dividing line between the towns of Harvard and Shirley as approximately located by the Nashua River; thence following said dividing line north 55 degrees 52 minutes 17 seconds east 110.22 feet to the aforesaid boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line south 71 degrees 6 minutes 53 seconds east 221.30 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 15,000 square feet.

Parcel "B": A parcel of land in the town of Shirley, comprising a portion of tract numbered 201, shown on sheet numbered 1 of a plan on file in the Office of the Corps of Engineers, New England Division, at Boston, Mass., as number NED–PA–638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northeasterly corner of said tract and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound marking the northeasterly corner of the boundary line of said tract and extending thence by said boundary line south 27 degrees 36 minutes 2 seconds east 55.34 feet; thence leaving said boundary line and extending south 67 degrees 31 minutes 31 seconds west 619.41 feet to a point again on said boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line north 62 degrees 23 minutes 58 seconds east 616.93 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 17,070 square feet (the above-described parcels of land being the same parcels covered by a grant from the Secretary of War to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated June 18, 1947, authorized by the Act of Congress approved July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. 104)).

Parcel "C": A parcel of land comprising a portion of the Fort Devens Reservation, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the westerly boundary of said reservation (in the town of Lancaster) at bound numbered 39 thereof, and extending thence (along said boundary between said bound numbered 39 and bound numbered 40) north 60 degrees 32 minutes 27 seconds east 623.39 feet; thence leaving said boundary and extending (partly in Lancaster and partly in Harvard) south 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds east 1,074.93 feet; thence in Harvard north 48 degrees 32 minutes 49 seconds east 368.43 feet; thence north 23 degrees 41 minutes 23 seconds east 375.84 feet; thence south 73 degrees 6 minutes 56 seconds east 90.00 feet; thence south 3 degrees 1 minute 55 seconds east 502.16 feet; thence south 15 degrees 29 minutes 11 seconds east 533.03 feet; thence south 51 degrees 39 minutes 51 seconds east 496.49 feet; thence south 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds east 5,656.00 feet; thence by a curve to the left of 2,400.29 feet radius 524.96 feet to a point on the northwesterly location line of the right-of-way of the Boston and Maine Railroad (Worcester to Ayer); said right-of-way location line also marking the easterly boundary of the aforesaid Camp Devens Military Reservation, and said point bearing north 6 degrees 40 minutes 47 seconds east and being 101.06 feet distant from station 1314+79.63 of the base line of said railroad right-of-way; thence following said railroad location line southwesterly by a curve to the left, as shown on plan, of 1,951.33 feet radius 5.87 feet; thence south 30 degrees 45 minutes 59 seconds west 151.40 feet, north 59 degrees 14 minutes 1 second west 16.50 feet and south 30 degrees 45 minutes 59 seconds west 85.78 feet; thence leaving said railroad location line and returning westerly by a curve to the right of 2,600.29 feet radius 423.91 feet; thence north 79 degrees 15 minutes 41 seconds west 6,534.00 feet; thence (partly in Harvard and partly in Lancaster) south 67 degrees 1 minute 10 seconds west 1,415.90 feet; thence (in Lancaster) north 47 degrees 47 minutes 4 seconds west 949.51 feet to a point on the aforesaid westerly boundary of Fort Devens Military Reservation, on the line between bounds numbered 37 and 38 thereof; thence by said boundary line north 70 degrees 11 minutes 26 seconds east 202.26 feet to the said bound numbered 38, and thence north 4 degrees 41 minutes 41 seconds west 503.20 feet to the point of beginning above described, at the aforesaid bound numbered 39.

The area of the above-described parcel is 91.20 acres of which 43.77 acres are in Lancaster and 47.43 acres are in Harvard.

The above-described parcel is shown on a plan signed by P. H. Kitfield, chief engineer, and entitled, "The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Plan of Land in the Towns of Lancaster and Harvard, Worcester County, in Which an Easement for Highway Purposes Is To Be Conveyed to the Commonwealth by the United States of America. Scale: 100 feet to the inch." (The above-described parcel of land being the same parcel covered by grant from the Secretary of the Army to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, dated May 22, 1950, authorized by section 7 of the Act of Congress approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 643).

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction herein contained shall take effect upon acceptance by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO CITY OF RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4359) to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif., is amended by the repeal of sections 3, 4, and 5 thereof, and the substitution of the following:

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized herein shall include all right and title of the Secretary of Commerce in and to that certain personalty now installed within the bed of the said Central Drive, to wit: Approximately 3,700 feet of 12-inch steel pipe, being a water main; and approximately 5,090 feet of 6-inch steel pipe, being a gas main. The city of Richmond may transfer or convey or otherwise dispose of the right, title, and interest in and to the aforesaid personalty, or permit the use thereof to others, whether by deed, lease, permit or otherwise, and grant as well a perpetual easement, any other provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding, over the lands the conveyance of which is authorized in section 1 hereof, so as to permit the replacement, maintenance, operation, renewal, and repair of said personalty: *Provided*, That as long as the property presently occupied by the said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 is held by the United States, the city of Richmond shall bind itself, its successors and assigns, its lessees and permittees to provide service through said water main and gas main or through any replacement or relocation thereof to said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 as is required of water and gas utilities under the laws of the State of California.

"SEC. 4. In consideration of the conveyance authorized in section 1 hereof, and in addition to the conditions set forth in section 2 hereof, the city of Richmond will at all times maintain the said public highway to provide and permit perpetual access to the said Maritime-Richmond Yard No. 3 via said highway for all purposes, and will bind itself and its successors, assigns, lessees, or permittees, as the case may be, to any of the said pipes and pipelines, to provide and permit such service of water and gas as is required of water and gas utilities under the laws of the State of California through said pipes and pipelines or through any replacement or relocation thereof to said yard, as long as the property presently occupied by said yard is held by the United States."

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

INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5398) to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 4, 1907 (ch. 2918, sec. 1, 34 Stat. 1322) as amended (33 U. S. C. 862) is further amended to read as follows: "Commissioned officers, ships officers, members of crews of vessels, and field employees of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey are authorized to make assignments or allotments of their pay under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe."

SEC. 2. (a) The last proviso of the first paragraph of section 16, act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 88; 33 U. S. C. 854), is amended to read as follows: "No person shall be appointed ensign and no commissioned officer shall be promoted to a higher permanent grade on the active list until he has passed a satisfactory mental and physical examination in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce."

(b) Section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 88; 33 U. S. C. 856), is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the third paragraph and substituting therefor the following:

"When serving with the Army, Navy, or Air Force, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall rank with and after officers of corresponding grade in the

Army, Navy, or Air Force of the same length of service in grade."

SEC. 3. (a) The second proviso of section 2b of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 7; 33 U. S. C. 854a (b)), as amended is further amended by inserting a period after the word "engineer" and deleting the words "in excess of one year" which appear at the end of the proviso.

(b) Section 8 of the act of January 19, 1952 (56 Stat. 8), as amended (33 U. S. C. 852b), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the active list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander, for a term of 4 years, and may be reappointed for further periods of 4 years each: *Provided*, That the appointment of the Assistant Director shall terminate 6 months after the appointment of a new Director. His appointment shall create a vacancy and, while holding said office, he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half).

"Any officer who may be retired while serving as Director or Assistant Director, or who has or shall have served 4 years as Director or Assistant Director and is retired after completion of such service while serving in a lower rank or grade, shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or rank held by him as Director or Assistant Director: *Provided*, That any officer, upon expiration of his appointment as Director or Assistant Director, shall, unless reappointed, revert to the grade and number that he would have occupied had he not served as Director or Assistant Director and such officer shall be an extra number in his grade."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 6 (a) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 298; 33 U. S. C. 853e) is amended by changing the period to a colon at the end thereof and adding the following: "*Provided*, That whenever there are vacancies in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), officers in the permanent grade of ensign may be promoted to and appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) upon completion of 2 years' service.".

(b) Section 10 (a) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299; 33 U. S. C. 853i (a)) is amended to read:

"Appointments in and promotions to all permanent grades shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

SEC. 5. The following statutes are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 4687 of the Revised Statutes (33 U. S. C. 886).

(2) Section 4688 of the Revised Statutes (33 U. S. C. 887).

(3) Paragraph 7 of section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (28 Stat. 613; 44 U. S. C. 247).

(4) The last paragraph of section 1 of the act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 974; 33 U. S. C. 863).

(5) The act of March 9, 1909 (35 Stat. 1064; 33 U. S. C. 889 and 890).

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

REGULATION OF FIREWORKS IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4650) to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), is amended by adding a new chapter, number 26, embracing sections 521 and 522, and reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 26—REGULATION OF SALE AND USE OF FIREWORKS

"Sec.
"521. Regulations authorized.
"522. Punishment for violations.

"§ 521. Regulations authorized

"The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to prescribe, and from time to time alter and amend, regulations prohibiting, limiting, or otherwise regulating the sale and use of any fireworks within the Canal Zone, or any portions thereof, as he may deem necessary to public safety.

"§ 522. Punishment for violations

"Any person who shall violate any regulation prescribed under authority of the next preceding section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $100 or by 30 days imprisonment in jail, or by both."

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

LANDS OF THE YAKIMA TRIBE (STATE OF WASHINGTON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1802) to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the act entitled "An act to authorize the leasing of Indian lands situated within the State of Washington for business and other purposes," approved August 9, 1946 (25 U. S. C., secs. 403b and 403c), or any other provision of law, the Yakima Tribe acting through its tribal council may lease to the State of Washington that land more particularly described in section 4 for the purpose of developing, maintaining, and preserving Fort Simcoe (Mool-Mool) for historical and for park purposes.

SEC. 2. The lease entered into under authority of the first section of this act—

(1) shall be null and void and the Yakima Tribe shall have the right of immediate possession if the State of Washington ever ceases to maintain Fort Simcoe (Mool-Mool) for historical and for park purposes;

(2) shall be entered into for a period of 99 years with the right of renewal for an additional term upon agreement of the parties;

(3) shall not contain any provision permitting the exploitation of any natural resource;

(4) shall specifically reserve to the Yakima Tribe all mineral and other subsurface rights in such lands which such tribe possesses on the date of enactment of this act; and

(5) shall be entered into under such rules and regulations, and contain such other provisions, as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

SEC. 3. The existing agreement between the Yakima Tribe and the State of Washington may be amended to comply with this act.

SEC. 4. (a) The land on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., which may be leased pursuant to this act, is more particularly described as follows:

The east half of the northeast quarter of section 20, and the west half of the northwest quarter of section 21, and the west half of the east half of the northwest quarter of section 21, all in township 10 north, range 16 east, Willamette meridian, containing 200 acres more or less.

(b) Such additional tribal lands of the Yakima Tribe as adjoin the land described in subsection (a) may, pursuant to all of the terms and conditions of this act, be leased by such tribe, acting through its tribal council, to the State of Washington.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "with the right of renewal for an additional term upon agreement of the parties."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions with respect to subjection of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation to exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws of the United States in the Executive order dated February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation, and in the third proviso in section 1 of the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202), and the provisions of subsection (b) (1) and (2) and of the remainder, following the word "purposes," of subsection (b) (4) of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 461–479), as amended by the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 862, 863; 25 U. S. C. 463), are hereby repealed, all tribal lands within the Papago Indian Reservation are hereby withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under such laws, the minerals underlying such lands are hereby made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian tribe, and such minerals shall be subject to lease for mining purposes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not be applicable to lands within the Papago Indian Reservation for which a mineral patent has heretofore been issued or to a claim that has been validly initiated before the date of this act and thereafter maintained under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 348; 25 U. S. C. 396f), is amended by deleting therefrom "the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona,".

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITY OF REFUGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5300) to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, when title to such lands located on the island of Hawaii, within the following-described area, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said lands shall be set apart as the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the benefit and inspiration of the people:

PARCEL 1

Being all of R. P. 3306, L. C. Aw. 7219, Apana 2 to Kaliae, all of L. C. Aw. 9470 to Muki, and portions of R. P. 7874, L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi (Ahupuaa of Honaunau), and R. P. 6852, L. C. Aw. 7712 Apana 1 to M. Kekuanaoa (Ahupuaa of Keokea).

Beginning at a 1½-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani," at the southeast corner of this parcel, the northeast corner of parcel 3, and on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Seventy-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred and eighty feet along the land of Kiilae, L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu and passing over a rock called "Kuwaia," marked K+K at six hundred seventy-three and two-tenths feet to high-water mark; thence along high-water mark, along seacoast for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seacoast being:

2. One hundred and thirty-five degrees fifty-one minutes three thousand nine hundred seventy-six and one-tenth feet;

3. One hundred and fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand and seventy-eight feet;

4. Two hundred and forty degrees fifty-five minutes one thousand two hundred four and four-tenths feet;

5. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees nine minutes two hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi, along stone wall and old trail;

6. Two hundred and sixty degrees fifty-four minutes one hundred seventy-five and nine-tenths feet across old trail along stone wall to a "+" on rock;

7. One hundred and fifty-eight degrees six minutes seventy-two feet along L. C. Aw. 7296 to Puhi, along stone wall;

8. Two hundred and sixty degrees thirty-six minutes ninety and seven-tenths feet along stone wall;

9. One hundred and ninety-four degrees ten minutes sixty-two and nine-tenths feet along stone wall along L. C. Aw. 7295 and 6979–B:2 to Keolewa;

10. One hundred and seventy-five degrees fifty-four minutes twenty-six and nine-tenths feet along stone wall;

11. Two hundred and fifteen degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-seven and four-tenths feet along stone wall along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

12. One hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-eight minutes forty-eight and one-tenth feet along same;

13. Two hundred and twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the south side of fifty-foot road;

14. Two hundred and sixty-four degrees fifty-one minutes one hundred fifteen and two-tenths feet along the south side of fifty-foot road;

15. Two hundred and fifty-two degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and two-tenths feet along same;

16. Two hundred and eighty-six degrees thirty minutes one hundred seventy and nine-tenths feet along same;

17. Two hundred and thirty-eight degrees twenty-five minutes ninety-two and eight-tenths feet along same;

18. Two hundred and twenty-three degrees one minute one hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet along same;

19. Three hundred and thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds four thousand nine hundred eighty and three-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi and L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument at one thousand four hundred eigthy-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, one hundred sixty-six and ninety one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 2

Being portions of L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi, R. P. 7874 (Ahupuaa of Honaunau).

Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the northeast corner of this parcel, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being two thousand one hundred thirty-nine feet south and eleven thousand six hundred seventeen and nine-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred fifty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred sixty and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

2. Ninety-three degrees thirty minutes two hundred and sixty-nine feet along the same, along stone wall, along lot 2 of the subdivision by B. P. Bishop estate;

3. Eighty-two degrees no minutes three hundred and eighteen feet along same to the east side of fifty-foot road;

4. Thence along the east side of fifty-foot road, the direct azimuth and distance being: one hundred seventy-one degrees twenty minutes two hundred ninety-one and five-tenths feet;

5. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes six hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the point of beginning.

Area, three and seventy one-hundredths acres.

Together with an easement six feet wide for a pipeline right-of-way extending from the Government road to parcel 1, the south side of said right-of-way being described as follows:

Beginning at the east end of this right-of-way on the common boundary of the lands of Honaunau and Keokea, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being three thousand one hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet south and eleven thousand seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Eighty degrees thirty-six minutes five seconds one hundred and seventeen feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa, to the Triangulation Station "Ahupuaa" of the B. P. Bishop estate;

2. Eighty-two degrees twenty minutes seven thousand two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument on the east boundary of parcel 1 the coordinates of said point of the end of this six-foot right-of-way referred to Government Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being four thousand one hundred eighty-two and four-tenths feet south and three thousand seven hundred thirty-nine and four-tenths feet east.

Area, one and two one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 3

Being portion of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu, being portion of the Ahupuaa of Kiilae.

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani" at the northeast corner of this parcel, the southeast corner of parcel 1, on the common boundary of the land of Keokea and Kiilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred thirty eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds five hundred ninety-five and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu to the eight thousand foot south coordinates line referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni";

2. Ninety degrees no minutes one thousand ninety-nine and seven-tenths feet along same and along said eight thousand foot south coordinates line and across school grant 7 Apana 6 to high-water mark;

3. Thence along high-water mark, along sea, the direct azimuth and distance being: two hundred six degrees thirty-three minutes thirty seconds four hundred eighty-two and nine-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred fifty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred eighty feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a rock called Kuwaia, marked K+K at six and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, ten and twenty-five one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. Upon the vesting of title in the United States to such lands as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary and suitable for historical park purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act, the City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be established by order of the said Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any other lands within the area described above shall become a part of the national historical park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States and upon publication of an appropriate supplemental order by the said Secretary in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, by donation or purchase, with any funds that may be available for that purpose, lands and interests in lands which may be needed for the City of Refuge National Historical Park within the area described in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 4. In order to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in consolidating in Federal ownership lands within the area described above, and to facilitate acquisition of the lands needed for the national historical park, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is also authorized to acquire lands for said park, at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii by exchange or otherwise, in accordance with procedure prescribed by the act of February 27, 1920 (41 Stat. 452).

SEC. 5. The City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 461–467), with regard to preservation of historic sites and objects of national significance.

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

ELIMINATION OF LIMITATIONS ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5376) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

BULK PURCHASE OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION ASSETS BY FEDERAL LAND BANKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some member of the committee if the conditions under which the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation can be purchased have been set out? If there is no one present to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF JEFFERSON AND PLAQUEMINES DRAINAGE DISTRICT, LOUISIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1768) for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SUBPENA POWER FOR COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4514) to strengthen the investigation provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some Member certain questions about this bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1955

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5650) to provide for the setlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 5650, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF PATIENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5787) to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, not to exceed $25,000 to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to settle or compromise all claims by various persons of right or title to or interest in certain structures (including furniture and fixtures therein) which were erected prior to January 1, 1954, by patients of the Public Health Service hospital at Carville, La., at their own expense on the grounds of the hospital. Such claims may be settled or compromised, with the approval of the Administrator of General Services, for such amounts as may be arrived at by agreement between the Secretary and the persons claiming such right, title, or interest. Nothing in this act shall effect the authority of the Attorney General to conduct litigation affecting the United States, and no funds available for purposes of this act shall be available for paying any judgment or settlement arising out of any such litigation.

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

AMENDING SECTION 1721, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5417) to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1721, title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"§ 1721. Sale or pledge of stamps

"Whoever, being a postmaster or postal service employee, knowingly and willfully; uses or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards entrusted to his care or custody in the payment of debts, or in the purchase of merchandise or other salable articles, or pledges or hypothecates the same or sells or disposes of them except for cash; or sells or disposes of postage stamps or postal cards for any larger or less sum than the values indicated on their faces; or sells or disposes of stamped envelopes for a larger or less sum than is charged therefor by the Post Office Department for like quantities; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards at any point or place outside of the delivery of the office where such postmaster or other person is employed; or for the purpose of increasing the emoluments, or compensation of the postmaster or any employee of a post office or station or branch thereof, inflates or induces the inflation of the receipts of any post office or any station or branch thereof; or sells or disposes of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, or postal cards, otherwise than as provided by law or the regulations of the Post Office Department; shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "willfully" and insert "willfully:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LOWERING LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE RETIREMENT AGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3399) to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former lighthouse service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZE EARLY COAST GUARD DISCHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5224) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting following and underneath item 369 in such analysis, the following item:

"370. Discharge within 3 months before expiration of enlistment."

SEC. 2. Chapter 11 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately following section 369 thereof, a new section, as follows:

"§ 370. Discharge within 3 months before expiration of enlistment.

"Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any enlisted man may be discharged at any time within 3 months before the expiration of his term of enlistment or extended enlistment without prejudice to any right, privilege, or benefit that he would have received, except pay and allowances for the unexpired period not served, or to which he would thereafter become entitled, had he served his full term of enlistment or extended enlistment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled 'Coast Guard', to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5875) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of this bill or some member of the committee in reference to it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

INCORPORATION OF ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3786) to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CORPORATION CREATED; INCORPORATORS; NAME

SECTION 1. The following persons, to wit: James G. Walsh, Distinguished Service Cross, 50 Patten Street, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Robert G. Woodside, Distinguished Service Cross, 3858 First Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Deming Bronson, Congressional Medal of Honor, Route 2, Box 322, Roseburg, Oreg.; George E. Parker, Jr., Distinguished Service Cross, Lutherville, Md.; Leo L. Zingale, Distinguished Service Cross, 3612 East 117th Street, Cleveland, Ohio; John Davis, Congressional Medal of Honor, 800 North Shore Drive, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Glen O. McEwen, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 737, Spokane 3, Wash.; Ben. Prager, Distinguished Service Cross, 316 Court House, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Earle D. Norton, Distinguished Service Cross, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Ray Eastman, Navy Cross, 396 LaSalle Avenue, Buffalo 15, N. Y.; Ben Neff, Distinguished Service Cross, 208 Evanston Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Warren L. Granger, Navy Cross, 703 16th Street, Alexandria, Va.; William Oliver Smith, Distinguished Service Cross, 907 Holt Drive, Raleigh, N. C.; Robert M. Gaynor, Distinguished Service Cross, 621 South Taylor Street, Arlington, Va.; Leon M. Hanna, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 217, McHenry, Ill.; Bruno O. Forsterer, Congressional Medal of Honor, Walker Street, Oakland, Calif.; Elmer R. Hangartner, Distinguished Service Cross, 2103 Lynn Avenue, Altoona, Wis.; Thomas Eadie, Congressional Medal of Honor, 120 Gibbs Avenue, Newport, R. I.; John D. Hawk, Congressional Medal of Honor, 3243 Solie, Bremerton, Wash.; Leon A. Dombrowski, Distinguished Service Cross, 137 Highland Drive, Williamsville, N. Y.; William C. Hardie, Distinguished Service Cross, Post Office Box 1396, Billings, Mont.; E. Lee Henderson, Navy Cross, 10948 Fruitland Drive, North Hollywood, Calif.; Othel J. Gee, Distinguished Service Cross, 416 Medical Arts Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Leslie Hardy, Distinguished Service Cross, 1021 East Sierra Vista, Phoenix, Ariz.; A. Allen Johnson, Distinguished Service Cross, 953 Dixwell Avenue, New Haven, Conn.; Dennis C. Turner, Distinguished Service Cross, 1008 Missouri Avenue, Houston, Tex.; Columbus Whipple, Distinguished Service Cross, 2704 Brinker Avenue, Ogden, Utah; John D. Licklider, Distinguished Service Cross, 229 Woodrow Avenue, Martinsburg, W. Va.; Murry Wolffe, Navy Cross, 240 Gregory Avenue, Passaic, N. J.; Willard H. Marshall, Distinguished Service Cross, 31 West Whitney Street, Sheridan, Wyo.; and such persons as may be chosen who are members of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., an incorporated patriotic society of service men and women and ex-service men and women to whom has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, or the Navy Cross, and their successors, are hereby declared to be a body corporate. The name of the corporation shall be Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

ORGANIZATION OF CORPORATION; DELEGATES

SEC. 2. The persons named in section 1 of this act and such other persons as may be selected from among the membership of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., a New York corporation, are hereby authorized to complete the organization of said corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and to do all other things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act, at which meeting any person duly accredited as a delegate from any local or State chapter of the existing corporation, known as the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., shall be permitted to participate in the proceedings thereof.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to commemorate the best traditions of the citizen and professional soldier, sailor, and marine; to foster the spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the Constitution of the United States; to perpetuate that spirit of comradeship which was the greatest single factor in the success of the armed services, and to keep alive the heroic incidents of the armed services and preserve the memory of our departed companions.

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

AMENDING THE AMERICAN LEGION CHARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3813) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Legion," approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285, title 36, U. S. C. 1940 edition, sec. 43), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the purpose of this corporation shall be: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to promote peace and good will among the peoples of the United States and all the nations of the earth; to preserve the memories and incidents of the two World Wars and the Korean hostilities fought to uphold democracy; to cement the ties and comradeship born of service; and to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service to their country."

SEC. 2. That section 5 of such act of September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285, title 36, U. S. C., 1940 edition, sec. 45), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That no person shall be a member of this corporation unless he has served in the naval or military services of the United States at some time during any of the following periods: April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918; December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945; June 25, 1950, to July 27, 1953; all dates inclusive, or who, being a citizen of the United States at the time of entry therein, served in the military or naval service of any of the governments associated with the United States during said wars or hostilities: *Provided, however,* That such person shall have an honorable discharge or separation from such service or continues to serve honorably after any of the aforesaid terminal dates."

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

AMENDING THE AMVETS CHARTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4754) to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act approved July 23, 1947, Public Law 216, 80th Congress (61 Stat. 407; 36 U. S. C. 67e), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Any person who served in the Armed Forces of the United States of America or any American citizen who served in the armed forces of an allied nation of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and on or before January 31, 1955, is eligible for regular membership in AMVETS, provided such service when terminated by discharge or release from active duty be by honorable discharge or separation. No person who is a member of, or who advocates the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government by force, and no person who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become, or continue to be, a member of this organization."

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

PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 734) to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That title 18, United States Code, section 871 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 871. Threats against President, President-elect, and Vice President

"Whoever knowingly and willfully deposits for conveyance in the mail or for delivery

from any post office or by any letter carrier any letter, paper, writing, print, missive, or document containing any threat to take the life of or to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, the President-elect, or the Vice President of the United States, or knowingly and willfully otherwise makes any such threat against the President, President-elect, or Vice President, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 41 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 871 of such title is amended by deleting

"871. Threats against President."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"871. Threats against President, President-elect, and Vice President."

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

INCREASING SALARIES FOR PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4791) to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 40. Compensation of referee's salary and expense funds; retirement of referees: a. Referees shall receive as full compensation for their services salaries to be fixed by the conference, in the light of the recommendations of the councils, made after advising with the district judges of their respective circuits, and of the Director, at rates not more than $17,500 per annum for full-time referees, and not more than $9,000 per annum for part-time referees. In fixing the amount of salary to be paid to a referee, consideration shall be given to the average number and the types of, and the average amount of gross assets realized from, cases closed and pending in the territory which the referee is to serve, during the last preceding period of 10 years, and to such other factors as may be material. Disbursement of such salaries shall be made monthly by or pursuant to the order of the Director."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, immediately after "40a," add "(11 U. S. C. 68 (a))."

Page 1, line 5, change the word "referee's" to "referees" and immediately after this word "referees" add a semicolon and the word "Referees'."

Page 1, line 6, delete the short line between the word referees and the letter "a."

Page 1, line 11, the figures "$17,500" should be changed to read "$15,000."

Page 2, line 1, the figures "$9,000" should be changed to read "$7,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING ADVANCES FROM THE UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5462) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Governor of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, or any of the Territorial laws, to the contrary, to obtain from the Federal Unemployment Fund, established pursuant to the "Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954" (Public Law 567, 83d Cong., approved August 5, 1954), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the Territory of Alaska may qualify for and as may be necessary to obtain for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to claimants entitled thereto under the Alaska employment security law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That the general fund of the Territory of Alaska from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits shall be reimbursed from advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate 1650 and insert the provisions of H. R. 5462 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

H. R. 5462 was laid on the table.

SALE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1762) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could have the attention of some member of the committee or the author of the bill. I note that this provides that the city shall pay one-half of the appraised value of this tract of land. I am wondering what the excuse is for the United States selling this property for half of its appraised value rather than its full value.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE OF MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6043) to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1126), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) The Secretary of Commerce shall maintain a Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., for the instruction and preparation for service in the merchant marine of selected persons as officers thereof. Competitive examinations shall be held annually among those persons nominated as candidates to the Academy by Senators and Representatives. The number of vacancies allocated to each State shall be proportioned to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce from among qualified candidates nominated from that State in the order of merit established by the examinations. In case vacancies remain after the appointments under the preceding sentence have been made, the Secretary of Commerce shall fill them by appointments from qualified candidates from other States.

"(2) In connection with such instruction and as a part thereof, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide for training of merchant marine cadets on Government-owned and subsidized vessels and, in cooperation with other governmental and private agencies, on other vessels, and, for instructional purposes only, in shipyards, plants, and industrial and educational organizations, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce and upon such terms as the Secretary of Commerce may arrange, and expenditures incident to such training are hereby authorized.

"(3) Cadets appointed to the United States Merchant Marine Academy may be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy and may be commissioned as Reserve ensigns in the United States Navy upon graduation from the Academy.

"(4) Cadets at the United States Merchant Marine Academy shall receive allowances for all required uniforms and textbooks as prescribed by rules and regulations under this Act, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet.

"(5) (a) 'Representative' as used in this Act shall include Delegates to the House of Representatives from Alaska and Hawaii and the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(b) 'State' as used in this Act shall include Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

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

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

DR. CRISTJO CRISTOFV ET AL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and head taxes."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERICO UNGAR FINALY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS JOHN MANTICAS ET AL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H R. 1328) for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "Yvonne Manticas."

Line 11, strike out "five" and insert "four."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON ATTORNEY GENERAL TO DETERMINE ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, with Senate amendments there, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Antonio Aikler."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Wladyslaw Barczykowski."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Stefan Ciundziewicki."

Page 2, line 13, after "Jankowski", insert "Roberts Gustav Javalds."

Page 2, line 15, after "Kaminski", insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sam Karlich)."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "Piotr Kowalczyk."

Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Zbigniew Piotrowski."

Page 3, line 20, after "Splawinski", insert "Jan Srodulski."

Page 3, line 21, after "Stubynski", insert "Silvio Svagno."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEMNITY FOR LOSSES AND EXPENSES INCURRED IN DESTRUCTION, ETC., OF SWINE, ETC.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1133) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954, in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema, which has already passed the Senate and is identical to a House bill H. R. 4576.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to indemnify in an amount equal to 50 percent, but not exceeding the indemnity paid by the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred, of the losses and expenses incurred by all persons whose swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses were destroyed, treated, or processed, under authority of law, in July 1954, as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease known as vesicular exanthema.

SEC. 2. The payment of indemnities under the provisions of this act shall be limited, in the absence of Federal appraisal, to those losses and expenses where required proof of such losses and expenses has been made to the State in which such losses and expenses were incurred and 50 percent of such loss and expense has been paid by such State.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be made from funds currently available to the Department of Agriculture.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 4576) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. R. 246, Rept. No. 593) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to postpone the special order granted him for today to Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ATSUKO KIYOTA SZEKERES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress

favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7125281, Berend, Peter Mihaly or Peter Michael Berend.
0300/370564, Boon, Lim Jew.
A-7849663, Brieze, Roberts Martins.
A-7849664, Brieze, Milda Hermine.
A-9555132, Chan, Si Heung.
0300/43030, Chen, Chen Ah.
A-6052568, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.
0300/27496, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng Shun Fan.
A-9766040, Chit, Ho Fung.
A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoik or Ting Hsieh Chow or Chow Ting-Hsieh or Hsieh Ting Chiu.
A-6851319, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang Hua Chow.
A-7073707, Chow, Tseng Kam.
A-9658660, Dong, Ng Eng.
0300/387990, Fong, Ho Wah.
A-8057994, Foo, Sin or Foo Sin.
A-6779040, Frankel, Edwin Nessim.
A-6819141, Hajduszewski, Tadeusz.
A-6970000, Hayya, Jacob.
A-6962959, Ho, Frank Hung Fai.
A-9661887, Ho, Lim Gat.
0300/390670, Huen, Kwai Chuen.
A-7863034, Kadegis, Arvids Gustavs.
A-7863033, Kiss, Eduard.
0300/402141, Kok, He Schiek or Schiek He Kok.
A-6788959, Kringelis, Teodors Andrejs.
A-6788960, Kringelis, Austra.
A-6788961, Kringelis, Daina.
A-6788962, Kringelis, Imants.
A-6634875, Krol, Kazimierz Julian.
A-9669192, Kum, Lay.
A-6843498, Lee, Mary Min Chen.
0300/30416, Lek, Yee Kow.
A-7249066, Liepa, Janis.
A-9682636, Man, Seid.
0300-134639, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.
A-6379854, Mei, Chu Chow Ah.
A-6794934, Mitri, Moise Hanna.
A-6971771, Pikkel, Miralda (nee Piht).
A-7204903, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).
A-6848225, Shen, Frederick Albert.
A-8196650, Shim, Chong.
0300-420528, Siang, Sung Chan.
A-7249064, Sturmanis, Karlis.
A-6965379, Tashkovich, Gligor Tashko.
A-6848676, Ting, Lu.
A-7129774, Tsai, Poo Hubbert.
A-7863001, Ulmanis, Ludvigs.
A-7249880, Valm, Mihkel.
A-7250165, Valm, Aleksei.
A-7249882, Valm, Theodor.
A-9802613, Yick, Tong.
A-6967695, Yin, Huo-Bing.
0300-83569, Ying, Chan.
A-9542543, Yu, Ling Tao or Lum Tow EE.
A-8082386, Yuen, Chan Kam or Chan Hong Kow.
A-6703490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-Shun.
0300-397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.
0300-427936, Chow, Chung Shan.
T-278683, Fong, Koo Chee.
0300-390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.
A-8082075, Kwan, Wu Sing.
A-6971768, Sooaar, Voldemar.
A-6971757, Sooaar, Hela (nee Feder).
A-6910014, Lokiec, Majer.
A-8039688, Tsai, Sung Chu.
0300/29659, Chan, Ah Hoe.
0300-418043, Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan Yuk Cheung.
A-9687373, Chan, Tim.
0300-370929, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu Bou Cheng Ching.
A-6972945, Cheng, Pauline Ming-Hung.
174/736, Cheong, Mong.
A-9533428, Ching, Mark.
A-9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chin.
A-8039173, Fok, Lam.
0300-400335, Fong, Lee.
A-6936267, Geiger, George.
A-6936268, Geiger, Ella (nee Spielman).
0300-423621, Hin, Wong Sui or Wong Kin.
A-6965180, Hsu, Chien Hwai or Jay Hsu.
A-6965179, Hsu, Jiu Hwai or Mai Hsu.
A-6958731, Janovitz, Serena (nee Simon).
A-6971749, Kaevando, Roman.
A-6971748, Kaevando, Helmi (nee Lents).
A-8015625, Kam, Cheung or Cheung Wuen.
A-6692899, Kramar, Branko.
A-6910269, Kramar, Maria.
A-6985975, Kulp, Karel.
A-6971798, Lepp, Aleksei.
A-6971759, Lepp, Agathe (nee Hanslep).
A-6888878, Lien, Din Shiang.
0300-66727, Linic, Vladimir.
A-9782777, Loo, Sam Teer.
A-6772581, Maksimovs, Eriks or Maximovs.
A-6917065, Maksimovs, Michelis or Mikels Maksimovs.
A-6670578, Pang, Yee.
A-7135610, Perl, Lazar.
A-9765644, Piccini, Francesco.
A-6955590, Pulauskas, Matas.
A-7809727, Shak, To or Doo Sat.
0300-400854, Shing, Lo Kam.
A-7849428, Silins, Adolfs Janis.
A-7849429, Silins, Maija Alexandra.
A-7849430, Silins, Jr., Adolfs.
A-7084938, Sipos, Marianne Margaret Kertesz.
A-9804295, Suurna, Mihkel.
A-9561923, Tee, Toon Hue.
A-6307394, Tom, Gong or Tom Gong or Tom Shing.
A-9533429, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or Tom Shing or Chung Chuen.
A-8258584, Too, Fung or Too Fung.
A-8082014, Toong, Cha Ching or Toong Chue Ching or Peter Chue Ching Toong.
A-8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.
A-6967364, Wang, John Y.
A-6851357, Wang, Richard I-Hsiang.
A-7476304, Yao, Ting Hui or Michael T. H. Yao.
A-9507456, Yow, Choy or Choy You.
A-7292642, Boldyreff, Antonina (nee Zhigmanovsky).
A-7292641, Boldyreff, Helen or Helene.
A-8082841, Chen, Yen or Chen Yi Shi or Yi Shi Chen.
0300-249540, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.
A-7210403, Christopoulos, Yoanna Khamis or Jeanette Christou Christopoulos.
A-6971650, Erdi, Anthony or Antal.
A-9647005, Fang, Pow Foo.
0300-97188, Fook, Tsang Koon.
0300-424088, Fu, Quo or Pang Choy.
A-6775569, Hlavac, Frantisek Josef.
A-7073610, Hlavac, Marta.
A-8082037, Huang, Mary Sei Mei.
A-6830536, Irani, Joseph Isaac or Joseph Irani.
A-6899364, Kazimierski, Stanley.
A-7863216, Kesteris, Mikelis.
A-7863217, Kesteris, Ilze.
A-7863218, Kesteris, Andrejs.
A-9836636, Lian, Shin Ah.
A-6851636, Liu, Julius Yun-I.
0300/408693, Moy, Young.
A-7084232, Petraitis, Juczas or Joseph Petraitis.
A-7243875, Stenclavs, Krists.
A-7244305, Stenclavs, Augusts.
A-6704110T, Sun, Pao-Chih or Paulette Pao-Chi Sun.
0300-402447, Teng, Wong Gee or Wong Kee.
A-6851366, Tien-Jan, John Paul Ly.
175/651, Wan, Lam.
A-9778441, Wei, Toh Chung.
A-8065346, Wei, Wang Ah or Wang Ah Vee.
A-6851523, Yang, Thomas Meng Ping.
A-9731090, Ching, Pang.
A-7863027, Eidok, Walter.
A-9644600, Fai, Cheung.
A-7087608, Fasko, Daniel.
A-9764648, Lewandowski, Julian.
0300-399882, Ng. Tou.
A-6986534, Odelia, Sister Mary (li Feng-yu).
A-7863008, Ritums, Janis.
A-7248309, Salme, Karli.
A-9633107, Skratic, Dragutin Pranjo.
A-7863203, Stendzis, Janis.
A-7863204, Stendzis, Ilze Pusaudze.
A-7863205, Stendzis, Imants Arvids.
A-6929742, Tam, Dianalihue Kao.
0300-373583, Wong, Ah King or Wang Ken Sing.
A-6044499, Woo, Sze Lu Hsiang.
A-8078864, Hao, King Fah.
A-8050321, Blascovich, Attilio.
A-7095908, Bogacki, Waclaw Zdzislaw.
A-8082842, Bors, Tibor Eugen.
A-7975342, Boucher, Arsene Andre.
A-6967730, Chen, Wen Pin.
A-6901310, Cheng, Chang Sin.
0300-417793, Chong, Fong or Chong Fong.
A-6986509, Chu, Sister Mary Dulcia.
A-6522833, Chu, Wei Liang.
A-7863026, Eizis, Aleksandrs.
A-7356380, Frankel, Maurice Solomon.
A-7863031, Galvans, Peteris.
A-8091397, Gega, Anthony John.
A-7863032, Gorbants, Imants.
A-9782690, Hee, Wong.
A-7354351, Huang, Shao Chi.
A-9703852, Kam, Mak or James Mak.
A-6848646, Gao, Rose Tse Ching.
0333-403722, Kee, Shum.
A-7095531, Kersna, Johannes Maks.
A-7095532, Kersna, Salme.
A-9573456, King, Ho Ah.
A-9196442, Kirs, Alexander.
A-7204900, Krno, Ladislav Gejza.
A-7204901, Krno, Katherine.
T-1144870, Krno, Katherine Tatiana.
A-7873848, Kum, Chow.
A-7048906, Laupa, Armas.
A-6812186, Lenart, Leslie Oscar.
A-7863225, Lidums, Rudolf.
A-7863227, Lidums, Olaf Rudolf.
A-5971242, Liu, San Koon or Liu San Koon.
A-6854454, Luca, George or Gheorghe.
A-6854456, Luca, Elena.
A-9684344, Lung, Shung Sin or Chung Sin Lung.
A-9825451, Magic, Zdenko.
A-7138009, Matusoff, Ethel.
A-7223209, Mejzr, Miroslav.
A-7223210, Mejzr, Ruzena.
T-2645007, Mejzr, Miroslava Marie.
A-7193990, Mejzr, Ivanka.
A-7802065, Petersons, Karlis.
A-6971770, Piht, Eduard.
A-6971772, Piht, Liidia.
A-9765057, Polushin, Walter John or Viacheslav Ivanovitch Polushin.
A-6405622, Rashin, Louis Nathan.
A-6703361, Shie, Wei Wu.
A-6855586, Shie, Susan Ding Neh (nee Wang).
A-7193991, Spitz, Ruzena.
0300-396920, Sufich, Giovanna.
A-9554379, Sui, Lui or Liu.
A-7975174, Surian, Luca.
T-1144528, Velcich, John.
0300-289791, Vlacich, Ferruccio.
A-6851354, Wang, Chou-Chiu or Gordon Wang.
A-6881707, Yang, Chi.
A-8065847, Yau, Loo.
A-6949354, Zee, Tsong Ngo or Ah Neng.
A-6589294, Aboody, Ruben Moshi.
A-9948302, Canaletich, Mario Giorgio.
A-6709262, Chang, Yuan Chun.
A-6171208, Chen, Kwei Sen.
0300-280451, Chen, Mes Chih Ping.
A-7879678, Chen, Thomas.
A-6970307, Chen, David.
0300-424485, Chen, Peter.
A-7955258, Chmielewska, Maria.
A-6988894, Chuck, Lou Yuen or Low Yean Choe.
A-7243252, Creglia, Giordano.
A-6971766, Esberg, Adele.
A-6971765, Esberg, Juta.
A-8021324, Fatutta, Marco.
A-8065726, Fong, Wong or Fong Wong.
A-7249077, Freimanis, Teodore Genrichs.
A-7249076, Freimanis, Anna Elena Olga.
A-6263402, Gartenszteig, Israel.

A–8031589, Ha, Tsong Tong or Tsong Tung Ha.
A–6971758, Hiiesalu, Endel.
A–7366483, Hsueh-Yung, Shu or Evan Hsueh-Yung Shu.
A–6660388, Hu, Tsei Suan.
A–7283198, Inwentarz, Izak.
1100–29956, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-Chen Kao or Mary Kao.
A–8082033, Kenul, Marcello.
A–8031384, Kow, Ng Kung.
A–6966542, Kuty, Frances.
A–6978177, Lederman, Pejsach or Pejsach Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.
A–6690537, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.
A–6690619, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim Hing.
A–7056802, Loh, Tsau Yueh or Thomas Y. Lowe.
V–305539, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.
A–9782737, Ming, Tung.
A–6971802, Oja, Harry.
A–6971796, Oja, Ruth.
A–8065366. Pomasan, Stefano.
A–2823761, Radulich, Mate.
A–7178411, Reinvald, Manivald.
A–8001335, Rubinich, Joseph.
A–7873098, Runco, Anthony.
A–7095534, Savisaar, Elmar Johannes.
A–7095535, Savisaar, Armilda Kolk.
A–7095536, Savisaar, Atso.
0300–418127, Sepcich, John.
A–9770642, Shi, Chang or Fred San.
A–6904332, Sipajlo, Jiri.
A–7809912, Strmecki, Josip.
A–7941177, Szubert, Konrad Joseph.
A–9765493, Tamme, Heinar.
A–6887270, Tang, Michael Tsin-Chien.
A–6448741, Tsu, John Bosco or Bing Ming Tsu.
A–9245758, Yiu, Young.
A–6704228, Zak, Helena or Sister Mercita Evita.
A–7095021, Brody, Alexander.
A–6712046, Fok, Dso Yun.
A–9559819, For, Leung or Leung Kai.
A–9799220, Hop, Chu or Chew Hop.
A–8039680, Jurasic, Angelo or Iurasich.
0300–387739, Kam, Sheh.
0300–245055, Kasser, Elizabeth Aranyi.
0300–245055, Kasser, Ivan.
0300–245055, Kasser, Mary.
A–9623303, Ko, Lee King or Lee Kam Ho.
0300–12942, Leong, Sing To.
A–7483853, Simcha, Helene (nee Rosenberger).
T–666654, Soo, John Yun-Chun.
A–6816885, Spitzka, Aloisia.
A–4039059, Toll, Friedrich Alexander.
A–8106037, Tong, Tsang.
0300–409250, Tsia, Ah San.
A–6694159, Weissbart, Esther Vera (nee Blinchevsky).
A–6847895, Chow, Ho.
0300–405869, Foo, Lee or Lee Wai Foo.
0300–408016, Fook, Lee.
A–6938801, Grive, Ansis.
A–9553994, Hing, Lee Ah.
A–9544110, Koel, Valdemar.
A–7126610, Lee, Ted Teh-Yuan.
A–9684355, Liu, Huo Shin or Fok Lau.
A–9529877, Mai, Lee-Shing.
A–7052332, Markovits, Salamon.
A–7138329, Markovits, Ilona (nee Weisz).
A–6974328, Meisels, Martin.
A–7139340, Shaw, Julia Chang.
A–7297278, Steinmetz, Abraham.
A–6933818, Stern, Tibor.
A–6953157, Sulyok, Dezso Karoly.
A–6970438, Sulyok, Etelka.
A–9571956, Tak, Lee.
A–8091549, Vosilla, Angelo, Otavio.
A–6858256, Wen, Peter Liang.
A–6694209, Wen, Amy Tang.
A–6028252, Wong, Yun Jee.
A–7074880, Yeh, Te Fung.
A–7874913, Celich, Frank.
A–9765153, Donatich, Giuseppe.
0300–429047, Fong, Lee Tsi.
A–6735483, Hallac, Joseph Paul.
0300–413098, Hing, Lo.
A–6578981, Kozarski, Danilo Zivko.
A–6640338, Szor, Leopold.
A–6345116, Szor, Irena Philipp.
A–8039682, Tsai, Hong Ping or Ping Tsai Hong.
A–8021319, Babenko, Gennady Konstantinovitch.
0300–387987, Chan, Hong Kong or Chan Pui.
A–9231941, Chew, Tan Sing.
A–7366302, Chu, Pan.
A–7383067, Garbin, Luka Eduard.
A–6499962, Hirsch, Nathan Alfred.
A–7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A–6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A–7849673, Kleinbergs, Mile Anete.
A–8082060, Lubicich, Mario.
A–7849671, Ozolins, Armins.
0501–19752, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang Tseng.
A–6971769, Peters, Juuli.
A–8065425, Shih, Shio Nia or Shia Nia Shih.
0300–421797, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.
A–6848091, Tan, Ying Chun.
A–6938807, Tipans, Valija (nee Ievins).
A–6887732, Tsao, Shu Yun Tseng (nee Shu Yun Tseng).
A–7056816, Tuzar, Jaroslav.
A–7358945, Tuzar, Jirina.
A–8015056, Tuzar, Jana.
0500–33535, Wimmer, Katalin.
A–6986573, Wong, Kau Sau or Kai Sau Wong.
A–7383351, Yang, Samuel Hsueh-Lun.
A–7383352, Yang, Hsiu-Hwa.
A–7283009, Borsic, Aladar.
A–6371814, Choi, Ho Liang.
0300–405913, Chong, Yun or Cheung Wan.
A–7350611, Chow, Chung Lee or Ven Sih Chow.
A–6320011, Chu, Choy.
A–7189791, Dambos, Kostas.
A–7243855, Fridmanis, Imants Egons.
A–7243067, Fridmanis, Erika Upite.
A–7138432, Grabowski, Bronislaw.
A–9501262, Grandke, Telesfor.
A–6952325, Grunfeld, Juda.
A–6857659, Habbab, Abdulghani Joseph.
0300–379350, Hah, Ng.
A–9686792, Kin, Chan.
A–7061800, Koci, Vaclav.
A–6971809, Kukk, Verner Reinhold.
A–6971810, Kukk, Fronelly Franziska.
A–6971777, Kukk, Harald.
A–5951611, Lung, Ben or Long.
A–8091360, Mon, Lum.
A–7244196, Nagy, Ivan Gabor.
0400/54441, Raicovich, Giuseppe.
0300–92577, San, Lum Hong or Chow King Fen.
0300–410615, Sang, Tsang.
A–8082091, Scaliordick, John or Giovanni Sgaliordich.
A–9560203, Sing, Foo Wah or Foo Wah Teng.
A–7138246, Sturm, Jolana Judita.
A–6381281, Tien, Sheue Fung or Arthur Whitfield or Stanley Tien.
A–9513949, Wai, Nam.
A–6624918, Woo, Henry Kyi-Oen.
A–6971805, Wosa, Aino Adele or Aino Adele Riks or Aino Adele Edal.
A–7961771, Wosa, Oscar Adolf.
A–9705521, Yee, Ho or Yee Ho.
A–8091322, Yee, Sang Fon or Yee Sing or Yu Hsing.
0300–422039, Yow, Ng or Ng Yin.
A–7244303, Akmans, Marta Emiolia.
A–7992859, Chew, Chan formerly Chan Shing Jow.
A–7457745, Foo, William Er Chen.
A–7249874, Kermon, Rudolf.
A–9733412, Kong, Ngo Ying.
A–6958636, Lin, Chao-Han.
A–6849918, Liu, Chia-Lo.
A–1903522, Liu, I. Hsin.
A–9744381, Toong, Ding Yao.
A–7138447, Winternitz, Jenta.
A–7120716, Balassa, Bela.
A–7173016, Balassa, Ida Bogyor.
A–6301049, Cerven, George.
A–6792244, Chang, Sing Chen or Sing Chen Chang.
A–7197313, Chang, Chien Wei Lan or Chien Wei Lan or Chang Lah Chien Wei.
A–7197314, Chang, Chung Yung or Judy Yung Chang or Judy Chung Yung Chang.
A–9635195, Che, Leong.
A–6163714, Ho, Lien Yu.
A–7395257, Ho, Yin Hwa Cheng.
A–7395258, Ho, Henry Nieuhan.
A–7395259, Ho, Stephen Shianoling.
A–7395260, Ho, Barbara Beeyuan.
A–7395261, Ho, Margaret Yustang.
A–6674633, Komarek, Vit.
A–7398466, Krizanova, Maria.
0300–416920, Li, Sheng Sen.
A–6026376, Lo, Arthur Wu-Nien.
A–6403589, Lo, Elizabeth Heng-Hui Shen.
T–1892157, Loy, Too.
A–6935169, Mok, Charlie or Mak Wee.
A–8282626, Sung, Zee Hu.
A–6847853, Tyau, Louise (nee Shu-Chiu Luan).
A–6847962, Wang, Yu Chiang or Richard Y. C. Wang.
A–6453829, Albrecht, Marie Neumannova.
A–7210188, Barta, Tibor.
A–6798984, Briedis, Arturs.
A–7087346, Chuh, Sharlin or Sharlin Charlie Chuh.
A–9569306, Foo, Wong Kia.
A–6849448, Guang, Mann-Lo or Michael Kan.
A–6971789, Hyvonen, Alice Uustalu.
A–6851462, Kiang, Lu Yu.
A–7171983, Knauer, Eugenie, formerly Strakaty (nee Petersen) or Indra Devi.
0400/47451, San, Yao Chin.
A–7202554, San, Vera.
A–7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A–7205703, Wong, Sio Yu San.
A–7202553, San, Yu Lan.
0400/54495, San, Yu Lin.
A–7178373, Sarapik, Evart.
A–9825044, Splawinski, Franciszek.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 4, strike out the name "Lek" and substitute "Lee."
Page 4, strike out all of line 6.
Page 8, line 2, after the name "Ng", strike out the period and insert a comma.
Page 8, line 23, after the name "Elizis", insert a comma.
Page 12, line 15, strike out the name "Rubinish" and substitute "Rubinich."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A–7118684, Chen, Jeanne Kuo-Cheng.
A–7790096, Chou, I-Kua.
A–6958664, Hsi, Eugene Yu-Cheng.
A–6848000, Hsi Eugenia Min-I (nee Huang).

A-6965690, Keh, Shou-bing (Alfred).
A-6845060, Lee, Kui-Lung (Cecilia).
A-6703299, Lee, Tsai Hwa.
A-6967575, Liu, Yung-Szi (Frances).
A-6589958, Tsien, Vee Chang.
E-079901, Chong, Kwai or Kwai Chong Chung.
E-092370, Tan, Tommy Sie-Chang.
A-6620717, Dunn, Lily Wen-Yuen Fong.
A-6564145, Fok, Ruth Louise (nee Shen Hsun-Lan) also known as Ruth Louise Hsun-Lan Sung.
A-6851384, Hsia, Chih Tsing or Hsia Chih Tsing.
A-6403564, Hu, Shengen.
T-1144534, Shew, Jimmie Chu Ting.
A-6457337, Tchou, Montchen Tu-Tsang.
0300-217753, Ting, Anna.
A-6008482, Ting, Sheng.
A-6760595, Wen, Richard Yutze.
A-4468478, Chiu, Katherine Yu (nee Tseng).
A-6435876, Chu, Esme Yun-Yun.
A-6691415, Nieh, Eunice Chen Yu.
A-6623014, Ying, Lu Lan.
A-6171334, Chiang, Pang Sun.
A-6351604, Chung, William Y.
A-6457476, Pan, Chi-Hsun.
A-6847923, Pan, Kay.
A-6403565, Shen, Constance Ming Chung.
A-6699858, Tai, Hsia Tao or Tao Tay Hsia.
A-6148143, Tang, Harry Kong Hung also known as Kong-Hung Tang.
0300-455922, Tung, Cheng Yu.
A-6847794, Woo, Dah-Cheng.
A-6848709, Young, Frank Kuankiang.
A-7414876, Chang, Che-Tyan.
A-6844259, Chu, Power Yung Chao.
A-6769936, Bittar, Evelyn Edward or Bittar, E. Edward.
A-6522835, Chu, John Wen-djang aka Chu, Wen Djung.
0200-130593, Hsia, David Yi-Yung.
0200-130594, Hsia, Hsio-Hsuan (nee Shih).
A-6421076, Jung, Angela Chih-Ying.
E-5755, Kaasik, Harald.
A-6688266, Teitelbaum, Tauba Raca.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR H. VOGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 899) to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized, for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act, to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to Oscar H. Vogel, for homestead purposes, the following-described land situated in Alaska:

Lot 3, section 25, township 11, north, range 7 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, containing twenty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That the purchase price for the land shall be the reasonable value thereof without improvements, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior but not less than $1.25 per acre.

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

PAUL A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5146) to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to promote Paul A. Smith, captain, Coast and Geodetic Survey (retired), to the rank of rear admiral (lower half), on the retired list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and that such grade will entitle him to all the benefits and privileges commensurate with that grade.

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

ERWIN S. DEMOSKONYI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erwin S. DeMoskonyi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, after "fee", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GLORIA FAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2360) for the relief of Gloria Fan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Fan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

IWAN BONK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam Bonk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Iwan Bonk, Tacianna Bonk, Mike Bonk, and Sam shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Iwan Bonk", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Tacianna Bonk", strike out the remainder of line 4.

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Bonk."

On page 1, line 11, after the word "deduct", strike out the words "the required" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "two."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUNO MICHAEL KIURU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bruno Michael Kiuru shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-contral officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

EUGENIO MAIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Eugenio Maida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenio Maida may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

MARIA LOUISE ANDREIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Maria Louise Andreis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Louise Andreis shall be deemed to be the minor child of her mother Egidia Bonessi Schaetzler, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purpose of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Louise Andreis shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Egidia Bonessi Schaetzler, a lawfully resident alien of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SUSANNE FELLNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 988) for the relief of Susanne Fellner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Susanne Fellner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

TAKAKO RIU REICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) for the relief of Takako Riu Reich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Takako Riu Reich may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and insert in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 7, after the words *"Provided, That"*, strike out the remainder of line 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the words "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the syllable "tion."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

GRACE CASQUITE HWANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1060) for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Grace Casquite Hwang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in the act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

EVAGELOS B. TZARIMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Evagelos B. Tzarimas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Enggill A. Zayemopoulos.

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

MIRA DOMENIKA GRGURINOVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1218) for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mira Domenika Grgurinovich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Nick Nickolich.

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

GEORGE PAUL KHOURI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1311) for the relief of George Paul Khouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1705, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Paul Khouri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 1311) was laid on the table.

SISTER ANTONINA ZATTOLO AND SISTER ANTONINA CALI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

HENRY KRAEMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1407) for the relief of Henry Kraemer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Kraemer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any bond which is outstanding in the case of such alien.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, after the words "is available.", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CATERINA RUELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Caterina Ruello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Caterina Ruello shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee", change the period to a colon and add the following: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

HELEN E. COX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of Helen E. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helen E. Cox may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

HELGA KUTSCHKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of Helga Kutschka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helga Kutschka, the fiancée of Vic M. Schreiner, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Helga Kutschka is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Vic M. Schreiner and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Kutschka, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Kutschka, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Helga Kutschka as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANDREAS KAFARAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Andreas Kafarakis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Peter G. Kiryakakis, a citizen of the United States.

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

MRS. MARY PEROUZ DERDERIAN DONALDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

LUCETTE HELENE ADAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1651) for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucette Helene Adams may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 1, line 4, insert "(9) and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

LUIS DERIBERPREY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1869) for the relief of Luis Deriberprey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luis Deriberprey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

GIUSEPPE TUMBARELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1897) for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Tumbarello may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

GIUSEPPA CURRO TATI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1935) for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppa Curro Tati may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MISS ATHENA KITSOPOULOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1962) for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Athena Kitsopoulou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 23, 1947, the date of her admission into the United States as a student, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "September 23, 1947, the date of her admission into the United States as a student" and insert "the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. HILDEGARD HERRMANN COSTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1964) for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 1, line 4, insert "(9) and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "this exemption" and insert "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "a ground" and insert "grounds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EMIL ARENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of Emil Arens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emil Arens may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

DE SOTO LEAD & ZINC CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 208) providing for sending the bill H. R. 5543 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5543) entitled "A bill for the relief of De Soto Lead & Zinc Co.," 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 House, 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 claimant.

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

FREDERICK P. FULMER

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 229) providing for sending the bill H. R. 5630, and accompanying papers, to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5630) entitled "A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Fulmer," 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 House, 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 claimant.

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

GALEN H. CLARK PACKING CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 230) providing that the bill H. R. 1901, and all accompanying papers, shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 1901) entitled "A bill for the relief of Galen H. Clark Packing Co., Inc.," 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 House, 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 and equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

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

ORA L. POWERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1145) for the relief of Ora L. Powers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ora L. Powers, of San Antonio, Tex., and her claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary emphysema contracted while in the performance of her duty as chief clerk at the station hospital, Camp Swift, Tex., between April 1, 1942, and February 29, 1944, is hereby authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Ora L. Powers, of San Antonio, Tex., and her claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary emphysema alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of her duty as chief clerk at the station hospital, Camp Swift, Tex., between April 1, 1942, and February 29, 1944, shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FREDERICK REDMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1415) for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond, New York, N. Y., the sum of $15,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the personal injuries and all expenses incidental thereto of the said Frederick Redmond sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States mail truck in New York, N. Y., on March 16, 1945. This claim is not cognizable under the Tort Claims Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2680, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frederick Redmond, an infant, and Ruth Redmond, his mother and natural guardian, Staten Island, Richmond, N. Y., against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained allegedly as a result of the negligence of a driver of a United States mail truck.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claims may be instituted within any time of 1 year of the enactment of this act. In any such suit brought pursuant to this act, proceedings shall be had and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims against the United States (title 28, U. S. C., sec. 1346 (b)): *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act does or shall constitute an admission of liability on the part of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSEPH J. PORTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Joseph J. Porter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph J. Porter, Claremont, Calif., the sum of $65.39, as payment of hospital and medical expenses incurred from July 14, 1953, to and including July 24, 1953. The payment of such claim shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Joseph J. Porter against the United States on account of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of such illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HOWARD RIECK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Howard Rieck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard Rieck, of Millville, N. J., the sum of $6,162.60. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Howard Rieck against the United States for damage caused October 19, 1951, to property on Cedarville Road, Millville, N. J., by falling aircraft belonging to the Department of the Navy, the occurrence not being cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 28, U. S. C.): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,162.60" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CHARLES F. BULLETTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2338) for the relief of Charles F. Bullette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles F. Bullette, Racine, Wis., the sum of $297.21, as payment of hospital and medical expenses incurred from August 24, 1953, through September 5, 1953. The payment of such claim shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Charles F. Bullette against the United States on account of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of such illness: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

MRS. JOSETTE L. ST. MARIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the application of all laws relating to benefits payable on account of death in the United States Army, the late Frank P. St. Marie, private, 31st Cavalry Reconnaissance Troop, Camp Shelby, Miss., whose death occurred at Camp Shelby, on March 9, 1943, shall be held and considered to have died in line of duty.

With the following committee amendment.

Line 8, after the word "duty", insert "*Provided*, That no benefits under this act shall accrue prior to the date of the application filed by Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie on August 31, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CHARLES R. LAW, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2768) for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Law, Jr., Cameron, Tex., the sum of $7,747.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of clothing and household goods destroyed by fire, such fire having occurred in January 1954, when a North American Van Lines truck, which had been contracted for by the Air Force, was involved in an accident and burned, thereby destroying said clothing and household goods. The sum mentioned above is the value of said clothing and household goods for which Mr. Law has not received compensation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,747.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,651.81."

Page 2, after line 4, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

TENNESSEE C. BATTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Tennessee C. Batts, Waco, Tex., is hereby relieved of all

liability to refund to the United States the sum of $647.50. Such sum represents compensation received by said Tennessee C. Batts as an employee of the Post Office Department during the period April 1, 1952, to include October 15, 1953, while he was also employed at the Veterans' Administration, and was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Tennessee C. Batts, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from the sums due him in the complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for such refund.

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

MARGARET MARY HAMMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3024) for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 765–769; Supp. V, title 5, sec. 770), are hereby waived in favor of Margaret Mary Hammond, of Columbus, Ohio, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, William Corbett Hammond, allegedly due to an injury sustained on April 26, 1938, while in the performance of his duties as a laborer with the Works Progress Administration, New Philadelphia, Ohio, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

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

E. S. BERNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3194) for the relief of E. S. Berney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. S. Berney, of Fallon, Nev., the sum of $12,000 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of representations made to him, on or about August 1943, by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy to the effect that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as part of a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943, with the result that he moved or sold his cattle and other property at a loss, when, in fact, the Navy did not enter on such ranches until April 10, 1944; and for which losses he has never been compensated since the ranches were considered abandoned property in fixing compensation in the condemnation proceedings which followed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Nevada to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of E. S. Berney, of Fallon, Nev., against the United States for damages sustained as the result of any representations made to him by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as part of a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943.

"SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for such damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

"SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by any time within one year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the cases of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, as amended. Enactment of this act shall not be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

COMDR. GEORGE B. GREER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Comdr. George B. Greer, United States Navy, the sum of $2,206.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Comdr. George B. Greer against the United States for compensation still due him for personal property lost or damaged on August 16, 1953, in an explosion in Quarters "M," New York Naval Shipyard, which he occupied as Ordnance officer of such shipyard. The board of investigation which inquired into the explosion recommended (in its report dated August 23, 1953) that suitable payment be made the said Comdr. George B. Greer for personal property losses, and the Bureau of Naval Personnel subsequently determined that $4,706.66 was due him on the claim, but he could be paid only $2,500 on account of the limitation contained in section 1 (a) of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

JULIUS G. WATSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3354) for the relief of Julius G. Watson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 1-year limitation of time contained in the first proviso of section 303 (d) (1) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1949 (63 Stat. 867) is hereby waived in favor of Julius G. Watson, Key West, Fla., with respect to his claim for compensation under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for injuries sustained on March 4, 1949, while in the performance of his duties as engineman at the naval air station, Boca Chica Field, Key West, Fla., if he files a claim for such compensation with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

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

KINGAN, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Kingan, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, out of money heretofore made available for the eradication of the disease vesicular exanthema in swine, to Kingan, Inc., of Richmond, Va., the sum of $13,095.82, an amount equal to that heretofore paid by the State of Virginia. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Kingan, Inc., against the United States arising out of the destruction of swine at its plant in Richmond, Va., in January 1953, because of the infection and exposure of these swine to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema. Such swine were destroyed by order of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Virginia, cooperating with the United States Department of Agriculture, under an agreement whereby such losses were to be indemnified on the basis of 50 percent by the State and 50 percent by the United States. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HOWARD L. GRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4198) for the relief of Howard L. Gray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C., 765–770), the Secretary of Labor is authorized (1) to consider any claim filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Howard L. Gray, of Fayetteville, Ark., for compensation for disability resulting from illness contracted by him while employed as a hospital attendant at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fayetteville, Ark., and (2) to award to the said Howard L. Gray any compensation to which he would have been entitled had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such sections. No benefits shall accrue under this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Howrd L. Gray, of Faytteville, Ark., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from encephalitis lethargica alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of his duty as a hospital attendant at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fayetteville, Ark., between the years 1938 and 1941 shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 1 year after the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Howrd" and insert "Howard."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Faytteville" and insert "Fayetteville."

The amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

MARTIN F. KENDRIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4902) for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, Army of the United States, retired, is hereby relieved of any obligation to repay amounts of overpayments made to him by the United States during the period beginning on May 24, 1951, and ending on February 7, 1952, when, as a result of a misinterpretation of section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, he was employed as a supply clerk at Fort Lewis, Wash.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan a sum equal to the amount of any repayments made by him to the United States on account of the overpayments described in subsection (a): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, Army of the United States, retired, of Tacoma, Wash., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the compensation paid to him by the United States for services rendered by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army at Fort Lewis, Wash., during the period from May 24, 1951, to February 7, 1952, inclusive; such employment of the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan having occurred as a result of a misinterpretation of section 212 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended by the act of June 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 761; 5 U. S. C. 59a).

"(b) That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Martin F. Kendrigan, a sum equal to the amount of any repayments made by him to the United States on account of the payment of compensation to him referred to in subsection (a), plus any pay withheld from him at the time of his separation from the service as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army on February 7, 1952, including all pay withheld covering accrued leave: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ALFRED J. STAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred J. Stahl, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $34,732.22. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Alfred J. Stahl against the United States (Philippine War Damage Commission claims Nos. 417 and 482) for compensation for certain business and property losses which he sustained as the result of enemy activities in the Philippine Islands during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$34,732.22" and insert: "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

IVAN N. BURLINGAME, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5494) for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration the amounts listed opposite their names, which amounts represent moneys paid from their personal funds to liquidate deficiencies incurred in their accounts in good faith and without fraud, collusion, or negligence on their part:

Ivan N. Burlingame, general housing manager, Badger, Wis., $10.

John Marlin, general housing manager, Tullahoma, Tenn., $29.84.

Thomas C. McDougald, management aide, Carver Court housing project, Coatesville, Pa., $25.

Irene K. Shinn, accounts clerk, San Diego, Calif., $20.

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

JOHN L. BOYER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5633) for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John L. Boyer, Jr., 5454 Mary Lane Drive, San Diego, Calif., the sum of $496.89, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by him as a result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer and Storage Co., 2301 Mills Street, El Paso, Tex., on June 3, 1954: *Provided*, That nothing in this act does or shall affect the right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the Government of the United States has as a result of this fire: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions

of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

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

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5634) for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney, employees in the Helium Activity, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, at Amarillo, Tex., are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $466.57, $923.47, and $66.90, respectively, which they received as excess compensation as a result of their promotions approved on November 8, 1951, and which were the subject of the Comptroller General's opinion of May 5, 1954 (B–119468).

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

DR. WOLODYMYR FEDYNIAK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5635) for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision contained in the Supplemental Appropriation, 1952, approved November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 736), prohibiting the payment of compensation from appropriations contained in that or any other act to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts and to relieve certifying officers of liability for such payments for services rendered by the following former employees of the United States Department of Agriculture: Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, Dr. Wladyslaw Albert Grajewski, Ivan Kuidych, Sam Popeil Oleskowicz, Vladimir J. Pelenskyj, Petro Pshyk, and Bohdan Tkaczuk.

SEC. 2. Where credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts or where certifying officers are relieved of liability in accordance with section 1 of this act, the former employees receiving the payments shall not be required to refund the amounts thereof, and any such amounts which have been collected from such former employees shall be refunded to them.

SEC. 3. Any former employee named in section 1 of this act who rendered service during the period November 1, 1951, through February 29, 1952, without being compensated therefor on account of the citizenship prohibition cited in section 1 hereof shall be paid for such services out of current appropriations or funds otherwise available for salaries and expenses.

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

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5809) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $7,582.57. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said company against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid (under protest) by such company on December 13, 1945, as damages for alleged violation, in connection with the sale by such company of imported chocolate bars, of price regulations established by the Office of Price Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

ALBERT WOOLSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of Albert Woolson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to the proper person or persons an amount equal to the total expenses incurred by Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., the last surviving member of the Union Army, for medical treatment and care required as the result of his recent illness, and for any medical treatment and care required by the said Albert Woolson after the date of enactment of this act.

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

FRANCIS BERTRAM BRENNAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 128) for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Francis Bertram Brennan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William F. Brennan, a citizen of the United States.

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

KURT GLASER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 143) for the relief of Kurt Glaser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kurt Glaser shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

PHILOPIMIN MICHALACOPOULOS (MIHALAKOPOULOS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 163) for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

JUNE ROSE McHENRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 271) for the relief of June Rose McHenry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, June Rose McHenry shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

SANDRA LEA MacMULLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 386) for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sandra Lea MacMullin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the act.

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

INGE KRARUP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 409) for the relief of Inge Krarup.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Inge Krarup shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ANASTASIA ALEXIADOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 416) for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anastasia Alexiadou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

CHOKICHI IRAHA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 891) for the relief of Chokichi Iraha.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chokichi Iraha shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

T-2672008, Alcala-Jiminez, David.
A-8258497, Bernhus, Christopher Olsen.
A-8258490, Bernhus, Ellen Olea.
A-8258491, Bernhus, Anne Mathilde.
A-8258492, Bernhus, Nils Christian.
A-8031685, Brown, Frank Naaman.
0300-201464, Cernilogar, Mario or Mario Merkle.
A-3442862, Dapello, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-9746898, De Roche, Lawrence Henry.
0300-405108, Eronen, Tynne Katariina or Tynne Katerina Koski (nee Talvite).
A-7712697, Forbes, Reginald.
A-8078862, Juarez-Chavez, Evaristo Jose.
A-6435718, Koslevsky, David or David Coster.
0300-351695, Lemos, Christos Panelis.
A-5801906, Molnar, Louis.
A-6153079, Mukoyama, Chiyoka K.
A-6153075, Mukoyama, Luis Reiichiro.
A-6153076, Mukoyama, Jorge Shojiro.
A-6153077, Mukoyama, Teresa Misuzu.
A-6153078, Mukoyama, Federico Takumi.
T-2760652, Naka, Hajime.
A-6154907, Noguni, Kamata.
A-6154905, Noguni, Nobuko.
A-6154904, Noguni, Hiroshi.
A-6154903, Noguni, Sadao.
A-6154906, Noguni, Yoshiko (Victoria).
A-7115197, Perides, Emanuel E.
A-3817461, Persoelis, Costas.
A-5401551, Popetz, Traian or Thomas Popetz.
0900-55372, Quilici, Cesare Ermanno.
T-1496855, Rodriguez-Unciano, Alicia.
A-5333372, Ruiffs, Albert Richardt Cornelus.
A-5284140, Shimotsu, Teru.
A-2658933, Tomaszek, Hugo Nicolas.
A-6777797, Tsu, Wan-P'ei Chang or Wan-Pei Pauline Chang or Un Pui Cheung.
A-7130708, Urias, Josefa Carrasco Vda De.
A-5609541, Valadez, Pedro.
A-3781283, Yamauchi, Kiyoko or Kiyoko Takemori.
0402/13555, Benedikty, John.
A-3485407, Chang, Pearl Chin-Ju.
A-6045012, Chauvet, Norma or Marie Raymonde Norma Chauvet.
A-4957901, Choy, Ming Chow or Wing Chow or George Choy.
A-5950851, Connelly, Richard or Connolly or Connely.
A-6849528, Douglas, Frederick Charles or Frederick Douglas.
A-4037689, Fernandes, Caetano or Cyril Fernandez.
A-9550591, Fragna-Rey, Juan.
A-5655987, Grisiuk, John or Jan Grisiuk or Ignat Sliva or Jenat Sliva.
A-7439189, Laca, Fernando Ignacio.
E-093560, Metti, Philip Jacob.
A-5919881, Piiparinen, Mauri.
A-5570728, Rai, Lal Singh.
A-3247861, Retter Friederich.
E-078907, Rodriguez, Leopoldo Cantu.
E-086948, Salgado, Mario.
A-6922766, Stagner, Rose Louise Pearson.
A-9727441, Tin, Chin or Lee San or Lee San.
0900-64111, Velasquez-Estrada, Celestino.
E-061647, Wilman, Rosa Salazar de.
1409-10532, Aguirre-Gomez, Pedro.
1409-10531, Aguirre, Catarina Ramirez De.
V-172461, Andreoli, Carlo.
A-1613805, Bieh, William or Wilhelm Herman.
A-1010587, Brown, John or Charles Brown.
A-6165969, Carter, Martha Antonia (nee Tablas Landa).
T-2760659, Cervantes-Diaz, Jose Luis.
A-8031923, Chiara, Gian Paolo.
A-7601311, Das, Abinash Chandra.
A-9511929, Fredriksen, Erik Emanuel.
A-6531519, Garcia-Orozco, Daniel.
A-6944242, Grossman, Chaskiel.
V-556765, Grossman, Fanni.
A-8196295, Gutierrez-Carlos, Federico.
A-8038726, Hansen, William Leonard.
T-303640, Isomoto, Masanao or Masanao Nojima.
0300-302349, Kui, Fung Ming or Harris Fung.
A-7961879, Kynard, Edna Sonia or Edna Sonia Artemenko.
A-2191134, Martin, Juan Rodrigues or Juan Rodrigues or John Martin.
A-4632828, Meron, Joseph.
A-2244858, Nitta, Sadakazu or Kazushige Yoshida.
0900/64623, Orozco-Torres, Jose.
A-7203339, Partridge, Josephine (nee Godinez) formerly Laborra.
A-3580428, Rafal, Pedro Corpos.
A-1171058, Suliman, Vait.
T-2671954, Villalobos-Ruiz, Eustaquio.
T-1496942, Villalobos, Ramona.
T-1496943, Villalobos, Sacarias.
T-1496944, Vilalobos, Maria Felis or Felix.
T-1496945, Villalobos, Marina.
A-6357958, Voikos, Sophia Arthur.
A-5993267, Wong, Jimmie Justo formerly Justo De Jesus.
A-5541529, Chung, Raymond or Kuang Wu or Raymond K. Wu or Chung Kwong Wu or Kuang Chung Wu.
E-084932, Colmelo, Antonio Dominguez or Antonio Emilio Rivero.
A-3112391, Drayer, Hyman.
T-2671873, Froberg, Wilhelmina formerly Kollmann.
T-2671874, Froberg, Maria formerly Kollmann.
A-1740189, Gutierrez, Demetrio or Demetrio Machado Gutierrez.
0900-39076, Juarez, Pedro Alonzo or Manuel Alonzo or Manuel Moreno or Tomas Pizano.
0900-39376, Alonzo, Antonia Aimaguer de.
A-5581921, Shimotsu, Itaro.
A-4496136, Trotta, Michele or Mike.
E-057313, Cameron, Elsie.
A-6028662, Contreras-Chavarria, Jose Angel.
A-6027750, Contreras, Esperanza De La Rosa De.
A-6162249, Eto, Some.
A-6162248, Eto, Yoshimitsu.
A-6162246, Eto, Nobuko.
A-9635249, Foo, Kut Chong.
1500/45912, Garcia, Margarita.
1500/47966, Garcia, Luis.
A-4885164, Glatter, George.
E-6167, Gum, Ho.
0300-376815, Ho, Zee Kwei or How or Zee Swei Young.
A-6421265, Lewis, Norberta Oquias.
0300-308151, Liu, Hsing Hui.
A-3559629, Magallanes, Josefina Aquiniga (nee Vasquez).
A-6153080, Mukoyama, Koshiro.
A-5328243, Pina, Jose.
A-6075197, Rose, Senior, George Edward.
A-6075199, Rose (nee Switzer), Ada Phyllis.
A-3793462, Schroeder, Alfons.
A-5265690, Schroeder, Clara Cecelia (nee Hoedt).
A-6345970, Simotas, Rose.
0300-9214, Spinozzi, Umberto.
A-6585178, Squeglia, Carmela or Carmela Volpe formerly Saggesse.
E-8309, Squires, Lionel Allen or Kenneth Inness.
0300-400307, Ten, Yuen or Yung Ten Yueh or Youen Loung.
A-2722769, Tsang, Fan F. or Tom Qui Tsang or Sam S. Tsang or Am-Ton.
A-6839003, Williams, Carolyn Elizabeth Waldron.
A-4477561, Wilson, Mary formerly Solomon (nee Grossman).
A-5031118, Zentack, Michael (Mike).
A-5311563, Zentack, Sophie.

A-2900415, Vartanian, Mary.
A-4878124, Ball, Marjorie Isabel, also known as Marjorie Hurley, Marjorie Flores, and Marjorie Barclay.
E-095789, Bobek, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-6799994, Caffrey, Lena Serafina or L. Serafini Perchiazzi, also known as Serafina Perchiazzi Johnson.
0901/20233, Escobedo-Herera, Salvador.
A-7138225, Fischer-Stern, Andrea.
E-061661, Gonzalez-Castillo, Guillermo.
A-1384235, Hui, William Lien-Chia.
A-6855176, Jack, Yee Monor Yee Jack, also known as Charley Leung Yee.
E-082880, Trematore, Anthony Frank.
A-7197918, Vieyra-Mondragon, Jose.
A-7138224, Fischer-Stern, Janos.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, strike out all of line 7.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

FAVORING THE GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-9540876, Andra, Ervin Rudolf.
A-8057219, Bacchia, Ermanno.
T-2786643, Bain, Hong Yuan.
A-9512692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.
A-9825169, Barulich, Antonio.
A-7186356, Basch, Marton.
A-6207921, Bistreff, Stanu Salvov.
A-6207920, Bistreff, Eugenia.
A-7538670, Chang, Yi-An Rosita.
0300/419969, Ching, Ah.
A-8082325, Chung, Cheng.
0300/396020, Chung, Shin or Shiu Chung.
E-094561, Ding, Sing Yoh.
A-6969986, Fabian, George Stephen.
A-9678368, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.
176/484, Foo, Yee King.
A-8082056, Fook, Lo.
A-7351309, Gruenberg, Dora.
A-9749483, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.
A-9686736, Hop, Leung.
A-7779095, Hung, Chung Shu or Francis C. S. Hung.
A-6971746, Huva, Walter.
A-6971747, Huva, Leili.
A-4191741, Kaminski, Kazmer or Kazimierz.
A-7863018, Kancans, Edgar Arnolds.
A-9575626, Kaneps, Peter Voldemars or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.
A-6967285, Kao, Evelina Tse-Ven.
A-9139291, King, Chin or Chan Kin.
0300/396086, Koo, Lee Yong.
A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.
A-4760478, Lee, Ching-Ye (nee Ling).
A-8117995, Lee, Tong.
A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.
A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Wei Kang or Wei Kang Liang.
0300-405868, Ling, Ah Fook.
A-6849848, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.
A-6703496, Lo, Yu-Cheng.
A-6703484, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.
A-6962954, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.
A-6041575, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.
A-7046279, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton, or M. T. Marton.
A-7200780, Mascitelli, Teresa (nee Tobolik).
A-9731869, Ming, Chan Choy.
A-7879331, Mintz, Samson or Szymszon Minc.
A-9825225, Morin, Silvestro.
0300-18256, Nee, Kai Sung.
A-9518299, Neng, Tan Jee or Tan Gee Ning.
A-9577665, Olman, Karl.
A-7371655, Paczosa, Marja.
A-7975173, Pien, Pao Chi.
0501-19744, Hu, Yu Ming.
A-8031504, Ping, Lai or Lai Pyee.
A-9290467, Poa, Tan Ki.
A-6756976, Potasz, Judithe.
0300-304535, Raczynski, Waclaw.
A-6393475, Rajczyk, Szmul Dawid.
A-9554180, Sai, Leong Kee.
A-5869957, Sang, Tsang.
A-6887953, Sefcik, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcik.
A-8091316, Sen, Tek or Fu Theh Shin.
A-8082001, Shah, Victor Stephen.
A-8091356, Sing, Leung.
A-8106036, Song, Lim Shi.
A-9609271, Soon, Jong.
A-7849432, Steinbergs, Juris.
A-7849433, Steinbergs, Velta (nee Brieze).
A-7849427, Steinbergs, Marija (nee Labonovsky).
A-7074013, Straka, Marie.
A-7886251, Straka, Karel Alex.
A-7061816, Sununu, Alfred Saleh.
A-7991591, Szabo, Senior, Thomas P.
A-7991592, Szabo, Eva Agres (nee Vicenty).
A-7991593, Szabo, Thomas, Jr.
A-7991594, Szabo, Adam.
A-9561964, Sze, Chen Tek.
A-7095904, Szonyi, Giselle.
A-6971787, Tischler, Albert.
A-6971783, Tischler, Vilma.
A-8001228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Loo or Choy Loo.
A-9529458, Tsou, Fong Shi.
A-6938806, Virdzenieks, Niklavs.
A-9810517, Virkebau, Uno or Wirkebau.
A-8082068, Wai, Lee.
A-6041703, Wu, Nelson Ikon.
E-094562, Wun, Choy or Won Sang or Wan Sang.
A-8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.
A-9677800, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.
A-9571659, Yeh, Lau.
A-6952737, Yuen, Yee Sin.
A-6967543, Liu, Chin Po.
A-6967507, Liu, Dah Wen.
A-9525198, Kovacevic, Mitar.

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

VASSILIKI D. PAPADAKOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1405) for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vassiliki D. Papadakou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ERNEST TOMASSICH AND YOKO MATUSO TOMASSICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1868) for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Matuso" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Matsuo."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUFEMIA BENCICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief of Eufemia Bencich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eufemia Bencich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ANTHONIUS MARINUS KRONENBURG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3972) for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa

fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on line 7, page 1, after the words "visa fee", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT IN CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL EDWIN B. HOWARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. METCALF objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my opposition to consideration of S. 1271 and S. 1272 on today's consent calendar.

These bills would grant exemption from our long established dual position statutes and permit Generals Partridge and Howard to accept positions as Assistant Commissioners of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, which is already headed by General Swing. If these bills were enacted, retired generals would occupy 3 of the top 5 operating positions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

In testimony before the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, in justifying the employment of these generals, General Swing stated that—

When a man has a big problem facing him he likes to have people he knows and can depend on and knows their qualifications.

Normally, there would be no objection to such a statement, however, the situation is immediately complicated by General Swing's background which has been exclusively military. As a retired general, he appears compelled to depend only on other generals or officers whose activities he was able to observe when he was in the Armed Forces.

General Swing recently stated before the Armed Services Committee:

I couldn't find anyone to take over the whole operation—

Of the Border Patrol—

and coordinate it from the Gulf to the Pacific.

And again referring to the two positions proposed to be filled by retired generals, he stated:

There was no one present in the Department who could satisfactorily fill them.

I feel compelled to observe that these statements of the general are completely incredible. The Immigration and Naturalization Service is an old established agency. It has over 7,000 employees. Yet, General Swing could find no qualified persons in the agency. In fact, it appears he could find no qualified civilians anywhere.

I am sure that no one of us is ready to abdicate traditionally civilian functions to the military—and frankly I cannot accord any substance to General Swing's alleged inability to find either civil-service career officials or civilians from outside of government to fill these positions. To me, this indicates a severe case of military myopia. Given adequate funds for its operations, as the Service has been given by this Congress, I am certain that civilian personnel would impressively acquit themselves in these positions.

General Swing has claimed that at no time prior to his administration has the wetback problem on the Mexican border ever been brought under control. If the General were acquainted with the history of his own agency, he would know that as recently as 1951–52 this border was effectively controlled when Congress, through a supplemental appropriation, approved the assignment of additional border patrolmen, and an airlift operation which carried wetbacks to the interior of Mexico. However, in the succeeding regular appropriation these funds were withdrawn and the patrol was reduced to inadequate strength. It was not secured again until General Swing took personnel from other branches of the service and assigned them to border patrol work. Since that time, he has been given the most generous appropriation ever granted to the Immigration Service for border patrol. In his first year as Commissioner—fiscal 1955—General Swing received $1,300,000 more for border patrol work than his predecessor had in fiscal 1954. For fiscal 1956, the general will have the unprecedented amount of $12,177,000, almost double the amount appropriated in fiscal 1953. If General Swing were honest with the Congress, he would admit to the fact that had he not received the appropriation requested he would not be able to do the job—not even by the grace of General Partridge.

The Service is charged with administering the immigration laws and has functions under the Displaced Persons Act and the Refugee Act of 1953. These laws were adopted by the Congress to give sanctuary to all peoples—and more recently, to give sanctuary to victims of totalitarian communism and nazism. I firmly believe that all of these laws can be more effectively and humanely administered by civilian than by those whose total experience has been in military activities—I say this, recognizing as I always have, and without in any way disparaging the significant contributions our military personnel have made in the realm of military activities.

I suggest that persons whose total experience has been in the Army are rarely fit by experience, training, or ability to carry out functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We are familiar with the hackneyed criticisms of so-called government by crony. Today such criticism may properly be changed to government by generals and this would seem to hold good throughout the entire Government from Generals Swing, Partridge, and Howard up to, and including, General Motors.

I am completely convinced that there is nothing unique in the services or experiences of these generals that warrants the passage of special legislation to provide them with an exemption from the dual-position statutes that have long been a part of our legislative pattern—and from which I submit, there should be no casual deviation.

APPOINTMENT IN CIVILIAN POSITION OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. METCALF objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO PACIFIC NORTHERN TIMBER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4853) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pacific Northern Timber Co., an Alaska corporation, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the said Pacific Northern Timber Co., the following described land situated in Alaska: That strip of tidelands in Shoemaker Bay approximately 6 miles south of Wrangell, Territory of Alaska, containing approximately 45 acres more or less and lying between mean high water and mean low water and abutting upon the land included in United States survey 3000, and lot 10, public service site, lot 11, lot 12, lot 13, and lot 14 of the United States survey 2589, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at meander corner No. 1 of lot 14 of United States survey 2589 and extending along a line south 89 degrees 30 minutes west approximately 8 chains to the mean low water line of Shoemaker Bay; thence following the mean low water line in a southerly direction to a point where it intersects with a line extending north 72 degrees 10 minutes west from meander corner No.

1 of United States survey 3000; thence south 72 degrees 10 minutes east along such line approximately 9.1 chains to said meander corner No. 1 of United States survey 3000; thence northerly along the mean high water mark or the Shoemaker Bay boundary of the property shown on the plats of United States survey 3000 and United States survey 2589 to the point of beginning: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey only that portion of the above-described property which is abutting upland property owned by the purchaser.

SEC. 2. That the land shall be sold to the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. at a reasonable appraised price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment due within 5 years after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the coal, oil, and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That any such patent shall be revoked and shall be of no further effect in the event the Pacific Northern Timber Co. fails to construct the sawmill facilities at this site required by its contract A10fs–1283 with the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "Shoemaker Bay" and insert "Zimovia Strait."

Page 2, line 25, strike out the remainder of line 25 and all of lines 1 to line 11 on page 3, and insert the following: "The conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. for the land at a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey, after taking into consideration the purpose for which the land is to be used. Conveyance shall be made only if the said Pacific Northern Timber Co. makes the total payment within 1 year after notification by the Secretary of the Interior of the amount due: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further.*"

Page 4, line 5, strike out "at" and insert "on or adjacent to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Calendar No. 83 on the Consent Calendar, the bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have just talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who earlier objected to the consideration of this bill, and explained that the bill allowed the Federal land banks to pick up what remains of the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. These assets have gotten so low now that the cost of servicing the loans which average only about $600 each, is out of proportion to the cost of carrying them. The land banks are already servicing such loans and can do it cheaper than if this work is divided up between two operations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I had reserved the right to object in order to ask a question, but there was no Member on the floor at the time who could give me the information, so I asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice. The gentleman from Texas has satisfied me that the bill should be passed, so I have no objection to its present consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Twentieth. Without regard to any limitations or restrictions of this act, to purchase all assets, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as a result of loans made on or before July 1, 1947, in the farm credit district in which said bank is situated and to assume the liabilities of said Corporation for future payment funds of borrowers and trust accounts applicable to said assets. The purchase price of notes and mortgages, purchase money mortgages, and real estate sales contracts shall be equal to the total of the unpaid balances on such items and accrued interest thereon at the date as of which purchase is made, less the total of the liabilities of the Corporation being assumed by the bank as herein provided. The purchase price of real estate, sheriffs' certificates, loans called for foreclosure, loans in suspense, judgments, and for any other assets eligible for purchase under this paragraph but not specifically identified herein shall be equal to the fair market value of the assets as determined by agreement. The total consideration for the purchase shall be payable over a period of not more than 10 years from the date as of which purchase is made, and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon through negotiation with the Board of Directors of the Corporation."

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 64]

Abbitt	Fenton	Morgan
Albert	Fino	Morrison
Ashley	Flood	Mumma
Barrett	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Becker	Friedel	O'Konski
Bentley	Fulton	Osmers
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gamble	Pelly
	Garmatz	Pilcher
Bowler	Gavin	Pillion
Buchanan	Gordon	Powell
Budge	Granahan	Prouty
Burleson	Gray	Quigley
Bush	Green, Pa.	Radwan
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Reece, Tenn.
Canfield	Heselton	Reed, N. Y.
Carrigg	Hiestand	Roberts
Chiperfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Christopher	James	Scherer
Chudoff	Jarman	Scott
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Sieminski
Corbett	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kearns	Taylor
Dague	Kelley, Pa.	Tollefson
Dingell	King, Pa.	Tuck
Doyle	Latham	Wainwright
Eberharter	McConnell	Walter
Evins	Macdonald	Zelenko
Fallon	Mailliard	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1413) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the House passed a bill covering this matter. This is a similar Senate bill that should have been offered at the time the bill was called on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is right. This bill puts on a limitation that was not in the other bill.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts," approved May 17, 1910 (40 U. S. C., secs. 104–106), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That to meet the expenses made necessary by this act an expenditure of not exceeding $35,000 a year is hereby authorized."

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action by which the House passed the bill H. R. 4534 will be vacated and the House bill laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve

itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one that has been badly misunderstood by the public generally; in some instances misunderstood by the press; misunderstood by the people of the United States, and misunderstood, too, by Members of the Congress. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the members of this committee if they will suffer the inconvenience of not interrupting me and not asking questions until I have had full opportunity to explain the bill. I will then be glad to yield to anyone and everyone insofar as time lasts and explain the bill as best I can.

I have a chart here to my left. I am not going to present the chart immediately. I want to take up preliminaries before explaining the chart.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this, in the first place, that this is an administration bill. It is a bill that has the endorsement of the Defense Department, the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense. It has the endorsement of the Armed Forces generally, the Secretary of the Army, the Department of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Department of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, Department of the Air Force. It has the endorsement of the commandant of the Marine Corps and the Marine Corps itself. It is a bill that is endorsed by the White House and has the approval of the President of the United States. As far as I am concerned, I know of no one in the whole world that today has the military judgment that we can use to rely upon in writing those measures for the defense of the Nation as has the President of the United States, and I am willing to follow his judgment in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the hearings in connection with this bill were not rushed hearings at all. They required 8 weeks, and 8 weeks of hard work. I want to pay tribute to the subcommittee that sat with me mornings and afternoons and worked long hours, under difficult conditions and under pressure at times to thoroughly work out all of the details of the bill and satisfy themselves that the bill was the type of measure that should be submitted to the full Committee on Armed Services and should likewise be submitted to the Congress of the United States.

When I say that this measure was approved and supported by the Pentagon, I do not mean, Mr. Chairman, that your committee accepted the Pentagon version of the bill blindly. On the contrary, it did not. It scrutinized every feature and every stipulation in the bill and satisfied itself in that connection before it was prepared to submit the bill and recommendations with approval to the House of Representatives. I do not mean that we did not amend the bill, either. We did amend it. We took out features, and we added features. If I were to tell you how many amendments we added or made changes in the bill and I should say there were 127, I think that I would be most conservative in that respect. We had 115 witnesses to hear. They came from all parts of the United States and from all groups. They came from patriotic organizations, church organizations, military organizations, and every single person who asked at the time of the hearings to be heard was heard respectfully and patiently by your subcommittee. I say again I want to pay our committee members a tribute for the service that they rendered to the country and to the defense of the Nation in handling the measure as they did.

Coming to the bill itself, this measure was first mentioned in this Congress by the President in his speech of January 13, 1955. I am going to read only a short paragraph from that speech which indicates the position of the President:

> Under the new national Reserve plan, selective service, and the Reserve forces in conjunction with our Regular Establishment will fulfill our security needs with the least possible disruptive impact upon the life of the individual citizen and the civilian economy. Flexibility is a primary characteristic of the plan. Constant scrutiny and review of the operation of the services will assure its increasing efficiency.

That comes from the President's message on January 13, 1955.

The measure is in no sense a UMT plan. I have received, I suppose, hundreds of letters from all parts of the country saying we were writing a UMT bill. I think nothing is farther from the mind of the committee that wrote the bill than that we were writing a bill which would be a universal military training bill or be a side door entrance to universal military training. On the contrary, this bill has no features of universal military training.

In the first place, the bill is not adapted to universal military training. Two branches of the armed services, for instance, the Air Force and the Navy, demand long term voluntary enlistments. The fundamental feature of universal military training is a short term training program for everyone. Long-term enlistments are a demand of at least two branches of the service, the Navy and the Air Force. In my judgment they would have opposed a universal military training bill at this time for the reason that they feel it would prevent them from getting long term voluntary enlistments which they need so badly in the technical features of their work in the defense of the country.

Universal military training is a permanent program. This is a temporary program, Mr. Chairman. This program is only for 4 years. It means that we take up our military situation at this hour, we take our country down its road of destiny for 4 years. At the end of 4 years the bill cuts off. Your Congress meets and decides then whether or not it wishes to extend the bill, modify the bill, or drop the whole matter entirely. That is 4 years hence.

This bill is not universal military training for the reason that there is no compulsion of anyone for entrance into the armed services.

You say that we have the draft. The draft comes in under a separate bill, which was passed by this House several months ago. Every portion of this bill provides only for voluntary enlistments in the armed services.

You have heard it bandied around that there is a 6 months' program for men. There is a 6 months' program, but that is purely voluntary and no young man is forced under any circumstances to accept the 6 months' program of training which is presented in this bill. The armed services today still wish to rely upon the voluntary system as much as possible and this bill seeks to help them in that program as much as possible.

This bill is not universal military training, because it is not universal. Mr. Chairman, how can you have a universal military training program when it is not is not universal? This bill provides that not exceeding 250,000 young men reaching the age of 17 and not above 19 may be enlisted voluntarily for 6 months' training in the armed services of the United States. Therefore it has none of the fundamentals of universal military training. It is not permanent legislation. It is not compulsory legislation. It is not universal legislation. It is not adapted to a UMT program.

As a matter of fact, the bill presents no new obligation of a military nature to our young people in the United States. It simply seeks to work out the obligation we have had on the statute books of this country for many years.

You say, "Yes, this provides for 8 years of military obligation, but it does not provide for an 8-year program." That obligation was set up first in 1941 as a 10-year military obligation for everyone, voluntary and compulsory, who enters the armed services. In 1948 that obligation was set up as an 8-year obligation. It has been carried on the statute books of this country since then. This bill does not seek to write out an 8-year obligation or any kind of long-term obligation for the individual that enters the armed services, regardless of the way he enters it, but it merely accepts the statutes and the laws as we have had them on the books for many years. It seeks, operating under the law that you have passed and that you have kept on the books for years, to write out a program of training for these people and to give our country a far better Reserve program to back up an incomparable regular Military Establishment to meet our troubles in time of great emergency.

What are our troubles, Mr. Chairman, in the international field? I want to read you a very short statement that will give you some idea of what I think we have to contend with at the present time from the only powerful nation that may really give us trouble in the field of international affairs, and that is Soviet Russia.

The Soviet Army consists of 2,500,000 men organized into 175 divisions sup-

ported by 400,000 security—NKVD—troops and 80 east Europe satellite divisions. The Red Chinese have 2 million regular army troops and 1 million uniformed security troops.

Within the Soviet Army are 65 tank and mechanized divisions equipped with 40,000 new tanks, and 40 new airborne divisions. Other divisions have been motorized and provided heavy artillery support. On May Day this year the feature of the parade in Red Square was reported to be a huge new artillery piece regarded by western military attachés as the counterpart of our atomic cannon.

Russia and her European satellites have 6 million men under arms and it is estimated that they can field 400 divisions within 30 days of mobilization.

Within the week it has been announced that Russia has built several thousand MIG–17 supersonic jet fighter planes. Their speed is put at 850 miles per hour or more—comparable to our F–100 Supersabre. The Soviet Strategic Air Army is operating units equipped with their new type 37 heavy, jet, intercontinental bombers. These are the equivalent of our B–52's. Estimates of Soviet military aircraft production generally are being revised upward, including data concerning their counterpart of our B–47 medium jet bomber, which they call type 39.

Soviet aircraft also reported are a small rocket-driven interceptor able to climb nearly 3 miles a minute at takeoff, and more than 7 miles a minute above 20,000 feet; a double delta-wing plane able to climb straight up; a tailless fighter, carried by a TU–4—B–29 type—mother ship, judged equal in capability to our F–100 Supersabre; and a 4-engined turboprop bomber able to fly 7,650 miles nonstop.

In support, major Red air bases are said to have been quadrupled in the past 4 years. The 20,000-plane Soviet air force has a strength of 600,000 men. That is merely a little bit of data I have to present to you to tell you why I think we must, in this period of international tension, have a trained, well-equipped Reserve, ready to move without further training when the emergency occurs. In the old days when our forefathers set up this Government, they were able to go to the walls and take their muskets down off the side of the wall and go out and in a minute they were ready to fight the battles of this country. At the present time, no such situation exists. You must have a trained Reserve ready to move at an instant's notice, if you are going to properly protect the freedom of the people of the United States of America, their safety and their very survival. So I tell you that is the reason I think we need a better trained and more efficient and better organized and better equipped Reserve than we have at the present time.

I want to say one more thing too in that connection. We need it for the reason that when Korea came, we found that there was no one available to use instantly except those who had already carried the heavy burden of combat in World War II. Therefore, we called out the trained men who had served our country in a prior war and we, your committee, feel that we have an obligation to provide additional prior-trained men so that in the event of another emergency, of the Korean type, we will be able to rely on others than those who fought World War II and those who fought in Korea so that we will not have to use them again in another emergency comparable to Korea. Therefore, we present this bill to you.

I am going to try to explain the bill to you by means of this chart. I will try, as best I can, to show you exactly what the purposes of the bill are and how it will work. We are providing a Regular Establishment of 2,850,000 men. We hope to provide a Reserve of 5 million men. Numbers of men are not the important feature in the bill. The important features are training, equipment, and organization of Reserves, as we see it. Under this program, we would have a Reserve of 2.9 million in the Ready Reserve, that is, 2.9 million men ready to go in the event of an emergency without a great deal of prior training, and we would then have the remainder of them in Standby Reserve as a manpower pool to use in "an all-out emergency," after Congress has declared an emergency exists and a state of war in fact exists with some other country. Then we would expect them all to go. We would have a Standby Reserve in shape and we would have the names, addresses, and communications, with those who are needed in that great emergency when it came.

Now coming to the bill itself, as I said, the bill provides no method other than voluntary enlistment in the armed services. I point out this chart to you. Each one of these columns represents a method whereby men can enter the armed services of the United States whether it be the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard likewise is supporting this measure.

In the first column we have in mind taking care of the National Guard. The bill covers the National Guard as well as the National Reserve generally. The guard is a part of the Reserve.

In this column we would show you how a young fellow 17 years of age, or before he reaches 19, who wishes to avail himself of the opportunity of going into the service. If he has decided he wants to volunteer for the 6 months' plan, with a 7½-year obligation, this is the way he would operate. He would go down to the National Guard unit and he would enlist in the National Guard for 6 months' training in the active field, and for 7½ years in the Reserves. It is purely voluntary on his part. He would enter in this column. He would serve 6 months. At the end of that 6 months he would be through his active obligation and then he would be placed in the National Guard training unit back home that he enlisted in. That would mean for 7½ years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

That would give him 7½ years' obligation to train with his guard unit back home. If, however, he wishes to go into the Regular Reserve and not the guard, he would then go down to the Reserve unit back home or in his neighborhood, and he would enlist in that unit for 6 months' active training in the field, and 7½ years in the Reserve training at home. This portion in red represents the 6 months' active training in the field that he would get. Then he would be passed into the Reserves back home, and he would be given 7½ years in the Reserve. During that 7½ years, what would he do? He would attend weekly drills. Under the law as we have provided in this bill, he would have 48 weekly drills throughout the year. He would take his training during that time and he would comply with the needs of the training period in that way. Sometime during the course of the year he is obligated under this program to 2 weeks' training in the field, and he would be sent sometime during this year for 2 weeks' training while he was on the inactive portion of his obligation of 7½ years. When he got back he would reenter training in his Reserve unit at home.

This column represents a new type of voluntary obligation which we have written into this bill. We have written it in in response to a request of the Navy and the Air Force. This provides that a young man wishing to enter the service may go down voluntarily and enlist in his Reserve unit, and he would be told that he would be called to duty at some time during the first 2 years after he entered his Reserve program. Before he took his active field duty he would be given the usual training back home in his unit as a reservist. Then he would be called to duty sometime during the first 2-year period. He would serve 2 years on active field duty, following which he would return to the Reserve and serve the balance of the 8 years, 4 years more, in his Reserve unit.

Then, here we come to the third column. This is the case of the draftee. A man is drafted for 2 years, and he served that time in the active field and the balance of the time he puts in the Reserve at home.

This column represents a voluntary obligation. It is a man who wishes to go in for 3 years voluntarily in the service. The balance of his time would be 5 years additional. Then this man volunteers for 4 years in active duty. The balance of his time would be spent in the Reserve. This man would come in on 5 years of active duty. The balance of his time, 3 years, would be spent in the Reserves in training. But all of that is three voluntary enlistments.

Now I want to say how this works. We want to give these men an incentive to get out of the Ready Reserve if they do good work. We want to give them an incentive; so how do we work it? We provide that the man who serves 5 years will not have any duty in the Ready Reserves; he will be within the Standby Reserves.

The man who volunteers for 4 years will serve 1 additional year in the Ready Reserves where he will do duty as an Inactive Reserve training at home.

The man with 3 years voluntary service would have 2 years in the Reserves training at home.

The drafted man would have 3 years if he did satisfactory work and performed satisfactorily, he would cut his active obligation from 8 years to a total of 5, and this portion of the obligation would be spent in the Standby Reserves where he would be called upon for no active training of any sort.

Likewise, coming to this chart in the case of the man with 6 months' volunteer training, that man would be given another opportunity to cut short his time by reducing his active training to 6 months. In other words, by taking more training in the field he can cut his Ready Reserve obligation down, but the men with only 6 months active duty in the field cannot reduce their obligation for training. It is an obligation for 7½ years in the Reserves. In this way we compensate for the fact that the 6 months' trainee has a very short active training period in the field.

We provide, also, in this bill for an ROTC. We have had trouble in the past with the fact that ROTC boys stay 4 years in college and when they get out some of them fail to get commissions. In this bill every ROTC man who graduates satisfactorily from the college and the ROTC program would be given a Reserve commission. If he is needed, he serves 2 years on active duty; if he is surplus to the immediate officer need of the Regular Establishment, he is given 6 months' training following his college career and then goes into the inactive training period subject, as I explained to you in this chart.

We provide also in this bill for a State guard. Let us assume that an atom bomb falls on a great city in the United States; our Regular forces are deployed overseas in the emergency and have reduced their forces here at home. We call our Reserves into active operation at once. They are called into operation, the guard is called out in my State, Louisiana, for instance, and sent up to New York perhaps. We provide under the terms of this bill for a State guard. The States may organize their own guard. We do not put up money for it, we provide surplus equipment already in hand to meet such a situation of crisis which, God grant, may never come, but when the National Guard is called into active duty there will be some organization to take its place there in a critical emergency, and that organization is the State guard.

I want to conclude at this point, then I will be glad to answer questions. I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that the idea of a Reserve is nothing new. George Washington, the first President of the United States, mentioned in one of his great messages to the American people on the state of the Union, the need for what he called a well-organized militia. Throughout the history of the 13 Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard there was a volunteer militia. It was organized to protect them first against the incursions of the savage redskins who sought to terrorize the colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. In every war since the birth of this Republic we have used components of our Reserve in the Active Army. In the War of 1812, we used them to man our forts and man our garrisons throughout the continental United States. In the War with Spain we found for the first time that our Reserves were sent overseas. They were sent to Cuba and Puerto Rico. But before they were sent they had to be well trained to meet the forces of Spain in that emergency.

In the two great world wars that we in our lifetime have passed through, we have sent our Reserves into the field in large numbers to back up the Regular establishments, but they went into the field of combat only after they had received long periods of training. It was my privilege to serve in World War I, and it was 14 months after we declared war before we had a major fighting unit in France on the western front. In World War II we trained our National Guard for 12 long months before they were in shape to go out to meet the enemies we had in the Atlantic and in the Pacific.

In Korea we had to call upon those who had borne the heavy brunt of battle in World War II. I think it is unfair to ask a man to fight in a great war, like World War II, then have to turn around and call that same man out of his home, away from this family, his business, his obligations and his ties to fight another war such as we had in Korea.

We hope we can give you a Reserve establishment which will permit us to broaden the obligation of citizenship, also broaden the military obligation, so come a future Korea in the history of this country we can reach down and call upon men who are not veterans, but at the same time men who are well trained and have no prior combat experience.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Suppose you have more men who elect to serve under the first column than the National Guard will take care of?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We do the same as we do now. We limit now the size of the guard of every State. When the number of volunteers to the guard in your State exceeds the quota for your State, they must draw on the quota of another State, or it will become "a first come, first served" basis. Likewise with the Reserves, assuming that the number set by the President of the United States as a quota for the Army Reserves is exceeded by the volunteers, it is on "a first come, first served" basis, which is as fair as you can make it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman mentioned over and over that there was no compulsion in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman tell me why it seems to be correct to force a man into the Regular service but it is wrong to force men to serve in the Reserves?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I cannot disagree with the able gentleman who is chairman of a great committee in that statement. I can say that the bill is so drawn that it is not compulsory to enter the Reserves. We do have the draft, which is the law of the land today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Was not the very heart of the program which the President sent up the fact it compelled people to serve in the Reserves and this bill does not do that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill compels them to do good work after they have entered the Reserves. There is no drafting of men for this 6 months' period into the Reserves. Does that answer the question? I want to say that the committee was satisfied with the bill that is presently reported.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the able gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In reference to active service under the National Guard and the Reserves, what would be the difference in the training that those two groups would have, or would they be taken at the same time and in the same units?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The guard is under the governor of each State. We run there into a historic situation. The guard is a State force. We have to work with the governors. A man would enter the State Guard, then he would be transferred to the regular establishment for 6 months' training, then he would be transferred back to his unit in the guard following his 6 months' training.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. With reference to the National Guardsmen and the reservists, those two groups might be taken to the same camp and put under the same program at the same time, then are transferred back to the guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The idea is to integrate them there. A man can sign up with the guard or Reserve, and he will be sent to camp or put in a unit. They might, in one or two instances, open up some additional parts of camps, but generally speaking, he will be put in a unit in existence for his training, and he will be required to get his training like any other trainee would, whether a guardsman or a reservist.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Do I understand that you will set up periods of training for these groups and you will take them in in groups, say, at every quarter or every month or something like that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They estimate there would be something like 8,500 per month the first year. But, of course, that is based upon a floor of 100,000, which would be the minimum amount which might be set for volunteer purposes under the 6 months' training for the first year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would those people have the opportunity in the National Guard, then, to select the branch of the service? In other words, the Army, the Air Force, or the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would be handled just exactly as it is handled

at the present time. In fairness to everyone, let me say this, that the Air Guard is pretty well filled up. I would not want to tell this Congress that if the Air Guard were completely filled up and a man wanted to go down to the Air Guard, that they would open the ceiling just to get him in when the Air Guard had been filled up. Likewise, if you take the Navy and the Air Force, they have said that they think they can get under this long-term program of voluntary enlistment the number they need for the air program. They say they would rather have a man coming in 4 years voluntarily than a 6-month trainee. If they can get their volunteers for 4 years or 3 years, they are going to take the volunteers until their quota is filled up.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri, if I understood it correctly, he can volunteer for some particular Reserve component before he gets his training. In other words, he volunteers for 6 months' training in the Army Reserve, under the National Guard, or the Air Force or the Navy air force program, and then he gets his training and reverts back to that particular service. However, with the permission of the two services, he can transfer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is very true, and I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the Defense Department appropriation bill was before the House last week statements were made that the Reserve setup had been poorly handled in the past. Does the gentleman think that the Reserve setup is now competent to handle this influx of reservists?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Well, we have to depend upon the executive branch of the Government. I will say this, it was poorly handled; it has been poorly handled in many cases in the past. We hope and trust to exercise some surveillance over the Department, as a legislative body, to try to see that the Reserve program is more efficiently handled than in the past.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. To answer that part of the question as to whether or not the Reserve program will be properly carried out, we have provided, of course, in this bill for a report from the Department of Defense each January so that we can review the program to see whether or not it is being properly executed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This is just a hypothetical case. In the event that someone volunteers for 4 years as compared to somebody that just joins the Reserve for 6 months, in the event of an emergency does this bill determine which will first be brought back into Federal service?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In Korea, when the emergency came along, we had no method of screening. We called, for instance, at that time, as a truck driver, a man who had been practicing law for 5 years. We called as a bookkeeper a man who had been practicing dentistry for 5 years. We called into service for Korea men who had been dead for several years. We had no way of screening. We had no way of keeping up with the reserves. This bill provides that we shall screen these reserves from time to time, and if there is any Reserve that cannot go, he will be screened out of the Ready Reserve.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, the volunteer for 4 years might be brought back into Federal service before the 6-month trainee. In the event of an emergency, does this bill provide that one who has merely taken a 6 months' training course will go into active service sooner than someone who had served for 4 years as a volunteer?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No; it is on a different basis. The basis is this. Where you need a certain number of engineers, you call engineers. If they need a dozen engineers, for instance, they would consider the equities; is it fair to call in a man who has done such yeoman duty for a long time or call in another one? In other words, they are to consider the equities in that case.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, under this bill someone who had served 4 years, in comparison with someone else who had had training for 6 months, could be brought back sooner than the one who had served only 6 months?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If they needed a lawyer or an engineer or a scientist, and he had been in service for 4 or 5 or 6 years, they could call him back if they had to have him. If a hardship is created, a Reserve would not be called.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. And let some of the 6 months' trainees go?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It could happen, yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was interested a while ago when the gentleman began his talk, in his statement that there was much confusion and misunderstanding about this bill, not only here, but with the people back home. I find that to be a true statement. There is much confusion. I wonder if my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would answer a question or two in the hope that we might clear up some of that confusion?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should be glad to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that this bill, if enacted, will become a part of the Selective Service and Training Act which is now the law? That is, this bill is an amendment to it, but this bill is a voluntary matter, and will become part of another law that has a compulsory feature. Therefore, if this bill is enacted, we will have a law that is one part compulsory, the present law, and this new bill which is purely voluntary; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is right; that is substantially correct. I thank the able gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have one more question I would like to ask, if I may.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On page 5 of the bill, in the second paragraph, I find this:

> Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may enlist in the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, or in the Reserve or in any unit of the Reserve.

Is not that the gist of the gentleman's bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. There is a 4-year period of enlistment that can be had voluntarily. We hope by the year 1960 that we can come to the Congress and say that we have a Reserve composed of prior trained servicemen who have at least 6 months' training in the active field.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One more question, if I may. Then under this bill, if it becomes law, no boy not now in the service will be required or compelled or ordered to leave his home and go to the recruiting station and enlist, is that true?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. It is purely voluntary.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But once he does enlist, he is in for a total of 8 years, 6 months of which is training and the balance various kinds of training, the Standby Reserve, the Ready Reserve, and so forth. Under the original part of the legislation, which is the present Selective Service Act passed by this Congress, he has a total of 8 years, of which the first 2 years are active training; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. I can say this for these young men who are 17 years of age who come down and volunteer for 6 months, that they are going to be required to get their parents' consent, just as all minors are required to have the consent of their parents before entering the service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Earlier in the consideration of this bill the gentleman from Iowa indicated that the military subcommittee on appropriations had been critical of the Reserve program. I think it should be pointed out in all fairness that any criticism we had was primarily directed at a lack of manpower and not necessarily directed at the management of the program. As I understand it, this proposed legislation is a big step forward to produce the necessary manpower.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. I will say that we have a legal limit on the Ready Reserve now of 1½ million men, but we actually have in the Ready Reserve 2½ million men. We do not train them. There is no procedure which would require them to train and to be well organized and well equipped for use in the immediate emergency. That is what we have provided.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. Referring to the fourth category, where the man is drafted and in for 2 years, and then is liable for 3 additional years, what is the present law?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The present law is for a total of 8 years. The difference we make is that we give him encouragement, let him do good work, as is shown on this chart, in his Reserve duty training, and then if he does that we release him to the Standby Reserve where he will have no training.

Mr. BELCHER. But it does not change that obligation at all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It shortens the Ready Reserve obligation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say first of all that as far as I am concerned I am going to support this proposition because I think it is needed and necessary.

I want to add one further word to the proposition raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. In the course of certain conversations about this measure some question was raised. As far as I am concerned, I think we need some reserves other than the boys who have already served 4 years. While possibly it might not be effective to try to write definite language into the law requiring that the boys in the Reserve who come in for the 6 months in the Reserve be called first in all cases, I think the record here as we make it ought to make it abundantly clear that we are in very large measure passing this legislation to create a body of reserves other than among the boys who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. Wherever possible the people having the program in charge should call the boys who have come in for the 6 months to be a part of the Reserves ahead of the boys who have already served their time but are required to serve a certain time in the Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That certainly sounds equitable. I call the attention of the gentleman to page 17 of the bill. We take the combat veteran off the hook in this bill, because under this classification he will not be called until consideration has been given to the others. Then we provide for certain categories which I commend to the Members of Congress to study.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What does the gentleman mean by a combat veteran?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I mean a man who served in the course of the Korean war. We provide for the date July 27, 1953. That was the termination of the Korean war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So that if I join the Army or the Navy and do my enlistment, whatever it is, how long do you put me in the Reserves, then?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It depends on how long you join. If you enlist for 5 years you are in the Standby Reserve with no obligation of training of any sort for 3 years.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, but you are obligated to be drafted if we have a war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. You are obligated to be drafted whether you are in the Reserves or not if we have an allout war.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How many Reserves do we have now?

Mr. VINSON. Two million two hundred thousand.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have 3 million under arms?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We are reducing to a regular establishment of 2,850,000.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has referred to column No. 4 as the draftee column for the 2 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Two years' drafted active service, the balance is in the Reserves.

Mr. VORYS. Is there not still a possibility of volunteering for 2 years for service in the Army?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; you can go in through the Reserves here as a volunteer, and then sometime in the first 2 years you will be called to active duty for only a 2-year active period.

Mr. VORYS. I thought that there was a Richards amendment that was still in the law that provided that a man could still volunteer for 2 years of active duty in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is the way they go in, but I understand it is legal to accept 2-year volunteers.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman made some reference indicating that this bill may change the status of graduate ROTC men.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; it will guarantee him a commission. It does not change his status, but it will guarantee that he will get a commission when he finishes the ROTC course.

Mr. MORANO. Assuming that this bill becomes a law, with what graduating class will it take effect?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It will take effect within 2 months after the bill is passed and signed and becomes a law.

Mr. MORANO. Does that mean a class graduating this June would come under this bill, if it is passed?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If it becomes a law by then.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just have one question. An emergency happens. I have been in the Army for 4 years. You have been in the Army for 6 months. I do not care whether it is a draftee or not. Who is better prepared to handle that emergency and go right into battle—the 6-month trainee or the 4-year trainee?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. MASON. That is exactly what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] was getting at and what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was getting at. The fellow who is best able to do the job that is needed is the one who is going to be called.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to the gentleman, in my opinion, there would be few volunteers if they knew you would keep taking them back first in the event of an emergency. You would have no volunteers whatsoever.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I point out that the man who is in the Standby Reserve will not be called out of the Standby Reserve to active duty except through the draft board. The draft board will screen them and see that equity is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for his extreme patience in hearing everybody and anybody who had anything to say about this bill, with the exception of one person who came before us about whom we knew a little concerning his background. When he insisted that he would not answer certain questions we immediately arose and would not hear him any longer.

First of all, in the approach of this bill, I think we want to keep in mind that this bill is designed to meet the needs of our forces so that we can properly defend our country. You must not forget that. This may not be the solution, but certainly, in our judgment, the members of the committee and the subcommittee, it is the best solution we have been able to arrive at under the circumstances. We are not just trying to pile a lot of people in and push them through a UMT program. We are trying to provide a Ready Reserve that could be called upon in case of emergency, and which will, in truth, be ready so far as we can be ready with a Reserve force. We must remember that we have a 6 months' training program which is a minimum. In the judgment of our best advisers and in our best judgment, this is necessary to give a foundation so that men who then go on into the Reserve units and continue with their training will be of some value; a ready force, and the minimum that we need to defend our country.

The question about whether the program will be good or bad is just like any other law that we write. Perhaps we will have to ride hard on the Department of Defense to see that the program is properly executed. We do that by making the Defense Department come back to us once a year and report on their stewardship. We have given a certain amount of flexibility to the Defense Department because you have so very many variables to be considered in any such program as this. But I can assure you that we have not given the Department of Defense carte blanche so far as the execution of this law is concerned. There has been a great deal of criticism of our so-called Reserve as of today. I think a great deal of that is justified. However, one of the big things we have

found during our hearings was that we now have units where we have a strong nucleus of officers and noncommissioned officers, but we have nothing but chiefs, and no Indians. I assure you, you cannot keep officers interested unless you have some tools for them to work with.

With reference to the question about those who will come in under the 6 months' program, I know there will be great opposition brought to bear upon that section, saying it will disrupt the high-school programs of various boys. Remember, they will not be accepted unless they have their parents' consent. So that puts to rest that part of it.

I think perhaps it was not brought out too clearly, but, for instance, those men who enlist in the National Guard or the Reserves are enlisted for 8 years—2 years of which will be on active duty. So that they do, in fact, have 6 years' Reserve obligation. However, we say, "If you properly and faithfully perform your Ready Reserve obligation—that is, 1 or 2 or 3 years—then you go over into the Standby Reserve." That is the same program we have for all of these men, with the exception of the 6-month boys. The reason we cannot make that program too attractive is the fear that it might be so attractive that you would have everybody going into that program and it would cut down on our volunteer program.

A man who serves 5 years active duty goes immediately into the Standby Reserve. On this whole program we are trying to design it for a long-range pull. We have blown hot and we have blown cold. We have had our peaks and our valleys. But we must set up a sound plan. One alternative we have is the one we had at the beginning of the Korean war. We had no Ready Reserve. As a result we called on everybody and anybody, helter skelter, hither and yon. We all know the objections we had to that. Many men were called to active duty who should not have been called. But under this program we will continuously screen men, first from active duty in the Ready Reserves. Then, while they are in the Ready Reserves, they will be continuously screened as to whether or not they should be in the Ready Reserve. When we speak of the Ready Reserve, we want people who are ready to go at a moment's notice. We will screen out the people who have hardship cases, because their status has changed, because they have essential skills, and so on. We will not disrupt the economy of our country. In that way we will take away many of the objections that some people have to this bill.

I cannot see any easy way out on providing these forces. To, you who can find an easy way out, my hat is off to you. It is our responsibility to provide defense forces for our country. We must provide them one way or another, either by a strong Ready Reserve or a huge standing force. We have no other choice. If, however, we have a properly trained Reserve, then we can, in my judgment, reduce our standing forces to a degree.

As far as I personally am concerned, I am willing to accept my responsibility and vote in support of this measure.

I think, however, before this debate goes very much further we are going to hear a great deal of criticism of the militaire. Perhaps I should not bring this up, having served a few years in the Regular forces myself, but let us not forget this:

> It was Tommy this and Tommy that
> And Tommy go away,
> But it was "Howdy, Mr. Atkins"
> When the band began to play.

Fortunately, the band is not playing now, but let us not be so shortsighted that we will not vote to support the reasonable program which your Committee on the Armed Services has presented.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. We all have tremendous respect for the gentleman's experience and ability. Will the gentleman tell us, or will we find in the report some place an explanation, how this 6 months' training plus 48 hours or evenings, plus 2 weeks, is going to provide an Active Reserve that is able to go into action immediately when there is an emergency? In prior times we found when we had a National Guard with some similar amounts of training that they had to go to camp for 6 months or a year before they could go into battle.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I believe I can explain that to a degree. They, of course, will not be battle-worthy troops, there is no question about that; to think so would be to fool ourselves. However, they will be very much better prepared than under our present program and primarily because in the National Guard and the Reserve units, when a man enlists he goes directly for 6 months' training. Without it he would be a very, very raw recruit and as a result your officers and senior noncommissioned officers have to devote the greater part of their time and attention to training them in the fundamental school of the soldier, and so forth; whereas with this 6 months' program he will have accomplished that and the man will have gone on into specialized training. Then when the man goes into the Reserves it will be possible to go ahead with the unit training. Do I make myself clear on that?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. How does the Reserve obligation of a man who elects a 2-year period of active duty compare with the Reserve obligation of a man who ignores it altogether and elects to be called up by selective service?

Mr. DEVEREUX. As far as the Reserve obligation is concerned it is exactly the same whether the man enlists or is drafted; the total service is exactly the same.

Mr. JONAS. But in the matter of his obligation in the Reserves, how will his length of service in the Reserves compare?

Mr. DEVEREUX. It is shown by this chart.

Mr. JONAS. Are we requiring the men who are discharged now after an experience of 2 years to enter the Reserves? We are not sending them to the Reserves, are we?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Yes. They go into the Reserves.

Mr. JONAS. I know, but they do not have these 48 drills a year, they do not go into the Active Reserve.

Mr. DEVEREUX. They have an obligation and, fortunately, to a certain degree, men are recognizing the obligation of going into it. As far as the implementation of the thing is concerned, the Defense Department has been hesitant to implement the law.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest reluctance I rise to express grave doubts as to the validity of this measure. I had not the opportunity of serving on the subcommittee which sincerely and earnestly studied it for a good many days. I had only the advantage of reading most of the voluminous testimony and hearing the testimony that was adduced before the full committee. It is with a great deal of trepidation, therefore, that I rise to express these doubts, because I have just been informed that the administration thoroughly supports this measure.

Who am I to question the judgment of the greatest military geniuses of our time? I would, however, in the small time allowed me, as a plain country lawyer from Maine, as a man who has served his country, and who has served in a Reserve unit and who is presently a member of the Air National Guard, like to express the doubts which I have about this bill.

In the first place, the key to our defense in this atomic age is a fine combat-ready standing force. Whether you believe in the theory of atomic retaliation or you believe in fighting all of these peripheral wars, the first requisite is a combat ready Air Force, a combat ready Navy and ground force.

What does this bill do in that respect? If you will read the testimony of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and of the Chief of Staff of the Navy you will find there is a question in their minds, and a grave question, as to what effect this bill providing for the volunteer induction of 6 months' trainees in numbers between 100,000 to 250,000 will have on the 4-year enlistees which the Navy and the Air Force have so long acquired. They express a doubt that if this goes on and is poorly administered, as it might be, it will seriously affect volunteer enlistments in those two branches of the service. There can be no question but what it does each year dry up to the extent of 100,000 to 250,000 men, men who might otherwise be volunteer enlistees in the Air Force and in the Navy.

Here is the second thing that gives me concern about this bill. It is true that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Forces is still considering the matter. It is the fact it does not do anything to remedy this Nation's plight with regard to scientific and engineering personnel. It does not do a thing in that respect. I know that the gentleman from Maryland wants to ask a question,

but if he will let me go on I think I will cover it.

We had testimony before our committee that this Nation is presently producing 22,000 scientific and engineering personnel a year as against 54,000 being produced in Russia. All this bill does is to say that those who are employed in scientific and engineering pursuits essential to the national defense can volunteer for 6 months and thereby be taken away from essential defense work for 6 months. Is there any necessity for that?

Third, this bill further complicates the situation of American youth in planning their future. It just adds another bewildering, confusing alternative; and if you do not think it is bewildering and confusing, just read the terms of this bill. Shall he volunteer for 6 months? Shall he take a chance on being drafted? Shall he go to school and try to be deferred, then when he gets older be drafted for 2 years?

If you are going to have a scientific and engineering personnel, as the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has so ably told our committee, these boys must be able to plan their future, plan their education, plan their graduate work. We are woefully behind in scientific and engineering personnel.

Just what does this bill do, when you analyze it? The first way to analyze it is to note those who appeared in opposition. There appeared in opposition to this bill the Air Force Association, the Naval Reserve Association, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, all in opposition to the bill. The Air Force Reserves and the Naval Reserves say they want to continue the reserve system that is voluntary and they want no part of a compulsory reserve system. Read, if you will, the testimony of the Air Force and the Navy—lukewarm, very lukewarm, in their endorsement of this measure, an endorsement, I think I may say, because for almost a year I learned part of the politics I now possess over in the Pentagon, because it was part of a Pentagon arrangement between the services.

The title of this bill should be "A bill to build up the reserves of the Army," because neither the Navy nor the Air Force want any part of compulsory reserves, nor do they want any part of the 6 months' trainees.

The Navy and the Air Force need 4-year enlistees, and there is every reason in the world that they need those 4-year enlistees, after they have completed their training, because modern technological warfare requires that the Air Force and the Navy have these technical men in their Reserves and not just 6-month trainees. I believe that this bill will weaken rather than strengthen our reserve system. It is a bill primarily to build up the Army Reserve. Will it succeed? Who knows? How many young men 17 to 19 would volunteer to go in 6 months with a 7½-year Reserve obligation? If it does not work, what is the Army going to do? The next thing for the Army to do is to come in here, not to ask for universal military training—I do not use that word—but to come in here and ask this Congress to conscript 6-month trainees in the proper Reserve. And then what a story we will have. While we are conscripting young people for 6 months to go into the Army we will be drafting the young men living next door to him to go into the Army for 2 years.

Now, I believe that this legislation is in large measure not legislation but a complete delegation of our legislative authority to the Executive. In the first place, for the first time to my knowledge we are giving the President the unprecedented authority of calling up a million reservists without the consent of Congress. Prior to that, he could call up the Reserves, but Congress had to specify in what number.

Now, read the terms of the bill. It is a complete delegation of authority to the military. It gives them complete control over the lives of these youths. What of these 6-month trainees? It is noted in the bill that persons with critical skills engaged in critical defense supporting industries may be allowed to fulfill their military obligation by serving on active duty for training. Who determines that? The President, undoubtedly, through the military. Then it sets up a system of screening where you get a proper distribution of critical skills between military service and essential civilian service. Who determines that? The military again; not your local draft boards, but the military. Then, when you finally get the members of the Ready Reserve in the Standby Reserve, you flop over again and let the draft board determine how that Standby shall be screened.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Maine has advised the committee that he is opposed to this bill. Does he not think he is under obligation to advise the committee of a plan or what he proposes to do about it? What suggestion does the gentleman have to offer in lieu of this proposal?

Mr. NELSON. Well, I would say to my distinguished chairman, the illustrious gentleman from Georgia, that if the gentleman from Maine had had more than 10 minutes, now almost gone, he would certainly endeavor to answer his question.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and he had ample opportunity there in the committee to point out what should take the place of this program. I am not trying to be critical, but I would appreciate it, and the Congress would appreciate it, and the committee would be benefited if the gentleman would offer his alternative to this proposition.

Mr. NELSON. Well, there are a good many alternatives, I would say to my distinguished chairman. I would just suggest one to him that was suggested to me by the members of the National Guard. The National Guard feel that they could completely and adequately take care of this problem if their appropriation was increased and their quota increased to take care of this number of men, 100,000 a year. But the Army does not want them in the guard.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman concerning the language on page 5 where it says three different times about what people may enlist or volunteer for this particular 6-month training. If the gentleman will refer to page 5, he will see that it says:

> Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may, within quotas—

And so forth. Then on line 12 it says:

> Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army * * * any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty—

And so forth. Then on line 20 it says:

> Any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve—

There are three different conditions. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] referred to a boy 17 to 19 years of age as being the only one eligible for this, and yet there are two other classifications of persons. Now, what applies?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will say this: If the gentleman will read those sentences very carefully and study them, as I did last night, he will find that they are entirely harmonious; that a young man 17 to 19, before the draft board gets behind him, can avail himself of this 6 months' volunteer program.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, that is covered by the previous language, that any person can, but he does not have to be 17 to 19.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That means anyone 17 to 19, provided the draft board has not yet sent him notice.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will read the language beginning on line 16, he will see that it says:

> Any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training——

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That refers to those who are 17 to 19, as the gentleman will see when he studies the bill carefully.

Mr. HINSHAW. The next line reads—that is, line 20—

> who is under the age of 19 years.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then there is duplication of language there.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is some duplication, but it does not hurt the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am bringing up the question because I know these boys, and when they start reading this language and try to find out what it means, they are going to be confused, just as is the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana is not confused. He knows what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on many aspects of military legislation I defer to the experienced judgment of my colleagues in this House who, as members of the Armed Services Committee, the House Appropriations Armed Services Subcommittee, or the Government Operations Committee, have made these subjects a matter of extended and intensive study over the years. I expect to continue to do so, at least until I have acquired a great deal more experience and wisdom in this highly technical and specialized field than I now possess.

But from time to time legislative proposals in the military field also involve basic principles and issues of governmental philosophy important to all Americans, vitally related to our very form of government and directly affecting the lives, plans, and freedom of our citizens.

A Member of Congress—even a new Member—who addresses himself to such a subject does not thereby assume the role of technical expert but rather, it seems to me, meets a fundamental obligation as an elected Representative under our constitutional system.

I feel very strongly that the legislative subject involved in H. R. 5297, the national Reserve plan, partakes of this broad character and imposes this responsibility. I am impelled to speak because there is no issue before this present Congress which has brought to my desk as large a volume of correspondence from my district, both pro and con. I am further emboldened to speak on this subject by the fact that my deep interest in this matter had its genesis in my 3½ years' association with my distinguished and beloved predecessor, the late Congressman Paul W. Shafer, who served long and ably as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Let me preface my statement of views on this proposed legislation with a a rather elementary analysis of the problem before us.

We are dealing here with one facet of the broad problem of procuring needed manpower for the Armed Forces—in this case for the National Guard and a Ready Reserve. The proposal before us envisions a total Ready Reserve of approximately 2,900,000. I am not here concerned with any question as to the proposed size of this force but solely with the question of the proposed methods of military manpower procurement under this program.

Now, fundamentally, there are three methods of procuring military manpower, whether for active duty forces or for the Reserves—First, the voluntary method; second, the compulsory method; and, third, the threat-of-compulsion method.

Today the voluntary method of recruitment has become very limited and circumscribed in its operation due, of course, to the continuation of the draft with the factors of compulsion and threat-of-compulsion which this involves.

Once upon a time in American history all military manpower was recruited by the voluntary method. Today the only true and identifiable volunteers are the men who enlist or reenlist for military service—Active or Reserve—after having fulfilled their draft duty requirements.

The compulsory method of military manpower procurement is self-explanatory. It applies specifically to those whom General Hershey taps on the shoulder.

The ultimate application of this method occurs in wartime when all voluntary enlistments are arbitrarily suspended. The ultimate application of this method in peacetime would occur under a system of universal compulsory military training and/or service.

The third method of military manpower procurement—the threat-of-compulsion method—is something new so far as the nonwartime experience of the American people is concerned. It is the product of the carry-over of the draft into peacetime. This method can be described with equal accuracy as a quasi-voluntary method and as a quasi-compulsory method. It is a sort of twilight zone between absolute voluntarism and absolute compulsion. It is neither white nor black but gray.

With the extension of the draft law and the draft threat there exists a climate of compulsion which brings in enlistees without the formality of an induction order. Today's lowered draft quotas indicate that this is numerically the most productive source of military manpower at the present time.

I should note in this connection one subsidiary but nonetheless important fact. Undoubtedly under this threat-of-compulsion situation there are many young men who are bona fide but unrecognized true volunteers. These are the young men who would enter the service as a career even if there were no draft threat hanging over their heads but who, because of this existing threat, cannot actually be identified as true volunteers.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the existing climate of compulsion and threat-of-compulsion obscures the identity of these young men. It is particularly unfortunate that it also obscures the true numerical potential of a genuine voluntary method of military manpower procurement. This fact, of course, enables the advocate of the compulsory and threat-of-compulsion methods to argue that we are getting our present large number of enlistments only because the youth of America have General Hershey breathing down their necks.

Both historically and in the present operation of our miiltary manpower procurement system, there are varying shifts in emphasis on these several methods of manpower procurement. Sometimes these shifts are made by administrative decision and action, as, for example, by the raising or lowering of draft quotas.

But the initial, basic policy decisions—for example, application of the compulsion or threat-of-compulsion methods to some new area of military manpower procurement—these decisions are legislative. They require the concurrence of the Congress.

Today we are faced with just such a basic, legislative policy decision in the form of H. R. 5297.

Today we are being asked to make fundamental, far-reaching, precedent-breaking and precedent-setting shifts of emphasis and of authority to the compulsion and threat-of-compulsion methods in the manner of procuring military manpower for the National Guard and the Ready Reserve.

To be sure the shift is being attempted on an easy-stages, painless, noiseless, soft-pedal, blandly reassuring, rubber-caster basis. But it is a very real shift that is being undertaken. Moreover, there are some not so reassuring, not so noiseless, voices in the background which have plainly said that this is only a beginning.

Let me refer to just two such fundamental changes involved in this bill. And let me interpret these proposed changes in terms of this threefold method of military manpower procurement I have described.

The first major provision of this bill would give 100,000 to 250,000 predraft age youths annually the option and opportunity to enlist in the National Guard or Ready Reserve, undergo 6 months of active training, and then be deferred from the draft subject to satisfactory participation in regular training for an additional 7½ years. The training would involve 48 weekly drill periods a year and 2 weeks in an annual training camp or, in lieu thereof, 30 days in an annual training camp. Failure to maintain training would make the enlistee liable to induction for 2 years active duty. While ostensibly applicable to all branches of the service, the bulk of the enlistees—99 percent—would be assigned to the Army Ready Reserves after their initial 5 months training.

This, of course, is an extension and application to the National Guard and the Ready Reserves of the threat-of-compulsion method of recruitment.

This has been facetiously described as a "bargain basement" deal for young men who face the draft threat. I am not so sure of the accuracy of that description.

I think it is a more accurate and forthright description to say that this is an opportunity for these young men to take their compulsion on the installment plan, with a downpayment of 6 months' active duty for training; with a 7½ year mortgage on their time, plans and freedom after the downpayment; with regular weekly and annual installments, and finally, with an unconscionably large forfeiture clause—2 years of compulsory active duty—for failure, anywhere along the line, to keep up on the installment payments.

There may be some honest differences of opinion as to just how great a bargain this really is.

Now I want to be entirely fair and realistic about this particular proposal and the problem that it is designed to solve.

I fully realize that there are problems of military manpower procurement for the Ready Reserves, and particularly so far as the Army's Ready Reserve is concerned.

I do not question the desirability and need for an Army Ready Reserve, provided its size is kept within sound and realistic limits and provided it is not a universal military training program in disguise.

I am not prepared to dispute the value of some period of preparatory basic training for men who are to enter the Ready Reserves. I belong to the old Civilian Military Training Camp era.

Moreover, while I prefer the genuinely voluntary method of recruiting manpower for the Ready Reserves, I would favor an optional enlistment in this program under threat of draft compulsion over any form of outright compulsory recruitment for the Ready Reserves.

Accordingly, I have no basic objection to offering the prospective draftee some type of optional enlistment in the Ready Reserves in lieu of draft induction and with a requirement that he maintain training standards in the Reserves. I understand this is now done with respect to National Guard recruits.

On the other hand, I question very seriously the necessity or wisdom of extending this period of obligated training for as long as 7½ years.

I say all of this, however, with three very important reservations. These reservations are so important in my mind that I am unable and unwilling to vote for this proposal at this time.

The first reservation is based on the fact that the bill originally submitted by the Pentagon called for compulsory drafting of men for the Ready Reserves if the optional-enlistment method failed to provide the quotas set for the Ready Reserves.

I congratulate the Armed Services Committee for its wisdom in striking out this provision.

However, I am well aware that the Army can be expected to come back next year, or the year after, with the report that the optional-enlistment plan has not worked and with the demand that they be given authority to draft. I am sure that a great many of the Armed Services Committee and of this House have the same opinion, and I am sure, I regret to say, that the Army will see to it that the optional-enlistment plan does not work because they want to extend the compulsory method of manpower recruitment to the National Guard and Ready Reserves. Their dream of universal military training dies hard.

There is a second very important reservation in my mind so far as this particular proposal is concerned. I have in mind that the Navy and Air Force have indicated no compelling need or desire for this particular feature, apparently because they are finding that the voluntary and optional-enlistment method of manpower recruitment is working successfully so far as their Reserve procurement needs are concerned.

I also have in mind the fact that some grave misgivings were expressed by Navy and Air Force witnesses that this proposal for optional enlistments for training only might seriously compete and conflict with their own programs of long-term enlistments. Obviously there is more than one side to the issue, even in the minds of many of the military.

I have still another very important reservation so far as this particular proposal is concerned. I have been amazed and shocked by the charges made by responsible and knowledgeable Members of this House that the Army has not really tried to build up its Ready Reserves and has not really tried to make methods of military manpower procurement, other than compulsory or threat-of-compulsion methods, really succeed.

In saying this I have in mind the statement of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] in this House only last Wednesday during debate on the Defense Department appropriation bill:

> It is of great concern to this committee that no really workable Reserve program has been brought forward in all the years since World War II. The committee has seriously wondered on many occasions whether there is a real interest in and appreciation for the Reserves among many of the professional soldiers who dominate the thinking in the Pentagon.

And Mr. SIKES went on to point out that—

> Reserves are pushed around in little ways—denied promotions, denied even the right to participate in study courses after the age of 45. Heretofore they have been denied the right of weekend drills. Our committee assumed that a quirk in the law was at fault, but found that there simply had been no implementation of regulations to permit weekend training of Reserves.

I have in mind also that this charge was repeated by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] during their able discussion of this bill last Sunday on the television program Both Sides of the Aisle.

I have in mind the apologetic "Maybe we haven't done as well as we should, but we will promise to try to do better" note in the testimony of Defense and Army Department witnesses before the Armed Services subcommittee.

Further, I have in mind the statement made before the subcommittee by our distinguished former colleague, retired Maj. Gen. Melvin A. Maas, of the United States Marine Corps, that "90 percent of the question of whether we are going to have an effective Ready Reserves is not the amendments to the laws we are passing, but it is a question of whether we are going to have actual facilities and a real training program."

I have in mind General Maas' testimony that "in the areas where there are adequate facilities, proper leadership and real training programs, you have waiting lists" for the Reserves.

I have particularly in mind that in answer to a specific question by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] as to whether he included the Army in that statement, General Maas replied emphatically in the affirmative and stated that in places where the Army does have the facilities, programs and leadership they are getting results.

I have in mind, finally, the question asked Col. Robert J. Philpott, president of the Active Duty Reservists Association, by my esteemed friend, the ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SHORT] and Colonel Philpott's reply:

> Mr. SHORT. If an honest, eager, sincere, determined effort had been made to implement the Reserve laws or even administer it as Congress had passed them, we wouldn't be in the awful predicament we are today?
>
> Colonel PHILPOTT. Not at all.

Now, just to keep the record straight and our perspective accurate, permit me to recall another occasion when this lack of a reserve program was a subject of similar complaint and of similar promises to do better.

This was also before the House Armed Services Committee, on January 24, 1951, and the witness was Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg.

In response to a question from the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] as to what specific proposal is there at this time by the Department of Defense for strengthening the Reserves? Mrs. Rosenberg replied:

> We will come up in no later than 6 months with a plan on an improved Reserve. We are very conscious that every time we have asked for something we have always given a thought to the so-called improved Reserve, but never set a deadline on which we would submit this.

Army plans and promises to do something really effective with or for the Reserves, like old soldiers, apparently never die—but they sure do fade away.

What, incidentally, is the Army's present plan for effective operation of the Ready Reserves it will acquire, or have the power to acquire, under this bill if it is enacted?

Or will this plan, too, fade away—and be followed by a new and urgent demand for full power of compulsion in this area of military manpower procurement?

A second provision of this bill I wish to mention briefly is the totally new requirement that all veterans of 2-year draft service and 2- to 4-year enlistment service, who began their service on or after July 27, 1953, must remain in the Ready Reserves and follow through on a compulsory program of weekly drills and annual camp training for at least 1 to 3 years additional. Failure to maintain training would result in recall for 45 days active duty and possibly additional years of obligation.

This is a totally new extension and application of the outright compulsory method of military manpower procurement to the National Guard and Ready Reserves. It is a totally new extension and application of the compulsory method to men completing regular draft or enlisted service.

I know it is denied that this is really new. I know it is alleged that there already exists in the law a statutory period of military obligation and that men can be compelled to continue training under this provision. That, I might add, was another one of those easy-

stages, painless, noiseless, rubber-caster propositions.

Actually, however, no attempt has been made to implement this generality and it has been conceded that it was unrealistic and impractical to do so under the broad generalities of the present law.

But that attempt is being made right here and now in this bill.

That is something new—and do not let anybody tell you different. Above all, I would respectfully advise you not to try to tell the returning veteran, subject to this added compulsion, that it is not something new.

The strange thing about this provision is that it has the support of many of those who have complained the loudest about equity of service and about veterans being required to perform double duty.

Aside from the inequity this imposes on the veterans, consider for a moment what this provision means in its broadest aspects.

It means, first of all, that hereafter, and for the duration of this law, every man serving in the Armed Forces for any period up to 4 years, either through draft induction or enlistment, will or may be compelled to continue military training for as much as 3 years after completion of his active duty service.

Consider also, what this provision does to those branches of the Armed Forces, particularly the Navy and Air Force, which have developed active and successful volunteer Reserve programs and which have sold returning veterans on voluntary enlistment and participation in these Reserve programs.

The method and spirit of compulsion is being arbitrarily imposed upon these services and these veterans. These services are being told, "You cannot have the voluntary system." And the veterans of these services are being told, "You cannot volunteer." All because compulsion is now the order of the day. What a farce. What a tragedy.

I revert to the premise with which I began these remarks.

We are dealing here today with a legislative proposal in the military field which, above and beyond its complex technical aspects, involves basic principles and issues vitally affecting our very form of government and directly touching the lives of our citizens. I earnestly hope that it will be viewed in that broader perspective.

The growing power of government over our lives, the growing encroachment of government upon the affairs and plans of young Americans, and above all the increasing careless and lazy reliance upon the methods of compulsion or threat of compulsion, which restrict and narrow down the freedom of Americans to do what they wish and can with their own lives, ought, it seems to me, to be a matter of the gravest concern to all of us.

I fully realize the difficulties faced by those who, well aware of the dangers of which I speak, must still grapple with the practical problems of building and maintaining adequate defense.

I fully realize the necessity of maximum reliance upon compulsory methods in time of all-out war—as, I am sure, do the American people generally.

I accept the fact that we still have the draft law—with its factors of compulsion and threat of compulsion.

But I also believe that we are far from exhausting the voluntary methods of military manpower recruitment—that, in some areas, we have not even begun to exploit these methods.

I believe that all too often those who today are urging optional recruitment under threat of compulsion have in mind that this is a step to their goal of outright reliance upon compulsion, and that they are accepting and urging it only on this basis.

And I believe that the methods of compulsion are a deceptively simple and lazy way of dealing with problems—a method which is no cure-all to the problems and which can enervate and destroy the freedom, initiative and creativeness which is the secret of America's greatness.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to register my objections to this bill and state that I intend to vote to recommit it.

I think it is rather difficult to discuss comprehensive legislation of this nature in 5 minutes, but maybe I can point out my objections by referring to a paragraph in the committee's report on page 10. It is the sixth paragraph down. I am going to read it:

> In the development of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, it was anticipated that the Ready Reserve would become a well organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that men with a statutory obligation in the Ready Reserve would participate in voluntary training in order to establish eligibility for transfer to the less vulnerable Standby Reserve. Such has not been the case; this incentive provision alone has not produced the desired result.

Of course, an incentive provision alone cannot produce the desired results, if those in charge of trying to make it work are not sincerely going about making it work. I submit that the present bill is no more than the previous one. It is again an incentive provision, and I happen to agree with the statement that this is not a UMT bill. In my judgment, it is not. It is not compulsory. It is the same type of thing, however, of providing an incentive. I recognize it as a very serious charge when I say that the Pentagon has not tried to make this previous system work. However, you can judge it this way. I am speaking mainly of the United States Army because the Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps are not particularly interested in this. It is mainly the Army's portion and the enlisted men's Reserve that has not been functioning and has not been working. Those who are in charge of the Reserve program in St. Louis, Mo., said that they never had a field rank officer of the Regular Army come down there one time to try to find out what their difficulties were in making the Reserve program function. That same kind of information comes from all over the country. Of course, if the top ranking men in the Army are not going to pay attention to these things, it cannot work because incentive alone will not do the job.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill is intended to carry out the terms of the reserve act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. It will implement it and assist the Pentagon and others in charge in making it work as it should work.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman, but in my judgment I have not noticed in the hearings any indication or explanation from the standpoint of the high-ranking men in the Pentagon of why this system did not work and what they had been doing to make it work.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I would like to note that I absolutely know that as far as the present people are concerned, every effort will be made to make this reserve program work. I would like to point out this other distinction, too, which occurs to me as I listen to the gentleman, as I always do with interest and understanding. The Reserves, as we have known them heretofore, have been made up of boys who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. To my mind, we are undertaking by this bill to create an entirely different group who come into the Reserve to be essentially the Reserve of the country. They come in voluntarily and get 6 months' training and not 2 or 3 or 4 years. Then they are under compulsion to participate in the required activities of their Reserve unit. So it seems to me we have here a much better prospect for an active, functioning ready and alert Reserve than we have ever had heretofore.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I point out to the gentleman there are many other aspects of this bill, and for other reasons I am afraid this program, as has already been pointed out in the judgment of some, is going to make it a great deal worse rather than better. I was pointing to the key of the situation, and the key is this: Until the military establishment comes before the Committee on Armed Services and explains in detail why a particular program which has been made law has not worked and what they have been doing to make it work, we are going to get nowhere. We can legislate again next year, and I expect they will be in here next year saying, "Well, we told you this would not work and it has not." And there we will go again. I think we have to dig into these things a little bit more to find out what we are trying to do.

The basic question I raised back in 1951 during the debate on the original Vinson UMT bill still remains unanswered. You talk of training, and throughout the committee's report on this bill there is reference to training, but nowhere is there attention paid to what we mean by training. The word training to have significance must reveal what we are training for.

Now I ask just what are the skills the United States Army needs in order to

be able to fight a modern war. Are they just combat skills as the term military training suggests? The answer, of course, is that they are by no means just combat skills. As a matter of fact any cursory study of the matter reveals that over half, and I estimate as high as 80 percent, of the skills used by the military establishment in World War II and needed today to fight a modern war are skills which have their counterpart in our civilian economy. There is nothing military about operating a bulldozer, repairing a truck, running a typewriter, keeping track of stock or painting a building.

I have quoted General Hershey's statement several times before to illustrate the Pentagon point of view. He said in effect the civilian skills are largely of no value to the Military Establishment, in fact they are somewhat detrimental because the military has to untrain them and then retrain them. Now this statement may be largely true when applied to combat skills and if combat skills were what the military needed his statement would have some meaning. But his statement I suggest is only 20 percent true. It is 80 percent untrue, and applied to the 80 percent civilian type skills the military may have need for it is terribly in error.

The Reserve program is based upon training, but the training is largely for civilian type skills for which the Military Establishment has no need to concern itself about other than to make certain that these skills exist in sufficient quantity in the civilian society so that they will be available to the military at such time as they might need them. That is the very essence of a real Reserve program.

Unfortunately, the statement quoted from the President's message to the Congress on January 13, 1955—page 5 of the committee report: "In the same period, exhaustive studies have been made on manpower—the key to proper military posture," cannot be substantiated. Far from exhaustive studies being made on the subject we are just beginning to make these studies and the Military Establishment has done little along these lines. What studies there are have been made in the past 2 or 3 years by the National Manpower Council working at Columbia University with the human resources project study. The preliminary studies published by the National Manpower Council and the Columbia study group all state one basic thing, the studies are just beginning to get into the meat of the matter.

Now until we get down to brass tacks and start treating this entire matter with the respect it deserves we are going to continue to get nowhere fast. There is no sense in the Military Establishment setting up a complete duplicate vocational educational system within the military departments. Instead they should avail themselves of the present very fine vocational education system with its schools, classrooms, teachers presently available. The cost of training a bulldozer operator through the civilian means is one-tenth the cost of the military doing it and you end up with a better bulldozer operator through the less costly system to boot.

Again I say until we do a job analysis of the skills the military needs we will get nowhere. It is time we stopped this talk of military training and asked ourselves just how many of the men in uniform will be expected to have combat skills and direct our military training to this group.

Nor will I buy this talk that all men need some combat training. This is a generality that cannot be backed up by any realistic look at the matter of modern warfare.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee, I must disagree with my chairman [Mr. BROOKS] in one statement that he made, that this is an administration bill. I have had a number of Members ask me why I opposed this bill. I did fight all the way through the 8 weeks' hearings against the administration bill that was supported by the Defense Department as originally submitted. We had under consideration in committee the original bill that placed compulsion on approximately 100,000 of these boys, with 10 years' Reserve service, not 8. And in that bill they could have given a discharge other than honorable, to prior servicemen who had served this country faithfully for 2 years or 4 years, but who did not actively participate to the satisfaction of the military in the Reserve organization. No Member of this House would oppose that bill stronger than I.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is not a bill that was sent to us. The gentleman will say that the bill had the support of the Defense Department, the White House, the President, and all of the patriotic organizations, and many others.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Exactly so. What I want to call attention to is this: If you read the 2,300 pages of testimony that we had in the subcommittee, you do not even get testimony for or against the bill which is before you today. Most of those witnesses testified for the original bill or against the original bill. I believe we have cut out the features which were objectionable to most of the witnesses on the original bill. For fear that we might have a bill that I could not support, I offered H. R. 4848 as a plan that I thought would be better than this, but if this bill were amended to 4 months' training, and the total 8-year obligation reduced to 5 years and the compulsory feature of 45 days for prior servicemen deleted, it would largely do what my bill offered to do. Therefore, I am supporting this bill.

In the full committee I offered a motion to cut out the 45-day compulsion against prior servicemen, but that motion was defeated. But let me say this about compulsion in this bill, it is nothing like as severe as the penalty against prior servicemen under the present law. In brief, the opposition I find to this bill, most people believe it is UMT, or that we on the Committee on Armed Services have endorsed the Pentagon bill. The fight was rather close in the subcommittee. Those of us who did not agree with these unreasonable requirements won most of the decisions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement, because as a matter of fact this bill was really a bill written by a discussion among the members of the subcommittee themselves. One of the things that the gentleman who is now addressing the committee urged, especially my friend from Mississippi, was that we should take out the compulsion, and not compel any man to serve who had served in the Armed Forces and had an honorable discharge. We discussed many of the features pro and con, and I think we have as workable a bill as you can get, with the diverse opinion that is obtained with this type legislation.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think Mr. Burgess did a great job to the various Departments of Defense to even agree on the general objective. I never heard as much testimony in my life that agreed on a general objective. But very few agencies or individuals agreed on methods of obtaining these objectives. No doubt every Member of this House believes it is necessary that we build a stronger Reserve than we now have. I could spend my entire time condemning and criticizing the Military Establishment myself, because I do not believe they have done all they could in order to build a Reserve. But that is not the question. Where do we stand today? We stand with a paper Reserve, regardless of what they tell you. If it had not been for World War II and the Korean war and the experience our men have had, we would have had practically no Reserve except a paper Reserve. I am convinced it is essential to strengthen the Reserve.

Now, what does this bill do? It imposes nothing more exacting than is already imposed, but it does grant additional opportunities for young men to volunteer in Reserve organizations, and fulfill their military obligations through a new type of program, strictly upon a volunteer basis.

Let me say that I supported UMT; I would support it today, but you cannot pass it. I say, however, to you who have opposed UMT that you would be far better off today if you took the American Legion plan, which is a UMT bill, than you would to put compulsion in the bill as it came from the Pentagon.

But I want to assure you again today that there is not a UMT and I cannot see, to save my soul, how a man can oppose this bill since it is amended to make a more workable solution for building our Reserves. As I said, it takes nothing away from anyone, it imposes little hardship upon anyone, and the military tell us they need 100,000 of the 6-month trainees each year for the next 4 years.

Our manpower pool, according to General Hershey, is close to 1,500,000 men subject to 1-A classification. We will

have approximately a million men coming into the 1-A group each year for the next 4 years. I am concerned about this, and I followed this point all the way through the hearings with practically every witness that we had: I could not quite subscribe to letting a man come in voluntarily for 6 months, and another man be forced in by the draft for 2 years. That is not good, but as the law now stands and under present conditions every young man faces the draft for 2 years and that alone adds nothing to the effectiveness of our Active Reserve strength.

If we get involved in a global war a strong Reserve is absolutely essential. If we stay out of war we must have a strong Ready Reserve force, established to protect us and give us the security we need. In my opinion without a strong Reserve we cannot have security. As to whether or not they will make it work I do not know. This is a task for the Army. The Air Force does not expect to use it. The Navy tells us they do not expect to use it. The Marine Corps testified they would accept 1,000 of the 100,000. But this bill provides that each branch of the service, should they fall short of what they now plan to do, may use this bill.

Let me say another thing, that in the case of the National Guard, under a similar program, approximately 30,000 men a year volunteered into the regular service from the National Guard. If you will make this attractive and permit these young men to go into this training program for 6 months, and the military will use any commonsense at all, this can and will be an effective program. If they would go to these youngsters who have had the training, give them a pat on the back, and say, "Young man, you show ability, but over in our Reserve service we will give you additional training," they would create an attractive atmosphere. I contend that a little commonsense from military leaders with the legislation we now have, and even without the provisions of this bill, we could go very far toward establishing a good Reserve organization.

So I shall support the bill even though it does not comply with my full desires or my opinion as to the best way to do it. I am sure this is the opinion of the men who have studied the military program and the Reserve program as I have for 12 years—and some of our committee members much longer. We must do something to build a Reserve that we do not have but that we must have.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman said that in the existing law the penalties are greater than they are in this bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Under the present law they are subject to trial in Federal court with a penalty, upon conviction, of 5 years imprisonment or $10,000 fine, or both.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does not the gentleman think that although the penalty in the present bill is somewhat lesser that it is equally obnoxious?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I offered an amendment to strike this compulsion out, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. On this question of whether or not you can issue an order that can be carried out—under the provisions of this bill of course we allow them screening and a certain flexibility of the Ready Reserves, but they have obligations, they can give an order and carry it out.

Under the present law, with the screening out that is involved, you would have every Tom, Dick, and Harry who got out of the military service subject to be called into the Regular service.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is right.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The Defense Department realizes that and that is one of the reasons they could not go for it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. This is much more practical than the penalties you now have.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In mentioning the groups that intend to use the bill, the gentleman overlooked the Coast Guard.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes; the Coast Guard. They are anxious for the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They want 2,000 the first year. I want to say in reference to the Army and the Navy and the Air Force that we put in provision for enlistment into the Reserve, to be followed by 2 years' active duty and training in the active establishment, especially for the Navy and the Air Force. They need that very badly.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The Navy can continue with the same Reserve program they have, even if we pass this bill, and they have done a good job. I think the Air Force will fall flat on what they claim they will do. The Air National Guard is the strongest arm the Air Reserve has. Now they do not want anybody except men who have had 4 years of service. The Air Force may have none but commissioned officers and master sergeants. They have agreed and this bill provides that they must use these trainees if they cannot meet their quotas under their plan. We give them a chance to try it. In other words they can do about what they want to do. This bill provides the machinery for each of them for reserves. Frankly, I think I will offer an amendment to this bill, or suggest to the chairman of the committee that he appoint a subcommittee with an adequate staff that will follow this from day to day and see that they try to make this bill work.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman that we cannot build the security of the future on the mistakes of yesterday. I would like to have the gentleman's reaction to see if he may not agree with me, that the Pentagon is so afraid and ashamed of what they have done in its massacre of the Reserve system that they will use every possible means to make this thing work successfully.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think some of them will, but I cannot say that for all of them. I hope they will.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman tell me why the provision for a National Security Training Commission has been limited?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I may say that provision, if I remember correctly, was stricken from the bill. It has no actual connection or reference to any part of this bill. So, to clarify the situation, on the subject of UMT, it was deleted.

Mr. DEVEREUX. May I answer the question? We are charging the Defense Department with the training of these men and, therefore, we do not want to have split authority or have a civilian commission, which it is, going into the various phases in which they are not qualified.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would not the gentleman say that Admiral Kinkaid, a former commander of the American Legion, and Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, as members of this Commission are qualified to comment?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I would say those particular ones are, but you would have others. Then you would have to build this up.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is 4 out of 5 who are qualified.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Only three.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Julius Ochs Adler is another well-known Reserve officer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is arguing for a split authority, two lines of authority, for the Army personnel. I do not think we have great reason for setting up a commissar system in our military composed of civilians. My distinguished colleague from California has mentioned and referred to certain men who are able, but they will not be here all the time. It would set up a commissar system.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would just like to conclude by saying this, that I did not have my way totally, but I had quite a little say, and I and those who shared my opinion in the subcommittee got considerable consideration. Let me repeat, there is no UMT here. This bill was not drawn by the Pentagon. It can do no harm to anyone. It imposes no hardship upon anybody. It gives additional opportunities to young men of this country if it is to their advantage, as long as the quota will permit, to volunteer their services in a Reserve component, train 6 months, return to their homes as students, attending their schools and churches, and engage in their active participation in a Reserve unit. I can personally see no reason to oppose that type of legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will go through with his idea of setting up some kind of commission check on our Reserve program. The

gentleman has studied the Reserve program for 12 years, and he well knows the reason we did not have any Reserve: First, because the people running the Reserve did not want a Reserve. They could have a Reserve today without this bill before us. The gentleman from Maryland says that we have heard criticism of the military today. I doubt whether there is anybody who has greater admiration for our military than I, but no one is more critical of them than I so far as our Reserve is concerned.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman from Texas, whom I consider one of the most solid Members of this House. I appreciate the comments of one with such an outstanding war record. I do not believe there is too much difference in the way we feel about the need for a Reserve program and the best way to accomplish this. The gentleman has himself submitted a bill on this subject, which is indicative of sound thinking on his part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have ever opposed a bill reported out of a committee of which I was a member. I do find it necessary to oppose this bill.

In this debate much has been said as to the dangerous world conditions. No one denies that. Much has been said as to the need of a strong Reserve. No one denies that.

Now, as for the need for a strong national defense, every Member of this body is for a strong defense. Every person here is for a strong, capable Reserve. The exact number needed in our Reserve is a matter of opinion, but every one of us here is interested in having a defense that can adequately take care of the needs of the United States. So, I am not going to take up your time repeating facts to which we all agree. I am, however, going to try to explain to you in the brief time allotted to me how this bill, instead of helping provide for a Reserve, will absolutely defeat the chance of providing a satisfactory Reserve.

First, what does this bill do? Of course, in the bill we have the usual platitudes about the intent of the bill. That is always said in favor of any bill. Second, we provide for creating a home guard in case the National Guard is called into active duty, which is really no part of this bill. The Committee on Armed Services could report out a bill to provide for a home guard at any time.

So, what is this bill? First, the Navy says they cannot use it. The Air Force says they cannot use it. Today, without this bill, any man between the ages of 17 and 18½, physically qualified, can enlist in a branch of the Reserves. I am going to specifically mention the National Guard, because the National Guard today is decidedly the strongest branch of our organized Reserves, and I believe the real reason for that is because the States have something to do with the National Guard. I think if the National Guard were exposed entirely to the Pentagon without the help of the individual States they would be in the same position as the organized Reserves. Today, the young man between the age of 17 and 18½ can enlist in the National Guard, and if the draft bill this body passed the other day becomes law, at the age of 26, his military obligation will be fulfilled. The National Guard has been able to meet every quota ever assigned to it and is doing so today. But if this bill becomes law, that man has got to take 6 months' training before he can even be a member of the National Guard or any other organized Reserve unit. It becomes far more difficult than it now is to become a member of an organized Reserve unit. Some of us have tried to get the compulsory time in this cut down to 4 months or 3 months, but the Pentagon was adamant in their stand that we must have 6 months. I do not know whether the Pentagon deliberately wanted to make it more difficult to build up a Reserve. It is difficult for me to understand why the Pentagon wants more training before a person can enlist in a Reserve unit than they have for a person entering the regular service.

Today a soldier entering the Regular service is given 8 weeks' basic training and 8 weeks' secondary training. Four months in all. That is what it takes today to train a man to go into a Regular unit. It only takes 4 months and yet they demand 6 months before a man can even commence training in a Reserve unit. This will destroy the organized Reserve.

During World War II basic training at times was fixed at 13 weeks.

I am and always have been for a strong Reserve. The first time I took military training was at the age of 18 years and I have been active in the Reserve from that date to this. I want to repeat this for the record: If we pass this bill and it becomes law, a year from the day it becomes law we will have less members in the National Guard than we will have when the law becomes operative. Is that the way to build up the Reserves to 3 million?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman knows that there is a provision in the bill to guarantee the full strength of the National Guard. We have pledged to guarantee the National Guard full strength.

Mr. BRAY. That is just the same as if I were to make a pledge to pay a million dollars. I have not got it; neither will the Pentagon be able to provide the men. Where are they going to get the men? Sure, they make a pledge to take care of the guard. They will do anything to get this bill through. Furthermore, the only person who is going to be forced into this program is the veteran who has already had 2, 3, or 4 years of service. It has been mentioned in this debate that the American Legion favors this bill. Perhaps they do believe that this bill may be a step in the right direction. However, a careful study of the American Legion bill and this bill will show that there is a slight similarity. The American Legion—and for that matter other veterans' organizations—want a Reserve program that will protect the veteran from again being called into service. Under this program the only person who is forced into a Reserve program is the veteran who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years. I am a strong supporter of the American Legion and I am active in its work, and I am certain we can get a better bill than this one.

I wish to read what Mr. Seaborn P. Collins, commander of the American Legion, said in the hearings on this bill, which statement is found on page 1987:

> The one big roadblock to an effective Reserve is the absence of a training program that would feed into Reserve units qualified replacements for the veterans of active military service.
>
> The present system requires that a few men carry the whole burden of national defense. It selects 1 man out of 4 for 2 or more years of active service, then obligates him to further training in the Reserves while requiring neither service nor training of the other 3.
>
> The unfairness of this double-duty requirement was dramatically demonstrated during the war in Korea. More than 800,000 World War II veterans were called back to active duty to fight that war. Two and a half million men, who had reached military age after VJ-Day and had not trained or served a single day in the uniform of their country, were left at home.

This bill is absolutely against what Commander Collins wanted. This is the situation you are going to have under this bill. The man who has already served 2, or 3, or 4 years is the only man who will be forced to take this program. They say that he will not be forced, that there will be no court-martial. I asked at the hearing what they will do with that man if he does not take the weekly training that they tell him to and they said, "Well, we will work out a program so that he can go for 30 days of summer training."

I asked, "If he does not go for 30 days of summer training, what then?"

They said, "Well, we will give him military orders for 45 days."

I said, "If he does not go, then what?"

"He will be tried under the Uniform Code of Military Justice."

That means a general court-martial and the penalty is whatever a court may direct. And then you say that you are not forcing that veteran of 2, or 3, or 4 years of service to take this training. If that is not compulsion, what is it? He is the only man who is forced into this deal, the veteran of 2, or 3, or 4 years.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that those people have enlisted voluntarily and assumed that obligation; and if they have assumed that obligation, why should they not be required to carry out their obligation.

Mr. BRAY. Just one moment; the gentleman misunderstands me. I was not saying that at all. The man who takes the 6 months' training and then later does not carry out his obligation certainly should be forced to do so. I am talking about the man who is drafted

today, who is serving his 2 years but who, when he gets out, is going to be forced into this. You say that by present law he is forced to do this. Perhaps that is true. But the military has never tried to enforce that. I do not know why, but perhaps they want us to restate that power, give them that power again. But they say they already have it. Maybe they failed to use it, the same way they have never tried to build up a Reserve.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] said, some members of the Department of Defenses have tried to make the Reserve program effective; I will admit that and they certainly deserve our praise. But I will say that this work has been futile, because others sabotaged their work.

I believe the National Guard is strong because the National Guard, as I see it, is assisted by the State and there is a certain State pride there. Any of the Members who have been officers in the service know this, you can make good soldiers out of persons who may not want to be soldiers, but when they take them and put them in a camp and keep them there 24 hours a day, 30 days a month, 12 months a year, they can make soldiers out of them. But a Reserve who you only have for training a couple of hours a day presents a different situation. However, by this bill you propose to force this man who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years to drill weekly or otherwise train. He is the only one forced to take this training. As for new enlistees you are making it far more difficult for him to get into a Reserve unit. He must train for 6 months before he can even be a member of a Reserve unit.

As for this man of 2, 3, or 4 years' service that you are forcing to train, you only have him 2 hours a week, everybody else having 6 days and 22 hours a week of his time. You know what that man is going to do. He will discourage and cause discontent among the new enlistees who are interested and want to make good. It will demoralize the entire program.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that in the National Guard if a man does not participate he is subject to compulsion by the State law?

Mr. BRAY. Certainly, and he should be. He has enlisted in that Guard and he should carry out the obligations of the Guard. I do not want any milktoast type in the Guard or the Army. In the tanks we expected men to keep their obligation and I know the Marines did, too.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman said the Air Force and Navy were not going to use this bill if it did become law.

Mr. BRAY. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. It was practically all for the Army?

Mr. BRAY. Practically all.

Mr. AYRES. What would be the effect if we changed the present law and permitted a man to serve only 2 years in the Army, and still be subject to the rules that exist under present law?

Mr. BRAY. I do not quite know what the situation would be there. I am not trying to say that the National Guard or the Reserve is trained as good as it should be. I have never seen the unit yet that has been trained as good as it should be. Much can be accomplished in 3 months' training, which is more than you had in the replacement training centers getting men ready to go into a unit that was to go into battle. Three months is all they had. Three months' training would take only one summer between the junior and senior years of high school, or the year after they got out of high school. Our American youth is our greatest asset. We should do all to help him in life instead of retarding him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recognize the gentleman is a very good student of military problems and has a tremendous war record, but regarding the 6-month period, it seems that General Walsh, who talks for the National Guard of the United States, said that was entirely satisfactory to the Guard.

Mr. BRAY. I want to repeat exactly what General Walsh said. He said, as I recall, they would prefer 4 months. I had many conversations with General Walsh on this matter, because I am deeply interested in having a strong Reserve. I believe if this bill is defeated we can go back and pass a bill to help get a good Reserve, instead of injuring the Reserve.

As to this 6-month training in the bill you are not training a man to be a finished soldier, you are merely training him to enter into a Reserve organization and continue his training. I have even seen some pretty creditable soldiers turned out in 1 month of training. The 3 months of training would not wreck anyone's life. I am not saying we have a perfect Reserve. We can improve it a good deal. That is what I want to do. But I do not want legislation that will prevent the Guard from reaching its quota. I am just as interested in the other branches of the Reserves as I am of the National Guard. The members of the Organized Reserve are just as capable as are the members of the Guard. The difference is that one of them has the State backing. The guard has done a good job, and the other units of the Organized Reserve would do a good job. I want to see them have the same rights as the guard has.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. When this program was first presented to some of us I wondered particularly about the equality of obligation that would be involved in this Reserve service. In other words, it has always been my idea that if we have some sort of training Reserve program along with Selective Service there should not be too much discrimination against the man who comes in for the 2, 3, or 4 years. Does the gentleman feel that if you further reduce the time that the man coming into the service must serve and otherwise lessen the obligations that now exist against him, he would still have that equality of obligation that I think we certainly would all want in these troublesome times when we have to do so many things we do not like to do?

Mr. BRAY. Are you aware that at the present time a person can enlist in the National Guard at 18 years of age and he will not be called into service unless his unit is called out? That is the law today. This bill does not provide anything that we do not have today except that you are making the man serve 6 months' time before he can even be a member of the National Guard, which he would be able to do today without that training. Few people are aware that that is the law today, and has been for a long time.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sure the gentleman, from his experience in the military service, will recognize the fact that a man who goes into the National Guard, as he does today, without any prior basic training, is not a good man and that does interfere with the National Guard program. That is one reason why when the National Guard is called to active duty, they have to go through this great amount of training.

Mr. BRAY. I am very familiar with that situation. I was not in the Guard before the war, but I did take command of a unit of the National Guard just before World War II started. I am not trying to say that their training is perfect, but I am trying to say that the same training that you gave a basic before he entered the unit, ready for combat in World War II, certainly should be sufficient training to put a man into a unit of the National Guard or the Organized Reserve.

Mr. BROWNSON. I am curious about this matter. On page 16 of the report, we find the statement that during the entire period of more than 2 years that the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 has been in effect, the Ready Reserve has exceeded the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000, and it gives us the Ready Reserve as 2,500,000 at the present time. If this Ready Reserve has constantly exceeded its statutory ceiling—is the problem getting more Reserves in at the bottom or doing something to train the Reserves in the program now?

Mr. BRAY. At the present time the name Ready Reserve means nothing. What we would like to do is to make the Ready Reserve mean something. If you pass this law, you will be passing a bill that will deter people from enlisting in it. I have talked to, I believe, 12 battery and company commanders of the National Guard and asked them what their enlistments would be if the enlistees were forced to have a 6 months' training period before they could enlist. Every one of them, without exception, said it would absolutely ruin enlistments in the Guard.

In conclusion, I would like to state that the issue in this bill is not whether we

want a capable Reserve of sufficient strength. All of us desire that. The question is whether this bill before the House gives us a capable Reserve such as we desire. I have tried to point out that instead of bringing new youth into the Reserve, that this bill will discourage enlistments in the Reserve, for while today they can enlist without prior military training, if this bill becomes law, the youth who desire to enter the Guard or any other Reserve unit, must first complete 6 month's military training, which is far more than the Army has at the present time, or ever has had, in preliminary training before entering a regular unit. This 6 month's service which is required before a person can enter a Reserve unit, cannot help but deter enlistments. The National Guard has met every quota assigned to it, but will not be able to do so if this bill becomes law.

If the youth are to be deterred from entering the Reserve units, where will we obtain the strong Reserve that the proponents of this bill say we need? The only source from which we can obtain these reservists is from those who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. This is unfair and against the general desire of the American people. It places an undue hardship upon these ex-servicemen, and it is extremely doubtful that these involuntary veterans will be of any value to the Reserve program. On the contrary, they may be injurious to such a program.

As I stated earlier, I expect the proponents of this bill, if it becomes a law, to return to us next year, or the one after, stating that this bill has failed to get a Reserve. I certainly believe it will fail, and that they will ask Congress to give them more and greater control over the youth of America. No one wants a strong America more than I, but I believe that all the strength of America is not in battleships, bombers, tanks and rifles. The greatest strength in America is in the hearts and souls of a free people, and their great spiritual and economic strength, and anything that tends to destroy the freedom and dignity of man and replaces it with regimentation, destroys the real strength of America. In providing an adequate defense we must never create a Frankenstein of regimentation and militarism which will destroy us. We can have a strong defense in America without resorting to this.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In this letter, which we received from the Republican whip this morning, in paragraph 3, he says:

> Universal military training is intended to mean what it says—universal; that is, to take all young men at the age of 18 and so on.

And then he says:

> This bill imposes a ceiling of 250,000.

Is it true that all of these young Americans who are physically and mentally qualified, and who do not belong to that 250,000, can be exempt?

Mr. BRAY. I do not care to comment on the whip's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H. R. 5297 because I believe it to be a step in the right direction, even though that step is a somewhat timid one. The fact is that we must do something, however small, to strengthen our Reserves to remedy its greatest weakness—the absence of trained enlisted personnel. Here are some of the facts of the issues. Russian communism wants the world. She will stop at nothing to gain the prize. Our Nation is the only nation strong enough to stop her.

The only issue here today is, How can we remain militarily strong without spending ourselves into economic collapse? One aspect of this problem may be simply stated: How do we build strong Reserves and how do we do it quickly without delay? What can we learn from our mistakes of the past?

Between World War II and Korea about 4½ million young men came of military age. About 1,100,000 saw service through being inducted or enlisted. Nearly 3½ million did not. Some of these, about 900,000, would have been 4–F under present standards. The balance were fit in every way for military service and yet were required neither to train nor to serve. So when Korea came and we had to mobilize rapidly, we had no source of trained manpower to tap—no men who could be used quickly except the veterans of World War II who still had a Reserve obligation even though it was not realized by a great many of them.

About 975,000 Reserves were recalled for Korea—over two-thirds of them being recalled in the first year. Between 600,000 and 700,000 of these, or about 70 percent, were veterans of World War II. A recent report by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee on the status of the Reserve indicates that probably more than half of all these recalled reservists were inactive reservists in a nonpay status. These veteran reservists when they were recalled to duty were fathers, essential workers, scientists, technicians, college students, farmers, apprentices, and just plain men earning a living. They were recalled to service regardless of any of the above situations which would have deferred them from initial induction while men younger than they who had never served their country before and who were fathers, essential workers, scientists, technicians, college students, farmers, apprentices, were either exempted or deferred from induction for service on the identical basis.

By the end of the first year of the Korean war, over 700,000 reservists were on active duty. They constituted about 22 percent of our Armed Forces. Five hundred and twenty thousand or 15 percent of the Armed Forces were World War II veterans. More reservists were called during the first year of the Korean war than we inducted through the Selective Service System. The Korean war began in June of 1950. By the end of September, about 250,000 reservists had been recalled.

Contrast this with the draft. In July no one was inducted. In August about 1,500 were inducted. In September 50,000 were inducted. In the months following September, the rate leveled off to about 50,000 but these men could not be used for at least 4 months after their induction. This was through no fault of the Selective Service System. They could have drafted many more but the untrained men must be trained before they can fight. The 1,500 inducted in August could not possibly have seen action in Korea before February of 1951—7 to 8 months after the war began.

The first and most horrible year of the Korean war was fought by Regulars but were brought up to strength by the veteran reservists—some of whom were in Korea in a matter of weeks after their recall. Where do we stand today? In almost exactly the same position we were in before Korea.

While we had at the beginning of this fiscal year over 2½ million in the Reserve, approximately 2,250,000 of them being in a so-called Ready Reserve status, more than 78 percent of this Reserve is composed of veterans of World War II, Korea, or both. The percent of veterans in the Reserve grows daily as more and more men who served in Korea conclude their tours of service and move into Ready Reserve status for 6 more years. Of these over 2½ million reservists, only about 750,000 are in a drill-pay status.

The requirements of the National Reserve plan are 2,950,000. It should be pointed out that the veteran Reserves of this figure are largely those who enlisted or were inducted for the Korean emergency and thus were given by the Congress an overall 8-year service Reserve obligation. Of the reservists who are active today, the great bulk are nonveterans and inadequately trained to be truly ready. The Army and Air National Guard permit nonveterans to enlist in their units and a large portion of their strength is in this group. The National Guard does an excellent job but as they themselves assert would be much better with pretrained personnel. The Navy, Marine Corps, and just recently the Air Force permit nonveterans to enlist in the Reserve provided they agree to be active in units with the provision they may enlist in that particular service in the event they receive a draft call.

The result is that about half the active ready reservists are nonveterans who have received no basic pretraining and receive in their Reserve units only 150 to 200 hours per year. The remaining numbers are veterans—the largest number of them being officers and noncommissioned officers. Therefore, the active enlisted Reserves are almost totally nonveterans and trained only briefly.

Ever since the end of World War II it has been the same old Reserve story. First, there was no organized input of trained enlisted men into the Reserves. The only trained men entering the Active Reserves were officers and noncom-

missioned officers who had served their country in wartime. There were few enlisted men for these officers to command except in the National Guard. In the National Guard, what enlisted men there were, were largely untrained so that these reservists were faced with the dismal routine of giving basic training over and over to the enlisted recruits. Thus, there was little real incentive for veterans to join the Reserve facing endless meetings of giving basic training over and over.

The second cause of the weak Reserve, and to me the most important one, has been that those in military authority have taken little or no interest in the problems of the Reserves. This has been true throughout most of our history. I received my Reserve commission back in 1933 and kept my Reserve commission and kept up my Reserve work—not because of any encouragement or any help from the Regular service but in spite of them.

Problems concerning the Reserve have always been shunted to the bottom of the pile of things to do on the desks of our military leaders. Too few of our military men who have been charged with our Reserve affairs have actually cared whether or not we build a Reserve. Some have actually tried to keep us from doing it. Too many of our civilian Secretaries charged with the Reserve responsibility have either devoted their time to other matters or have been ineffective spokesmen for the revervists. I believe that it can be proven that the Regular services have over and over attempted to prevent our having a strong Reserve. It makes little difference what kind of a law we pass here in Congress unless the people handling this program want it to work, it will not work.

We have a Reserve Forces Policy Board which was created by this Congress to advise the Secretary of Defense on Reserve affairs. It would be interesting to know whether or not the Secretary of Defense has ever accepted a recommendation of this Board. From what I can find out, they have too often been considered as an advisory board whose advice was not wanted. Being adviser to the Secretary of Defense they have no real independence. Too often their views have been filtered of all their substance by the military and civilian authorities which serve as a buffer between them and the Secretary. They were relegated to the back room in 1953–54 when Mr. John Hanna was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel and have been there nearly ever since.

One of the greatest rays of hope I have received along these lines has been the interest shown in the Reserve affairs by the new Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carter Burgess, because it does not matter what we legislate here it will be a failure unless men with initiative and imagination administer it vigorously. It is probably true that our Reserve would still be forgotten even now, we would have no bill before this Congress today, and the Department of Defense would never have initiated a study of the Reserves, if a wholly independent group acting independently at the direction of the President had not been directed to make a study of the Reserve affairs in 1953. This group was the National Security Training Commission who due to their independence were able to report directly to the President as a result of which he ordered the Department of Defense to take action to develop the National Reserve plan. This plan is actually very simple. It proposes to remedy the one weakness of the Reserve upon which the Congress had failed to legislate. It provides an avenue for supplying trained enlisted men into the Reserve. That is the core and the heart of this bill.

My only misgivings about it are that the bill fails to provide that in the event the yearly quotas of volunteers for this program are not met, induction shall not be used. This was requested by the President. The committee failed to grant it. It seems strange, indeed, to me that we should provide induction to meet the needs of the Regular military service and should be too timid to provide induction to meet the needs of the Reserve. We have certainly had no qualms about enlisting men for 2, 3, 4, and 5 years of service or inducting men for 2 years of service and placing all of them on an 8-year obligation whether or not they wanted it.

The trouble with the present system is that a great many of those who have seen service for 2 years or more do not care to be active in Reserve affairs so long as they know that so many hundreds of thousands of others have done nothing and are being required to do nothing. One reason we have no well-trained enlisted men in our Reserve is because a man who has seen 2 years of service if he is any good is a corporal or sergeant after his 2 years' service. If he is still a private or private first class he should not be in the Reserve anyway.

The Air Force and the Navy apparently desire Reserves composed entirely of officers and noncommissioned officers, with no enlisted men, that is, if they actually desire Reserve at all, which I doubt. This is the same problem which I talked about earlier in saying that this program must have sympathetic administration once it is passed. This bill seeks to remedy one of the glaring inequities of the Korean recall of Reserves. It permits combat veterans and others who have seen prior service to be screened to the Standby Reserve. Then in the event of a national emergency declared by the Congress, Standby Reserves will be called to active duty only through the machinery of the Selective Service System. Many of the inequities of the Korean emergency will thus be avoided. In that emergency inactive reservists who would have been deferrable under Selective Service were called to active duty while younger nonveterans who were in the identical categories were either exempt or deferred from the draft.

Although it is not provided in this bill, I, for one, would like to receive an annual report from a wholly independent group regarding the progress of the entire Reserve program. I would like this group to be one whose first interest is in the Reserve forces and not the Regular establishment. I would like to see an independent group with authority to at least nudge the Armed Forces in the right direction in carrying out the intent of this bill and the Armed Forces Reserve Act. True, I think that the present Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel is interested in this, but he has many problems other than those relating to the Reserves. Reserve affairs are a full-time job for any man. Also, we should remember that unfortunately Mr. Carter Burgess will not always be in his present job. His predecessor, in my opinion, was no friend of the Reserve. The man who follows him might be of the same caliber.

Mr. Chairman, I hear it said that this is a UMT bill. It is extremely difficult for me to follow this logic. It is not UMT. In the first place, no induction of any kind or any type can be found anywhere in this bill. That bill on induction was voted on last February—the extension of the draft. At that time, with only four dissenting votes, this House voted to continue Selective Service for 4 more years. There were no cries of UMT at that time; yet, under the provisions of that bill we could conceivably induct every young man in the United States under the age of 26 for 2 years of service if necessary to meet our military requirements. There were no cries of UMT then. I am still not clear as to why it would not be just as logical in order to meet our military requirements for the Reserve forces to allow induction for the training program just as we do for the Regular services.

I would point out also that under this bill deferments continue as under the present system. UMT would allow no deferments. This bill limits the number of men going into the training program to 250,000 a year. UMT would include everybody.

This plan is designed to meet the military security requirements of the Reserve—not to train everyone for the sake of training. This bill is to expire in 4 years. UMT was conceived as permanent legislation.

Lastly, this program is so far from being universal that those who call it such should brush up on their arithmetic. Even if all possible avenues for fulfilling the military obligation are taken into account, the program is far from universal. We have over 1½ million men in class 1–A today. This does not include the 1 million men who became fathers during the Korean war who are exempt from military service under present regulations. We have between nine hundred thousand and a million physically fit men coming of age each year. Only about one-half of these are required for military service each year either through volunteering or being inducted. If the full quota of 250,000 men each year is enlisted into the military training program, hundreds and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of physically fit young men will not have seen service or training or reserve obligation by the time this bill expires in 1959.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation's security, fairness, in equity demand that we pass this bill. We should never let happen again in our country what happened

when all our World War II veterans were called back in for the Korean war. The postponement of this or any other measure for our defense cannot postpone the disaster to which unpreparedness may lead us. Many opponents of this measure say to us to let those who have served and fought once or twice go out and fight again when the next crisis arises. They say that no one really cares about the matter of equity and fairness in this program. The argument is raised that the Nation's security comes first and that equity can be forgotten.

No one can deny that the Nation's security comes first. But I most emphatically deny that the basic American principles of equity and fairness can be forgotten. If inequity and unfairness can be avoided at the same time we can serve the cause of national security, inequity and unfairness should be avoided. To say otherwise is doing cynical thinking which can endanger our very security itself, for inequity and unfairness lead to poor morale and the core of all security is the high morale of the men who serve.

If we take no action here, it means that in the future inequities will be heaped upon those who have already suffered much in the past. It means that we refuse to build a combat Ready Reserve composed of young men who have not seen prior service. Thus in the event of a future emergency, we must call back reserves who have seen service not only in Korea but perhaps in World War II as well. It means in effect that we are telling the veterans of this Nation that we desire to compound inequities on them rather than ask that some who have never served before, who might never serve in the future, take their fair share of the burden of defending this Nation's heritage of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for false optimism. A failure to pass this bill is to legislate unpreparedness for this country. If we lose our present struggle against communism, it will not be through any overwhelming strength from the part of the Soviet Union. It will be because we have failed to use the strength, the moral and the physical strength, which we possess.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we pass this bill and get on with building a strong Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say that the reservist is a needed individual in the defense scheme of our country. He is the best friend that the Department of Defense has because he will support any worthwhile legislation or any congressional budget within reason for the improvement of national defense. In peace he will give up his recreation and spare time to carry on his military training. In war he will liquidate his business and professional career to serve in the Armed Forces. He only asks for the right to train and serve in the highest capacity in which he is capable—to be recognized and treated as an equal part in the service of his country. A civilian soldier in peace or in war is a valuable part of our Nation's security forces.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

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

There was no objection.

NIKE

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the Army's Nike site at Lorton, Va., was on display for the Members of Congress. I was one of the few able to attend. This visit brought to my attention the importance and value of the role the Army has in preparing to defend our country against air attack and the magnitude of the task which is now being accomplished throughout the United States.

Since most of my colleagues were unable to attend, I feel it is my duty and privilege to briefly inform you of what I saw and heard yesterday afternoon at an operational Nike guided-missile site, which is ready and prepared on a few minutes' notice to defend our Nation's Capital against enemy bombers.

As we drove down Shirley Highway and on the winding roads near Lorton, I congratulated myself on having taken advantage of the opportunity to spend such a beautiful day in the outdoors. Suddenly we were at the control area of the Nike battery. It was a surprise to find that we were so close before I had noticed it. The long, low concrete-block buildings are painted light green, with a dark green trim, and blend so successfully with the spring landscape that it is very difficult to pick them out at a distance.

Since we do not have time this afternoon for a full description of all that took place, I will only touch upon what to me were the most important features.

The first of these is the fact that the Army is a highly important member of the team on which we rely for our protection against air attack. The Army, by means of Nike, the 90-millimeter and 120-millimeter guns, and Skysweeper, is providing defense for our most important cities and installations. The Nike defenses are constantly ready, day and night, week in and week out, to seek out and destroy enemy bombers while they are still many miles from the vital area being defended.

Because it is impossible to provide an antiaircraft defense for every city and installation worthy of protection, it is necessary to select the areas to be defended after due consideration of a number of factors. Among these factors are the following:

The population density.

The relative industrial importance.

Geographical location.

Availability of other means of air defense.

Availability of antiaircraft weapons and crews.

I am happy to report that mass production of Nike and the training program for the troops are progressing very satisfactorily.

The second highlight of the day was the construction at the battery. I mentioned before how the control area buildings blend in with the countryside. Let me assure you that the buildings now being provided our "frontline soldiers"—the antiaircraft batteries—are a far cry from the wartime emergency type of construction to which we all are accustomed. The concrete block type of building now being constructed for our antiaircraft personnel are attractive, comfortable, and economical. I can well understand why some communities have, in the past, objected to giving up land for the installation of an antiaircraft battery. The people were afraid that, based on the type of structure which was built during World War II and is still so prevalent at Army posts, the local battery would be an eyesore and seriously affect surrounding property values. Now that I have seen an example of the construction which is being put up throughout the country, I can assure you and your constituents that the Nike batteries will be a credit to any community.

Another phase of the construction that impressed me was the underground magazines. These massive structures, filled with deadly Nike missiles, are completely out of sight. By storing the missiles underground, the area required for one battery is reduced from nearly 150 acres to about 50 acres. Here the missiles wait until an enemy is detected, stored at under nearly optimum conditions and without danger to adjoining areas in the event of an explosion. As General Hendrix informed us yesterday:

> We want the people to feel and see that the Army is doing everything possible to maintain high standards; that the Nike site is not dangerous, but as safe as a gas station; as important to security and as much a part of the local community as the police and fire departments; and that the physical appearance of our sites will blend with the adjoining civilian areas.

A third highlight of the day was the Nike equipment. Anyone who has stood in the control area of a Nike battery, watching the three radars and associated equipment while the highly trained crew goes through the preengagement routine, cannot help but be impressed, not only with the complex equipment, but with the skill and efficiency of the men manning the equipment. To me, the real thrill so far as the equipment was concerned, came in the launching area. Here, when the long slender Nike's were erected on their launchers—impressing the viewer with both their beauty and lethal efficiency—I could really visualize the true effectiveness and value of this new and deadly antiaircraft weapon—the only known operational surface-to-air missile in the hands of troops.

We have been hearing for years about this missile system or that one. How effective each will be—when it is perfected. Yesterday I did more than hear about a missile—I saw it, ready to go into action now against any enemy which might attack us.

The last, and possibly most important, highlight of the day was the antiaircraft personnel. As I looked at the men manning the equipment, the battery and battalion officers, and the general commanding the defenses of this and other cities on the east coast, I felt that the

trust we and the people of this country have placed in them was well bestowed.

The men in a Nike battery must be highly trained in order to adequately maintain and operate their equipment. A Nike specialist who has gone through the long training courses at Fort Bliss is an electronic technician who can readily find a job in civilian industry. I am happy to state that I was assured that recent action by this Congress has improved substantially the economic status and morale of the soldiers, and that it is hoped that more of the specialist personnel will now remain in the Army.

From the young private, only a few months away from home, to the general, veteran of many years' service, I received the same impression—competence in his job, awareness of the importance of his mission, confidence in his weapons, and resolution to do his part to defend his country.

Gentlemen, in closing let me assure you that I wish everyone of you could have been with me yesterday. It is most heartening to turn for a moment from our daily task of deciding what should be done for the Nation's welfare to actually see what has been done as a result of our past actions. We, as well as the Army, should be proud of the Nike.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, no legislation will come before the Congress this session which deserves more thoughtful consideration than H. R. 5297, the so-called Reserve manpower bill.

My particular concern arises from the many letters received from people in my district expressing their views. These opinions come from citizens whose interest in the welfare and future of this Nation is paramount, and while the conclusions of those who wrote differ, the underlying and common desire of all is to avoid militarism and preserve our peaceful civilian mode of life.

We Members of the House recognize from our correspondence when the hearts and minds of constituents are speaking, as against organized self-interest pressure mail. I know of no mail on controversial legislation of recent years which originated from finer motives of freedom and patriotism. On the one hand, a fear was registered that this program is a step toward Prussianism; on the other, it is considered a step in the other direction.

Here is a case where we have the responsibility of digging out the facts and casting our vote, either for or against strengthening the Reserve military forces, on the basis of information available to us. Facts and not emotionalism should be the governing factor.

I hold here in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Socialist Labor Party entitled "Stomp UMT. It's a Step To War and Fascism." In its four closely printed pages there is not one reference to the provisions of this bill. There is no analysis or argument—just emotionalism saying "militarism will continue to flourish until the workers, enlightened and conscious of their potentially invincible might, consolidate their power in the Socialist Industrial Union, and shielded by their political organization, take over and run the industries of the Nation, for the common good." It sounds like substituting one kind of fascism for another to me. But if any Members have received anticonscription resolutions, it might be because of the suggestion of this Socialist Labor Party literature. I did not get any. The only thing sent me was the pamphlet with a strongly worded letter protesting its contents and distribution.

Now as to the Reserve manpower bill itself, to me it is a step toward disarmament and demilitarization. Certainly there must be great misunderstanding about it.

I can see the argument that a program which is set up on a voluntary basis can be changed to a compulsory plan, more easily than a new compulsory program can be established. However, it would seem to me opponents of militarism would favor a reduction in full military service for many, rather than continue the extent of the draft as it has been and complete disruption of civilian life for so many young men, interrupting their education and preventing the normal process of starting in on careers.

As has been pointed out under this law, a boy who is subject to the draft if he elects, and only if he so elects, may volunteer for the Reserves. If he volunteers, he is then obligated to a 6-month training period. When he completes this 6 months' training he is relieved from further training except in the event of a national emergency when all Reserves would be called. Meanwhile, he has an obligation to attend drills, either go to camp 2 weeks each year or to attend 48 drills a year. He stays in this reserve status for 7½ years. Under the draft law, if the boy preferred not to volunteer under the Reserve program, he would have 2 years in the service and then would be on reserve status for 6 more years. This law does not change the length of time the boy remains in the Reserves.

The only change is that young men who find it less disrupting to their lives and prefer it, have an opportunity to volunteer and take 6 months' training rather than being drafted for 2 years' service.

So, as I say, this legislation seems to me to be a step away from militarization, and it is most certainly not universal military training. What it is, as I view it, is a modification of Selective Service. I think there is a widespread lack of information on the bill as reported from the Committee on Armed Services and it is lack of understanding which has caused considerable misapprehension. The world is divided into two armed camps which is tragic and wrong, but as long as the Communists adhere to their objective of world conquest we must be prepared to defend ourselves and strength of potential trained manpower to resist aggression is our best hope of peace.

A study of the bill and a careful examination of the Armed Services report of the hearings on it convince me I am doing right to support this legislation.

This Nation will never be in danger of militarism as long as the congressional representatives of the people follow the recommendations of their consciences, and I, for one, am heeding mine in saying I am supporting this bill.

And in conclusion let me just add, since this is fundamental legislation and highly important as far as our future national policy is concerned, I am thankful partisan politics is not a consideration. I respect the opinions of members on both sides of the aisle who differ from my conclusions. This is not an issue on which one follows a leader, the President, the Secretary of Defense, or anyone else. Today, we follow our own thinking and as the Bible says, we must look to ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I can honestly say I have looked to myself in this respect and as such urge passage of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use my allotted time to discuss the bill before us in detail either critically or otherwise. I propose at this time to discuss an amendment, which I am going to offer to this bill. The amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 3, strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any male person 17 years of age or older who has not received notice to report for induction under this act, but who is enrolled in a full-time course of instruction at a high school, college, university, or similar institution, may, by filing a notice with the appropriate local draft board, elect to receive training and service, and serve in a Reserve component, under this paragraph in lieu of performing active duty for training and service in a Reserve component under any other provision of this act or any other law. No person less than 18 years of age may make such election unless he has the written consent of his parents or guardian. After such person has made such election, if he continues to attend such an institution, he shall, on or after the 1st day but before the 11th day of June in each of the next succeeding years in which he is physically able to serve on active duty for training, be ordered to active duty for training for a period of 91 consecutive days during each such year for not more than 4 summers. Such person and his dependents shall be entitled, with respect to all such periods of active duty for training, and necessary travel to and from such duty, to all the pay, allowances, and other benefits to which enlisted members of the uniformed services in pay grade E–1 (and their dependents) are entitled with respect to periods of active duty or authorized travel, as the case may be. If, before completing four annual periods of active duty for training under this paragraph, such person ceases to attend an educational institution under circumstances (other than by transfer or graduation) which indicate that his enrollment in such institution may reasonably be considered to have been voluntarily terminated, or if his enrollment is termined (other than by transfer or graduation), his election to receive training and service under this paragraph shall be deemed irrevocably canceled, and he shall thereafter be liable for induction for training and service under the remaining provisions of this act; however, full credit shall be given him toward completion of his required period of active duty for training and service, and service in a Reserve component, for all active duty for training performed by him under this paragraph (4).

Where such person graduates from an educational institution and enolls in another educational institution, or where he transfers from one educational institution to another educational institution, he shall not thereby become liable for induction for training and service under any other provision of this act if he otherwise meets all requirements of this paragraph (4). After such person has been ordered to active duty for training under this paragraph (4) during 4 years, he shall be placed in the Standby Reserves for 1 year. After he has been a member of the Standby Reserves for 1 year, such person shall be released from all liability for training and service under this act and any other law. If any such person is not permitted to serve on active duty for training under this paragraph (4) by reason of a disease or disability of a permanent nature which would afford a basis for deferring him from induction for training and service under this act, he shall thereafter be deferred from training and service under this act, unless he volunteers for induction for such training and service. This paragraph (4) shall not be operative in time of war or during any period of national emergency proclaimed by the Congress."

It has to do, in my opinion, with the preservation of one of the finest educational systems on earth.

I have been a member of the Committee on Education for over 20 years. Prior to that time I was interested in the field of education. I have thoroughly discussed the amendment mentioned with the 30 members of the Committee on Education. No formal action was asked because the matter was before another committee of the House. To me it is perfectly astounding that this, the Congress of the United States, should be assembled here discussing a bill affecting the future educational standards of this great Nation—the opportunity and privilege of boys going to school. I mean, discussing those things that not only affect, but control—and not one single word is said in behalf of the boys, or the future of their educational opportunities, and the military has not exhibited any interest in the field of education, with the exception of insisting, and they can, will, and should provide, such education as in their opinion the young men should have, but carefully avoid even mentioning our traditional methods or institutions. I looked at a television program this morning, in which the Armed Forces educational system was being advertised and promoted—the recruiting offices are full of pamphlets, programs, beautiful expensive booklets — advocating what? That they can properly educate the youth of this land, the citizens of tomorrow. Turn them all over to us. Listen to this advertisement, a beautiful 8-page booklet—red, white, and blue—with 8 action-colored pictures. I am reading:

The guard offers unlimited educational opportunities. Your son may attend Regular Army or Air Force service or technical schools with pay, or he may take correspondence courses. Through these schools, which offer more than 450 courses, he may improve his education, boost his military specialty, and increase his civilian earning power.

Which in effect is saying, "We can offer more courses than any college in America and can pay you while you are being educated."

Correspondence courses. Yes, but the military shudder when one mentions using our high schools, prep schools, private schools or colleges. They not only recommend these military schools which offer more than 450 courses, where he may improve his education, and boost his military specialty and increase his civilian earning power, but leave the impression that they seek authority to make them use these schools or else.

All this time I have been dumb enough to think that the fine educational system of this country, the public school system, the private school system, the church schools of this land, the colleges, the junior colleges, and the prep schools were to educate our youth and were doing a grand job. But they can make no such claims as the military is making.

And when asked, through the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am chairman, for a report on the operation of their schools, the activities of their educational program and its cost to the taxpayers, the Department of the Army furnished the following foolish and meaningless reply:

It has not been possible to provide meaningful figures in some reports concerning obligations. Estimates were made, when possible, but the nature of some of the Army educational and training activities is such that even approximate estimates are not possible. At Army service schools, for example, the only available information concerns amounts obligated under "Army training" which cannot be furnished as representing the total cost of operating the schools since they do not include amounts required to furnish standard supplies and equipment issued through normal supply channels, such as travel in connection with the schools or numerous expenses provided for in other cost categories. In this same connection, it should be noted that the pay of personnel participating in Army educational programs is paid from other appropriations, and consequently is not included in obligations shown for education activities. (Reference: H. Doc. No. 428, p. 165, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

The gentleman handling and directing this bill has not opened his mouth about encouraging education or giving the average kid of 17 or 18 years of age one thing in the world that would encourage him to get along with his education. America did not grow great by accident, improvement in living standards was not just handed to us. All the educational institutions in America from the little red schoolhouse to date have certainly been one of the greatest contributors toward making this Nation not only a powerful Nation, but also the greatest producing Nation of everything from necessities to luxuries on earth, all of which play a large part in the high living standards we now enjoy, and I am now reluctant at this late date to trade off the views of our educational leaders for the views and ambitions of the Pentagon.

I feel this so deeply that I must express my resentment to the highest military officials, whether they be in the Pentagon or wherever they are, that want to control and regulate but not educate. They want to subordinate education, revise it, revamp it, and worse still, direct and control it. I fear this policy and attitude.

No. They do not lend a hand. At the same time they seem to take the attitude that education is not one of the very foundation stones upon which this Nation must defend itself; yes, even survive, unless provided by them at taxpayers' expense—in the most expensive and haphazard way.

I would like for the gentleman or anyone else to challenge that statement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not want to get into a debate with my good friend. However, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he believes that every young man has a very definite obligation in the defense of his country?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to my distinguished friend, I wish you had not directed that question to me. Both you and I know the answer to that so well, and every person in this House knows the answer to that. I recognized mine. You recognized yours. And I have faith and confidence enough in the youth of this land to say that the generations to follow after you and me will be just as good, yes, I hope better and more cognizant of the responsibility that they have to this country. That is not the issue. Are you trying to force the choice that they must give their all to the country and ignore their preparation for themselves, their families for good citizenship, and what we call a better way of life in America? No, you are not doing that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I certainly am not, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Exactly what is the point you are getting at? That we are requiring military service through the draft?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Maryland is a faster thinker on this than I am. The point I am getting to is this: We can stand here and let out these blood-curdling yells about the scientific men Russia is turning out, about those planes that go 850 miles an hour, about those terrible death-dealing scientific machines they have.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Not now.

We can hear all of that if we please. How did they get them? It was not the soldier who could just do "squads right" or "squads left"; it was the scientific men, the chemists, the physicists, the electrical men, the well-trained men, those who can think, invent, and understand those gadgets and develop them.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute, just a minute.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Just at that point.

Mr. BARDEN. Just a minute. Well, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I hope I have not taxed the gentleman's patience.

Mr. BARDEN. You did not, but you almost did.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am happy I did not go that far, but my good friend, colleague, and chairman——

Mr. BARDEN. All right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to give the gentleman's background as chairman of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives. I want to join in your fine tribute to education. I am agreeing with every word you say. I hope that your able committee gets to work, writes some provisions within the views that I expressed on Federal education. I do not want Federal control of education, but within those views write some legislation on education and bring it before this House, then we can carry out some of the gentleman's excellent views.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to my friend that we have enough laws in America guaranteeing an education if you will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am sure the gentleman——

Mr. BARDEN. Now, you wait a minute; you are going to listen to this whether you like it or not. What good would it do for the Committee on Education and Labor to double the number of school buildings in America and treble the number of school teachers if you are going to be standing there at the door of the high school to take him away and put him in a camp for such a long time that he does not want to go to school any more?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me pursue this just a little. Under our military program the school enrollment has doubled, trebled, and increased beyond all bounds until the universities are fairly bulging and not able to take care of enrollments. There is more education now in the United States than there has ever been.

Mr. BARDEN. Listen, my friend, that is not because of the Armed Services Committee, but in spite of it. And let me say another thing, that I hope those schools and colleges will continue to bulge, and I hope the output will be more and more and better and better.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I join you in that.

Mr. BARDEN. All right. Now, what I am trying to point out—under difficulties—is this: I have proposed an amendment, or will propose it when the opportunity presents itself, that when a boy reaches the age of 17, whether he be in high school or college, that he may with the consent of his parents up to 18—and after 18 it does not require consent—volunteer for a reserve program. My amendment does not cut one thing in the world out of the bill. It adds an option, that is all. You have a lot of options in here, but I reserve the right to express by opinion on them later. It gives another option: a boy can serve 91 days in the summer, go back to school in the winter, serve 91 days the next summer, go back to school, whether he wants to be a doctor, whether he wants to be an engineer or whether he wants to be a businessman or whatever he wants to be, and follow that 4 years.

When he has completed those 4 years, he is in the Standby Reserve, whatever that is—I have had several definitions of that term—for 1 year. The Standby Reserve does not require drills or active service except in time of war or emergency declared by Congress.

Now, what have we accomplished? Which is more valuable to America in time of war or peace, an educated boy or an uneducated boy? Which is more valuable to America, certainly in war or in a threat of war, a boy who is freshly trained every year for 4 years or draft him, put him in for 2 years, then let him forget all in 12 months? It is that simple.

There is another fair provision in the amendment. Probably he would go for 3 years, which would be 9 months of active service; then conditions at home, illness, his own condition or something else might arise that would prevent him from finishing up. This amendment provides that he shall have credit for the 9 months that he served. Why shouldn't he? Then he would serve only 15 additional months.

The amendment will provide that he draw a private's pay, about $80 per month. One of these provisions in the pending bill, I do not know which one it is, provides for $50. The bill holds out some bait, then puts something on it that would not make it taste good by cutting it down to $50. The gentleman brought out the officers' pay bill some time ago.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman did not bring out an officers' pay bill, may I suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman was riding along with it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman voted for it and I voted for it. May I say that we did not cut the pay of the trainee at all; we raised it. It was recommended at $30 and we increased that to $50.

Mr. BARDEN. Who recommended that?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Pentagon.

Mr. BARDEN. If we could get a great volume of commonsense and get you to thinking, and cut you loose from the Pentagon, we would get further.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BATES. I think the gentleman will recall that 4 years ago both of us opposed universal military training.

Mr. BARDEN. With everything there was in me. That was the boldest attempt to militarize this Nation ever made.

Mr. BATES. In both of us. Will the gentleman tell the committee that in the event his amendment passes he will support this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, I will, if my amendment passes.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. I think there is so much possible good in it. Now, I am glad the gentleman did not press me and ask me what I was going to do if the amendment does not pass. But, I will say this, that I have not heard any valid reason why the amendment should not pass. We are cutting down, as somebody said a while ago, on our scientific men. We are just simply depleting our ranks of scientists. You say there are more men in college now. Why, we have more people. We just have more people. So we cannot go by what has happened in the past.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MASON. As a school man of over 30 years' experience, the gentleman's idea is an idea that has been promulgated on this floor more than once, training in school and with a school program. I am for it 1,000 percent.

Mr. BARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah. A fine educator—one who has had the responsibility of a college president, and above all a fine delightful gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's position. Boys at 17 years of age usually have not graduated from high school. If they go into the service for 6 months and come back to school in the middle of the school year, most of our high schools cannot enter them because they do not have a program that begins with the quarter or semester as do the colleges.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. If they cannot enter school they will go to work. Then, if they go to work, they are weaned almost entirely away from high school. If they do not get a high-school education, they are not eligible for the many fine positions which are open to them and they are under a great handicap. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's position. But in the bill may I ask this question? If the period of enlistment in the bill were changed to read "any high-school graduate who has reached his 17th birthday and under 20 years of age and any non-high-school graduate who is 18½ years of age and who is under 20 may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training," would that not be a simple solution and still protect the boy's right to a high-school education?

Mr. BARDEN. I will say this to the gentleman, there is a tremendous number of students who finish high school considerably before they are 18 years of age, and I do not have to tell you that if they are drafted into the Army, that is too bad, or too good, one or the other, and I am trying to follow the reasoning of the committee. They set out these various things and say they will take this 6 months or something else is going to happen. These provisions illustrate the objectionable approach which this program makes to military service. It puts a threat over the heads of all of those likewise, and the penalty behind this threat is that the boy will be called up for active service. I think that is emphasizing patriotism in reverse. I hope some day the Army will learn that they have a selling job to do somewhere other than on the television screen and these pamphlets. They can do a selling job in the camps, and a much better selling job than they have been doing, and they will have more volunteers and we will have less trouble. Let's produce

more doctors, and make the Army more attractive somewhere else besides on television and pamphlets. It will then not be necessary for more and more force. But, I do want to emphasize that I have been on the floor on this subject many times, and regardless of how long I stay here, every time I have an opportunity I shall attempt to emphasize the absolute necessity of education in our defense setup as well as in our Government and otherwise. We cannot be strong militarily unless we are strong mentally. I think that is fundamental. We must have more scientifically trained men, more men who understand the speed of this age, because we cannot put out as many foot soldiers and depend on mass warfare any longer. You must be able to compete in speed, in science, and anybody who is thinking knows that the next war we have—and God forbid we ever have one, but if such should happen—you know it will not be fought and won with brawn alone; it will be a brain contest of science, of electronics, atomic and kindred weapons. It will be a question of getting the high-speed jet bomber before it delivers its lethal cargo. If we cannot do that then the number of men will amount to little. In my opinion, our survival could very easily depend, as it has at times in the past, upon trained, skilled, and scientific minds.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my task this afternoon is certainly not an easy one, and it is by no means a pleasant one. However obnoxious one's duty may be, it should and must be discharged; and however heavy one's responsibility may be, it cannot be shirked or avoided. Certainly I do not relish my present position of having to go against my own President, the leadership of this House, and many of my best personal friends on both sides of the aisle. Heaven knows, if any four men on this earth could convince me of anything, I think they would be Dwight Eisenhower, Arthur Radford, Carl Vinson, and Joe Martin. But I am not going to live with those gentlemen forever, which is most fortunate for them; and certainly they will not always be with me to grant their wise counsel and fearless direction. But a thing that I have considered bad under previous administrations, whether Roosevelt or Truman, I consider bad under Eisenhower, Smith, Jones, or anyone else.

There is one person I must live with forever, and from whom I can never run away, and that is DEWEY SHORT.

A great man once said:

To act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright.

And when he nailed the 95 theses on the cathedral door at Wittenberg, he said:

There I take my stand. I can do naught else. So help me God. Amen.

No, it is not an easy nor a pleasant task that I have. After wrestling with my conscience, and talking to myriad friends, and after receiving at a conservative estimate 3,000 messages, letters and telegrams on this particular bill before us, and after being torn asunder by good, loyal friends, dear and near to me, pulling in opposite directions, it is not an easy decision I have been called upon to make.

Now let us look at this bill. What is the history of it? One does not have to be a Member of Congress, a Philadelphia lawyer or a Ph. D. to know that ever since the close of World War I, there has been a persistent, pugnacious, perennial, relentless, costly campaign to cram down the throats of the American people universal military training or peacetime conscription.

Having served in this body for almost a quarter of a century, having served on the different committees, special as well as regular legislative committees of the House that have considered this and allied problems, I know the tremendous pressure, I know not only the cajolery and the pleas, but even the threats, the use of the taxpayers' money to spread propaganda, to cut the political throat and nail the political hide of anyone who dared to oppose the different programs that have been offered from time to time.

In the Democratic-controlled 82d Congress in 1952 we succeeded in the well of this House by a margin of 74 votes in defeating the UMT bill. This present bill is not UMT, granted. It is limited and restricted and has a termination date. Oh, yes, it terminates on July 1, 1959, if not extended—if not extended. But you get your foot in the door, let the camel get his nose under the tent. You pass this legislation, and it will bring us just a little closer to the water's edge, to thrust upon us a foreign philosophy, an alien ism. You will find it very difficult to repeal. It is not where you begin, but where you end that counts; not where you start, but where you stop. It is not UMT, and compulsion was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman and members of his subcommittee, who worked so long, faithfully, and hard on this bill, and who improved it enormously, particularly by eliminating the discharage other than honorable. I wish they had accepted the amendment I offered to cut down the length of Reserve service from 8 to 4 years, because these 18-year-old youngsters take their 6 months' training between their 18th and 19th birthdays. I was the only one to vote for my amendment, but at times it is great to be alone. I shall offer my amendment on the floor. Oh, yes, there will be volunteers, but that volunteering, with the draft hanging over their heads, does not give them too much freedom of choice. Of course, they will volunteer for this 6 months at $50 a month, and the minute they sign up they are hooked for 8 long years, from 18 to 26. You know, and I know, that most of these youngsters before they reach their 26th birthday will be married, perhaps have a child or 2, perhaps have gone into business or entered a profession. Then he is required to take 48 weekly drills a year for 7½ years, and not more than 17 days of training in summer camp, giving up his vacations. I do not know whether his employer is going to be willing to grant him 17 days off each summer for 7½ years. He is going to do that, but if he wants to surrender the 48 drills and the 17 days of camp in the summer for 30 days of concentrated training he can do that. If he does not carry out satisfactorily the provisions of the Reserve bill, then he can be drafted for 45 days. If he does not perform that satisfactorily, even at the end of the 6 months' training or a year or 2 after he can be inducted for 2 full years, 24 months, or he could, in dire emergency, be court-martialed under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. You call that voluntary when they once sign up? Nonsense. There is little freedom in this.

Which branch of the service can he enter? The Air Force says, "No; we don't need him." The Navy says, "We don't expect to use him." The National Guard is not satisfied with it. We were told that 99,000 out of 100,000 supposed to be taken in would go into the Army Reserve. So that is what it is, 99,000 of the 100,000, and the others perhaps would go into the Coast Guard or the Marine Corps. There is not much choice in it. Let us now tell these youngsters the truth.

Then, after this youngster 18 or 19 years old takes his 6 months and he performs satisfactorily his service in the Ready Reserve for the next 2 years, suppose when he reaches the age of 21 or 22 we become involved in a global conflict. What happens to him then? Do you think by that little training he has had he is equipped and ready, and because he is in the Ready Reserve do you think the Reserve is ready—trained in units to go into combat—when our experience is that it has taken the guard almost a year to get ready? And where is this boy actually going to take his 48 weekly drills when he lives 50 or 150 miles from the nearest armory? A group of us last Friday flew out to Colorado Springs and back to Washington on Sunday. As we went over the vast open spaces of western Kansas and eastern Colorado, over that Dust Bowl, I just asked some of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans both, who were along, "How is that boy down there in that Dust Bowl or wheat field going to carry out his Reserve service when he lives perhaps 200 miles from Denver or Colorado Springs? And how about his 6 months' training? How are you going to teach him to use the latest and most powerful weapons? You can teach him to use a rifle and do squads right and left and all about sanitation and hygiene and carry out military discipline and orders—all of which is already taught in the National Guard and the Organized Reserves, as well as the ROTC"—and I am not so sure that the discipline he gets on our athletic fields and in our gymnasiums at their own expense instead of at the expense of Uncle Sam is not just about as valuable and good. A great Englishman said:

World War I was won on the hockey and cricket fields of Harrow, Eton, Oxford, and Cambridge.

In the case of a boy who takes 6 months' training—when war breaks out 2 or 3 years later—do you know that youngster will have to be called in and physically reconditioned and perhaps have to be taught how to use an entirely new and different set of weapons?

The rapid changes in techniques and methods of modern mechanized warfare renders the training of these men most expensive, and I cannot escape the feeling that it is a waste of manpower, materiel, and money because ground troops with a rifle, machinegun, tank, or a field gun cannot shoot down a super bomber carrying an atom or a hydrogen bomb. I do not want the American people to be led astray by Maginot line thinking or World War I psychology by putting faith in sheer numbers of men. Heaven knows, we can never match man for man the hordes on the Asiatic Continent. They are expendable; we are not. The cheapest commodity in the Orient is human life. I do not believe that if our ground forces are built up, it will help us too much in these days of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb. Suppose we build up our Reserves from 700,000 to 2,900,000, plus 3 million in the active forces making 6 million plus 2 more million in the Standby Reserves. Even if we had a total active force and Reserves in Ready and Standby of 8 to 9 million men, I do not think it would add too much strength in this atomic and hydrogen age. I do not believe that America could get an expeditionary force from this country to Europe today, in a short period of time, even if our active, standing forces were twice as large and our Reserves were three times as large. I do not believe we could get enough ground troops to Europe in time to stop aggression by Soviet Russia on the ground. If we do not stop her with our airpower and naval power, and with superior weapons, we are in one awful fix, because Heaven knows in a global conflict our only chance of victory and our only hope of survival is in the superior power of our weapons and the superior skill of the men who man those weapons. I feel wholeheartedly, as I have during the past 20 years, as does the able and fearless gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], that no nation can be stronger than the intelligence and character of its people. It is in the American home and in the church and high schools and universities under our system of free education that we have grown to be the richest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. Nothing in this world is great but man and nothing in man is great but mind.

God did not endow all men with equal talents and ability. Why should we, therefore, compel the genius to walk or train with the sluggard merely to please the sluggard? Put the right man in the right spots. They will be coming back. If a hundred thousand boys under this program do not volunteer, what happens? It is innocuous. We have much ado about nothing. A lot of senseless chatter; an enormous and inexcusable waste. If more than 250,000 want to come in, who is going to select them? Remember, only 100,000, as stated in the original bill, were to be admitted. Oh, the bill is far from perfect. If more than 250,000 young Americans want to take this 6 months' training, rather than be drafted for 2 years—I am going to have a little difficulty when I go back to the Ozarks in explaining to my people why we had the courage, just a few months ago, in this present session of Congress, to vote to conscript their sons for 2 years and send them to serve on foreign soil, but do not have enough guts to vote to conscript for 6 months boys to stay here at home. Who is going to select these boys? This might be an elite guard. Who is going to choose these 250,000 young men? Oh, what a chance to play favoritism and politics. This bill is full of headaches and heartbreaks.

I am not going to quarrel with a single Member of this House about how he votes on this bill, or any other bill. I have never done that. Strong as my convictions are, deep as my feelings are, I am not going to quarrel with you. I will still respect and love you. I just hope and pray that some of my close friends will be as charitable to me. I like to be on the team. I want to go along. I bend over backwards at times, almost choke on my Adam's apple when I vote for the brass and the braid, not only to increase their pay and hospitalization and family care, voting for dependency benefits, PX and commissaries and all the rest of it. I want to be their friend. They are great and good men. But as I have often said, no general ever had a big enough army to command any more than a preacher ever had a congregation big enough to preach to.

Now, you say this is not compulsion. I will tell you what it is. When I was a barefoot boy and a barehead youngster down in the Ozarks in southern Missouri—I live quite near the gentleman who is now in the chair [Mr. TRIMBLE]. We are both ridge runners and hillbillys. In fact, I get lost over in Jim's district and he gets lost in mine. We always manage to find our way out—but when I was a youngster I drove a team of jennies. I know how I got my education too, GRAHAM BARDEN. I got it the hard way, but I got it the free way. I could follow my own inclinations and talents, if God had given me any. The worst part of this military is that we have too many square pegs in round holes. Misfits. Let each man follow his own conscience and carry out his own will, the equal of every other man, and to go his own way. I believe in freedom because in freedom is our strength.

So I used to go out to these little jennies in the field with a nice big ear of corn in front of me, but I always had a halter or a bridle back of me. These young jackasses would come up to get a bit of that free corn, and when they would come to get something for nothing, then I would put the halter on them. Oh, they have sugar-coated this bill. They have made it palatable. They have watered it down. It is a little innocuous thing. They offer these boys 6 months' training, and they think they are going to escape service. Yes. They will come to get a bite of the ear of corn, but always they will get that halter on them. I would get the halter on those jennies and get them up to the barn and harness them and hitch them up to the wagon, and then I would take the blacksnake and I would whale the everlasting wind out of them. I had them where I wanted them.

And here they come. Greeks bearing gifts. Offering you a sour pickle covered with honey. They have tried to do something with this bill—I will not call this a subterfuge; I will not say they are trying to come in the back door or the side door—but they just want to get the thing started, get the halter on you; oh, just 4 years; 1959.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that no one in this body is so naive as to believe that there will not be a determined effort made to get this bill, if enacted, extended beyond 1959. I dare predict that the Defense Department will be coming back asking that compulsion be added to the bill.

It is also a bit incongruous at the very time the President asks for world disarmament to have this measure brought in to increase our armament, though I doubt the effectiveness of this bill in building up our military strength. How can this administration or this Government reconcile the appointing of Harold Stassen as the Secretary of Peace with the enactment of this questionable bill?

One more point, Mr. Chairman, that must not be overlooked is the enormous cost of this new legislation which will jump from $700 million to $1,156,000,000 next year and will approach approximately $2 billion in 1959. Personally, I think we will not get our money's worth out of these vast expenditures, and God help us if we continue to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. That is what the Soviets have hoped and planned for and if we are not careful we will knock ourselves out by our own proficiency.

The bill should be recommitted and a measure brought in that would not have such serious impact upon the individual lives, the freedom of our people, and the terrific shock on our industrial might and sound domestic economy.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. I do not think there is a Member of the House but who respects the opinion and conclusions of the gentleman from Missouri, and I have stood by the gentleman's side in a determined effort to fight universal military training, compulsory military training, and still so stand and will continue to stand with the gentleman against that. However, having convictions of my own, having voted for the extension of the draft which incorporates the principle of picking out boys and inducting them for 2 years' service with 6 years obligation to the Reserve plus a penalty of $10,000 and 5 years in jail, in my own mind I cannot stand against something that softens the approach to the problem.

Mr. SHORT. I thank my very dear and good friend for his remarks. Of his honesty and sincerity there can be no doubt. I just do not capitulate quite so easily. I want the world to know that I have and want no better friend than LES ARENDS.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, by the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the Constitution, our adherence to its objectives and principles, we are today productively and

militarily the most powerful Nation in the world.

Our citizens have more of the good things that men desire than any other people who at any time lived anywhere on this earth.

Freedom, opportunity, prosperity, security for the individual have been ours.

Independence and security as a Nation we have attained.

All these blessings and more—because of the inspiration which gave us the Declaration of Independence, because of the wisdom written into the Constitution, because of our adherence to the tenets therein set forth, because we have followed the advice of Washington and Jefferson, have been ours.

The principal reasons which drove our ancestors to leave their homes, face and conquer the hardships of the hostile world, were the tyranny of a king, their hatred of conscription for military service to fight wars in which they had no personal stake, their lack of opportunity.

Through our adherence to United Nations we have surrendered a part of our national independence, the right of the Congress to declare war, the ability of our people to avoid wars in which they have no vital interest.

Our youth lacks neither the ability, the courage, the independence, the determination, nor the inclination to fight and die for home and country.

Their failure to enlist in the armed services in numbers sufficient to satisfy the demands of the armed services to implement our foreign policy is not because they lack patriotism or courage.

It is due to the fact that they and their fellow citizens are now convinced that those who conceive, formulate, and administer our foreign policy have forgotten the causes which made us a Nation, the reasons for our national existence.

In recent years our foreign policy, which calls for burdensome taxation, the unprofitable expenditure of billions of dollars, the sacrificing of thousands of our young men, has been conceived and administered by individuals who refuse to accept the reality that we cannot by force of arms conquer and hold the rest of the world—subject its people to our thought, our way of life.

Assuming their patriotism, there remains the sad, sorrowful fact that, as a result of their thinking, today the revolving world, as it falls away from the last rays of a sun sinking beyond the horizon, in every land and on every sea, brings darkness and night to shadow the land, the water, which hides the grave of a son of an American mother.

Here in the homeland, there is scarcely a square mile in the country, a town or city, where does not dwell a father, a mother, a wife, a son, a daughter, who does not mourn—suffer—because of the loss of one who, called to the defense of his country, fought not under the Stars and Stripes, but under the flag of the United Nations—not to defend or fight in the interest of his own country, but because of a policy which serves the interests of other countries.

In the wars which world politicians, internationalists, and the U. N. have brought us, cooperation forgotten, we have been left to furnish in money, munitions, and manpower, all but a small fraction of the cost.

From those wars, certainly from the last one in Korea, which the politicians prevented us from winning, we, as individuals, as a Nation, have gained nothing of spiritual, material, lasting benefit.

Why the recent and present demands for a continued and enlarged participation in world affairs?

Why, Europe having been made comparatively secure, shift the policy of stripping America of its resources to an aid-for-Asia policy?

Why the ever-continuing, ever-increasing propaganda of fear?

In recent years, we have been governed by fear—a synthetic fear—generated and imposed upon us by those who have little faith in the principles enunciated in the Constitution, in the ability, the courage, the patriotism of our youth, by those who refuse to accept reality—to admit that, great as they may be, our resources, our manpower, our military might are not inexhaustible.

We insist that we love peace; that we are not an aggressive people or nation, but from our shores our Armed Forces go east, go west, until they meet on the other side of the world—while peace, we insist, is our objective.

Our excuse for the establishment and maintenance of more than 900 military installations outside of the continental United States is that we desire to contain communism.

It can no more be successfully either contained or suppressed by force than was Christianity.

If Red China or Russia be the embodiment of communism and a threat to our national existence, if war must come then let our answer be quick and firm. Let it be directed at the source of the opposition, not at its puppets.

If our scientists, our military men, know what they have accomplished; if their statements as to our military might are accurate, then, at the first knowledge of real danger, let our A-bombs, our H-bombs, our guided missiles, our fleet, our submarines, our air force, whatever and all weapons that we may possess, be directed against the military installations of those countries.

Let us not sacrifice our foot soldiers in a futile invasion of either China or Russia. To attempt an invasion of either would mean the loss of our men to their teeming millions.

Before we invade either let us read history's primer.

The legislation before us today and supplementary legislation which will follow will destroy the freedom, the opportunity, which our forefathers came here to attain.

It will give us universal military conscription, return to the youth of today and tomorrow the military servitude which our forefathers came here to escape.

King George III hired the Hessians to fight the colonists. They fought for pay.

We would have our youth fight the battles of other nations, but without pay.

The answer that we cannot avoid war; that, unless we travel half way around the world to fight, to carry on a war, war will be brought to our shores, is answered by the fact that in preceding world wars neither Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Portugal, nor Spain participated. Today no nation will carry war to us.

There is no sound reason why a peace-loving nation, the most powerful military nation in the world, should be so fearful as to impose upon the present and future generations conscription, which requires every mentally and physically qualified young man, when he reaches the age of 18 years and 6 months, to enter and remain under the direction of military men for 2, then an additional 6, perhaps 8, years.

The average conscription service in other countries is less than 24 months. Russia, which we characterize as a nation whose citizens have no civil rights, imposes but 24 to 60 months military service upon its people.

We, the representatives of a free and independent people, so-called, today are asked to force our men—and if present trends continue, will be asked to force our women—into the service of the military for a period of 96 months, or 8 years, or, as some insist, possibly 120 months, or 10 years.

With our productive ability, our military might, the answer to the demand for universal military conscription for a period of at least 8 years is that we insist that the State Department shape its thinking and its policy to fit the Republic and the purposes for which it was established.

That the military cut its demands to the preparation of an adequate, efficient national defense, to the establishment and maintenance of a trained, efficient armed force whose sole objective is the protection of the interests of the United States, the preservation of our national sovereignty, the freedom of our people.

Once convinced that the sole purpose of the State Department and of the armed services is the protection and the preservation of the Republic, the freedom and the opportunities of our people, there will be no need for conscription of any kind.

Until the State Department and the armed services announce and adhere to the purposes set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, I will not by my vote take from the present or future generations the blessings which have come to us because of the love of freedom, the wisdom, of those who established this Nation, which have been so dearly earned and preserved by the efforts and the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in calling for a greatly improved reserve program, the Government is taking another important step to reinforce our immediate and long-range security.

I believe the program offered in H. R. 5297 is both realistic and fair. It will help provide this country with a genuine

military readiness for the long haul which may lie ahead.

It is part of a related program to bolster our active forces, and to provide us with a capacity to mobilize swiftly and without undue difficulty if war should come to us.

Better than a year of exhaustive study and analysis on Government and related levels went into formulation of the administration's reserve program. Senate committee studies, veterans' association testimony, and other expert analysis had earlier defined a clear need to revise the Reserve program to get a more effective military instrument. The House Armed Services Subcommittee, headed by Mr. Brooks, has now spent better than 2 months in further study and refinement of this measure.

It should, I believe, be considered as one more positive step in the process of evolving a sound and equitable reserve program in this country. Basically, it amounts to a sharpening and tightening of the legal basis for a reserve established by Congress in the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

Like most legislation, it probably will not satisfy the objections of all interested parties. But I am convinced that it offers the best approach to a serious problem, and one which sincerely tries to deal constructively with the interests of all concerned.

Generally speaking, in many instances, H. R. 5297 follows the recommendations of the President as outlined in his January 13 message which listed the requirements for a Reserve as follows:

First. Improve the Reserve structure.

Second. Supply initially trained young men to the Reserve forces without adverse effect on the Active forces.

Third. Assure supply of trained personnel to the National Guard by assignment of obligated reservists.

Fourth. Secure compliance with Reserve training participation requirements.

Fifth. Permit organization in peacetime of State militia.

H. R. 5297 would accomplish each of these principal requirements.

The Reserve forces, composed of a Ready and a Standby Reserve, will be expanded to around 5 million men by 1959. The Ready Reserve will become properly organized and trained. The Standby Reserve will be nonorganized, but will contain trained personnel available in an emergency proclaimed by Congress.

The 6-month program for supplying initially trained young men to the Reserve forces will be volunteer in character, with a minimum and maximum quota of 100,000 and 250,000 annually, set by statute, and the numbers to be trained under these limits will be determined by the President. This program will have minimum effect on the Active forces because manpower pool levels will be protected.

The National Guard will be insured a supply of trained personnel, both through the 6-month program, and, if volunteer methods fail, by assigning reservists leaving active duty to guard units on the request and approval of appropriate authorities.

Compliance with the training program will be secured by stressing the obligation to serve in the common defense of the country, by proper incentive and earnback privileges, and by limited enforcement measures.

When the individual's participation in drills and annual training is deemed insufficient to maintain proficiency, he may be offered 30 days annual traning. Reservists who fail to perform duties under either choice may be required, without their consent, to take active duty for training for a total of 45 days annually. This, in the place of discharges "under conditions other than honorable," seemed to the committee a more positive approach to the problem of insured participation.

The organization of State militia in peacetime is permitted by the bill because of a need to underwrite internal security at times when the National Guard of the State is absent on Federal missions. I can see no conflict with the proper area of the guard in this arrangement, and such a militia in each State would unquestionably strengthen our civil defense.

This, in general terms, is the proposed Reserve program. Some details remain to be worked out, but in the main the provisions of H. R. 5297 provide for these results.

I might add a special word about the ROTC program. Special attention is given to this area in the national Reserve plan.

Under the proposed legislation, the ROTC program will be stimulated and brought into a more realistic unity with the remainder of the defense system. Basically, this has meant solving the problem of a greater ROTC production than our active forces require—short of mobilization. Added to this has been the need to maintain equity of service between ROTC graduates and all other able-bodied young men.

The national Reserve plan will allow qualified ROTC graduates to be assured of their commissions. Those in excess of active force requirements would take 6 months' training and spend the remainder of their military obligation in the Reserve. In addition to stabilizing the question of ROTC commissions and service, I am advised that the Department of Defense is actively promoting measures to upgrade the quality of the entire ROTC program.

ROTC graduates have more than proved their tremendous value to our defense in the past. This vital program shall be used to the full extent of its facilities.

The Reserve program of the administration recognizes the folly of trying to match the massive manpower of the Communist bloc of nations by maintaining equivalent active forces. Such a policy would quickly transform us into a garrison state, in which the loss of individual freedom would be an inevitable result.

We are, instead, placing our emphasis upon an active force of adequate size and power to handle the initial phases of any attack upon us, backed by a quickly mobilizable Reserve of trained manpower, and an ability to strike back with devastating force.

Add to this, the existence of the greatest industrial plant on earth, a constantly increasing technological ability—including the area of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons—and the proven fighting qualities of the American serviceman.

Properly integrated with the sizeable contributions of our allies, these separate factors add up to a formidable combination.

I believe the improved Reserve program now being proposed will do a sound and constructive job, and one which will generate increasing public confidence as it moves along.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with those who are in opposition to this bill. I speak partly because I have two sons who someday in the very near future are going to be affected by this type of legislation. Secondly, because although I was also on active duty for about 5 years, I have been a member of the Reserves for a great many years.

Some of you may remember the broadcast which took place about a week ago in which the people who took part in it reviewed the 10 years since V–E Day. The first group of people who appeared were military men. They prayed and hoped that we would not have an atom war, but they insisted that we be ready for an atom war. The next group of people, two of the finest cartoonists that came out of the recent war, predicted that we certainly would have a war.

Then, third, there was a little boy, I think he was about 10 years old, who prayed that we might be able to have, and he believed we would have when he grew up, a better world. Someone asked him if he would have to take part in military training. He said he supposed he would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to think in the terms of that little boy because we owe him the duty of writing the kind of legislation which is adequate and which really does a job for our country. My objections to this bill are twofold. First of all, it has provisions in it which would, in my opinion, give to the military absolutely uncontrolled power over the young people of this country at a time when that power should not be exercised in times of peace. Secondly, it does not provide a decent Reserve for the kind of emergency which we will have to face. It provides merely a Reserve for the Army. It makes no provision for an all-out, well-rounded military Reserve program. It does not even go into the qualifications that the Pentagon will set up to provide the kind of training which will be needed. And, I know that many people here know at this very moment, even under the compulsory program that we helped to vote for, that the Pentagon today is not providing a decent training program for those who are forced and inducted into the Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but believe that the Committee on Armed Services can do much better than this bill does; that they can, expressing some of the ideas that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], so well brought out here, make use of the educational facilities of our country; that they can go even further into the industrial units of our country and get them to cooperate in the kind of a Reserve program which will keep our men and our women all the time up to date in a program which will be needed if we have an all-out war.

This program that we are faced with today is simply a kind of a stop-gap program that the Pentagon has forced this committee to take in order to have some improvement over the utter failure that they have provided so far. I cannot help but believe that we live in a serious enough time so that it is the duty of this House to send this bill back to the committee and ask them, in view of all the things which have been said here this afternoon, to again put their wonderful efforts to work and bring out a bill which will provide us with an adequate Reserve and which, at the same time, will not interfere with the youth of our country and put them in the hands of the military 1 day a week in order that the military may sell their program to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether the gentleman is discussing the security bill and the defense of this country or discussing the convenience of individuals. Now, we cannot always conform to the convenience and the pleasure of individuals when we have the national security at stake, and we look at the problem primarily as a way to protect our country, even though some individuals might be seriously inconvenienced. No matter what kind of a bill you draw, there will be flaws in it. I do not care how wise you are or how skillful you are, whatever bill you draw will be a compromise of conflicting views.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let us get a bill that does not have all the flaws that this bill has in it. I think we can have a better bill. This bill is full of flaws. It does not provide—and I think you will admit this—it does not say a word about the kind of technical training which we talked about the other day when we passed the bill for the appropriations for the armed services.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There are some provisions in there on that topic that might be improved. I will concede that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But I do not concede that the bill is full of flaws; not by any means.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad tomorrow to point them out 1 by 1.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman said that the bill does not provide for what kind of technical training and so on?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It does not make use of and it provides no incentives for the young people of this country to stay in school and stay in college and work out their proficiencies along the line which will be something that they can take up afterward under civilian control rather than under military control.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am afraid the gentleman has not read the bill completely.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I have.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Under the present law we can draft individuals into the military service.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, but you draft only a very small number.

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is true, but it may be the rare bird that you draft into the service. Under this program, a man who has exceptional ability after he finishes his 6-month period will be screened then into the Standby Reserve. He will have no Ready Reserve obligation whatsoever. Therefore, we have an improvement over the present law. We have recognized the individual repeatedly. We have corrected the bill so that we do take care of those people with exceptional skills where we are in short supply.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Why must they have exceptional skill? We need lots of these people. Is there anything which says who is going to decide that this man has the kind of skill which will put him in this Reserve?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is the military, is it not?

Mr. DEVEREUX. No, no; it is not. As a matter of fact, when that question was brought up, it was under a board established, and naturally established, by the Secretary of Defense. Seeing the danger in such a procedure as that, I personally offered an amendment to change that and set up a board under the President of the United States because, after all, he must consult with other departments of the Government.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Has the gentleman any assurance that that board will not be made up of military people?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Why, certainly, because, for instance, the head of manpower, or labor—all of those people must of necessity be consulted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would be glad to see the language in this bill that says a single word about a civilian being on that board.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and experience has demonstrated that it does not make very much difference, perhaps not at all, what the Congress writes into the law. The armed services interpret it the way they want to. And all anyone needs to do to confirm that is to look at the history of the Tydings amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as one who has been in the Naval Reserve for over 14 years and who has served more than 8 years on active duty, I regret that I must take the floor to oppose this bill, especially in view of the fact that I have been a long-time advocate of a strong Reserve program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I know the gentleman is sincere and honest in his conviction. I wish the gentleman as he goes along would offer to the committee an alternative program, assuming that this is not what he wants. Will the gentleman give us his ideas on what we ought to have?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think, if the gentleman please, it would be a bit presumptuous of me to write a bill for his committee; but I do not think it is presumptuous of me to criticize this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Is it any more presumptuous to say that this bill is not satisfactory than it would be for the gentleman to say, "Here is my plan, I think it is a good one; this is what I would offer?"

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am not proposing the plan. I am undertaking, as I consider I have the right to do as a Representative, to criticize some specific parts of the gentleman's plan.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think the gentleman is well within his rights, of course. The committee was sincerely trying to work out a program that would fit the convenience of the individual and limit the authority given under the bill to the extent they could. I think the committee was very sincere and honest in trying to do that.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think so; but I regret I have not been here quite long enough to even presume to write such a bill.

I object specifically, if it please the gentleman, to the punitive aspects of the plan. One gentleman took the floor in support of the bill and said he admitted the present punitive aspects of the selective-service law were obnoxious and that those included in the measure are just a bit less obnoxious. He did not say, however, that they are not still obnoxious.

I do not think that these young men are sufficiently developed mentally at the age of 18 to make binding decisions which will affect their lives up through the age of 26. I do not think that every commanding officer in the Reserve is competent or well enough supervised by his superiors to be able to send a boy back into the service for 45 days if merely in the officer's judgment, the boy is not performing satisfactorily. I am told positively that neither the Army nor the Marine Corps plans to make use of the punitive aspect of this legislation; but it is still there.

I am not sure what the Army Reserve is going to do. I have been a bit amused by some of the statements to the effect that the Army Reserve program has been admitted by the committee to be a rather complete failure. I have as yet seen no

complete exposition of the reasons for that failure. We only have assurances that they know they have failed so far and only promises that they will not fail any more. I have seen no plan to overcome their deficiencies.

This is not an armed services Reserve bill, this is an Army Reserve bill. If it were so labeled I would be perhaps a little more sympathetic to it. I know it does nothing for the Air Force and nothing for the Naval Reserve. I do not know the Coast Guard problem. It seems to me a bit ridiculous to turn in 181 amphibious ships last week and this week ask for a larger Reserve, because it is going to take more than just a few days, as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee said the other day, to put 181 amphibious vessels back into commission to carry the big Reserve that you are going to build up.

I do not think I can write a better bill, on the basis of my own limited experience, and I acknowledge my limitations, but until I learn more I do not intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, every Member of the Congress has received many letters, phone calls, and personal visits from people who are worried about the possibilities in the National Reserve plan, as embodied in H. R. 5297, of the creation of a militaristic state. All of us, I am sure, share in that concern. I believe the record should be made clear in regard to several complaints made against this proposed plan.

First, we are told that we cannot prevent war with a big military establishment. May the record unmistakably show that no one in authority in this Government has any illusions that military might alone will prevent war. We are well aware that war can be prevented only by solving our economic, social, and spiritual problems. It was well stated by General MacArthur, when he spoke in this Chamber, that "wars could be prevented only by a rebirth of the spirit."

Actually, it is primarily because of our failure to carry the message of the spiritual nature of our concept of freedom that we have lost so much ground in our ideological conflict with communism.

It is important to remember, however, that communism uses physical force not merely as a weapon on the battlefield but as a diplomatic and psychological weapon. Unfortunately, in order to neutralize the effect of Communist use of physical force it is necessary to maintain a physical force of comparable power.

Many of our constituents argue that history shows that the establishment of a large military machine has not kept nations out of war. We are well aware of that. But by the same token failure to maintain an adequate defense has not prevented a nation from involvement in war; as witness Korea and other nations, too numerous to mention. Moreover, nations which have been careful to keep an adequate military defense have been able to avoid wars, such as Switzerland and Sweden.

Finally, it is argued that a large military machine may lead us into the role of an aggressor and we may be tempted to use it for selfish purposes as other nations have done.

It must be admitted that this is a risk. Historically, we have a good record. We have led the way in granting independence to peoples who have come under our control. Whether we fall into the error of misusing our military power will depend upon the character and spiritual strength of we, the people, who are the sovereign power of this Nation. If we are to win the ideological war with communism, we cannot fail in this test of our character and spiritual strength.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman has said, that military power and strength of itself will not prevent war, but I think my friend will agree with me that adequate and powerful military strength and power might deter and prevent an aggressor from making war.

Mr. HYDE. It might, but I am afraid the best use that can be made of it is simply a balance against the physical forces of atheistic communism.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I also wish to compliment the gentleman on his very interesting statement. Is it not conceded by almost everyone, both those opposed to the bill and those who are not opposed to it, that we can have the best kind of protection if we have military strength when we bargain. Also, I call your attention to the fact that General MacArthur in the last issue of the Reader's Digest booklet states that the only way to solve the problem of war is to abolish war. I am sure that General MacArthur, when he advocates the abolition of war as the only way to cure the situation we are in, believes that we must maintain a strong military posture, to move in the direction of the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman. I think there is no question about it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has 34 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AMERICA LIVES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the smooth, uneventful American Airlines return flight which I took last Tuesday morning following the acceptance of the Georgetown University John Carroll award at Boston, Monday night, vividly emphasized that America lives.

It is a drive of about 17 miles from my hometown, Rockville, Conn., to Bradley Airport, the fine, new terminal which serves the Hartford, Conn.-Springfield, Mass., area. While some may still be sleeping, there is great activity at 6:30 a. m. on the road I must travel to the airport, since it is a main artery for workers in this section of eastern Connecticut who are employed at the new plant of the Hamilton Standard Propeller Co.

Invariably the workers drive their very own cars, having left their self-owned homes. But the report that I desire to make to the House today concerns the overall picture, the activity that is everywhere viewed from the plane en route to Washington.

Very shortly after we were airborne there appeared to be more than the usual number of lakes and ponds on either side of the Connecticut River than are indicated on the map of the State. These are tenting being spread over wires under which tobacco plants will be set out in another 2 weeks, and Connecticut shade-grown tobacco, the best cigar wrapper, will be in production again. From the air the white netting simulates water.

In minutes, one sees the tall spire of the Travelers Insurance Co.—its distinguishing beacon light now extinguished since the sun has brilliantly risen and it is 7:15 a. m., albeit daylight saving time. Thin smoke emanating from lofty chimneys atop the Hartford Electric Light Co. plant near the Charter Oak Bridge proclaims the approach to Hartford, the State capital, where the wheels of its diversified industry are humming with activity as attested to by the many workers' autos which surround the buildings. Incidentally, much West Virginia coal is used by the Hartford Electric Light Co. A quickly disappearing white steam shooting from low stacks on the east side of the river confirms that jet engines are being tested at Pratt and Whitney Aircraft.

The route to New York discloses new industrial plants which contribute much to the economy of the local community by creating a need for additional workers, homes, schools, churches, stores. New railroad spurs are being put in place leading to these new plants to insure rapid and efficient handling of interstate commerce.

The first glimpse of New York City is always a most exciting and invigorating sight. While practically circling the city to land at LaGuardia, the viewer notes the consolidation of great wealth which makes an immediate and indelible impression on the mind. The highways, skyways, and byways leading into the

city are alive with traffic which resembles a blending of the colors of the rainbow.

After a short stay at LaGuardia, the flight is resumed and this time the plane heads for the George Washington Bridge to cross the Hudson and then to head south for Washington. There comes the opportunity to the passenger to catch a panoramic view of Manhattan Island, its skyscrapers, its avenues, its wharves and piers. The human eye records this never-to-be-forgotten scene that will remain in the recesses of memory and the entire picture recalled vividly with the mere thought and reminder of this morning.

Ships are now moving into and out of New York Harbor past the Statue of Liberty.

Many tugboats are shifting barges and cargo and passenger vessels into loading and unloading piers—everything is alive—it is a new dawn, a new day, a new era, America proceeds to its greater destiny, America lives.

Mr. Speaker, I continued to be overwhelmed with the scenes below of great chemical plants, various other heavy industry, as we proceeded toward Philadelphia and I can recall where a month ago on a similar flight I had seen clusters of trees and small hills. Today they are gone, the trees have vanished, and the elevation is leveled. Foundations are in place and a large shopping center in various stages of construction is well underway.

In another section, a housing project—individual homes—multicolored roofs, all new, are clearly delineated from the air.

The trains, buses, trucks, smoke from refineries are all symbols and evidence of the continuing prosperity and greatness of America.

The bulldozers, tractors, and other equipment actively engaged in road building along the New Jersey Turnpike reminded me that more of this is needed today and tomorrow to cope with our expanding economy and American automobile ingenuity. Recently, I heard a highway engineer state that 1 month's auto production placed bumper to bumper would stretch for a distance of 90 miles.

There was a repetition of these sights and scenes as we flew over Philadelphia and on to my ultimate destination, Washington.

The longest freight train I had ever seen was crossing the 14th Street Bridge into Washington, D. C., just as the plane came in for the landing at National Airport. The closed sides indicated that the boxcars were filled—a proven barometer of healthy business activity.

My fellow passengers who transferred at La Guardia to planes bound for the Middle and Far West and others who continued their journeys to Florida and Texas in my plane saw a continuation of varied signs which, translated, spell peace and prosperity. Yes, Mr. Speaker, truly America lives.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I sent a questionnaire to the voters of the Fifth Congressional District of New York in an effort to determine their views on pending legislation and subjects that might give rise to legislation. I endeavored to reach every household in my district that had a registered voter.

Question No. 38 on this questionnaire was as follows:

Would you favor a national lottery to help defray Government expenses?

Eighty-two percent of my constituents who answered this question were in favor of a lottery.

We are all interested in balancing the budget, and I do feel that we should explore this possibility for obtaining the necessary funds for this purpose. Many countries have found this to be very satisfactory and by using the lottery they have been able to keep their tax rate down.

I am today introducing a resolution which, if passed, would direct you, Mr. Speaker, to appoint a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine the advisability and feasibility of using a governmentally conducted lottery as a means of raising additional revenue for the support of the Government. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to support this resolution.

THE NATION NEEDS AN ADEQUATE RESERVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, conditions which confront the free world today make it mandatory that the United States and its Allies look to all aspects of their security.

The nature of the Communist threat has remained basically unchanged.

World War II saw the Soviet Union emerge as the greatest single power on earth next to the United States.

But when the United States and the remainder of the Allies who had fought against the Axis Powers disarmed after that war, the Soviet Union remained fully mobilized, and began a feverish buildup of those areas of its military might which the war had depleted.

From this fact has sprung the basic misery of the present time—which is a world threatened by the possibility that unrestrained military destruction will be unleashed upon mankind.

From their position of power, it was an easy thing for the Reds to ignore promises and honorable commitments previously made and to further advance world communism.

In close cooperation with the Soviet forces stand the armed millions of Communist China, whose leaders continue to be dependent upon the Kremlin for the industrial sinews which their war machine requires.

Here it is pertinent to note that about 3 months ago the Peiping government announced a vast overhaul of its Armed Forces, and a compulsory program of active and reserve military service for every man from the age of 18 until he reaches his 40th birthday.

It requires little imagination to surmise the total numbers of trained men any such program as this will provide the Chinese Communist military planners.

Thus the Communist powers of the world stand today—armed to the teeth and determined to grow even stronger in every military capacity.

From their position of massive armed might they support their worldwide program of infiltration and subversion, espionage, intimidation, and outright challenge of democratic processes in country after country.

At the present time, most of the tension forthcoming as a result of these facts centers around the area of the Formosa Straits, and in the region of the China coast.

In the past, however, and in much the same fashion, the deadly influence of massive Communist military power has caused upheaval, conflict, and even open war in areas like Czechoslovakia, Greece, Berlin, Iran, Korea, Indochina, first one and then the other.

So what we face today in the creeping expansion of communism backed by hundreds of divisions, guns, bombs, and a manpower supply running into the millions, is a long-term challenge to the free nations of the world, and to every individual living in them.

The United States today is making response to this fundamental threat in a variety of ways.

The bonds with our allies are being strengthened—in NATO, in the London and Paris accords, in the Manila and Rio pacts, and in our mutual-defense treaties.

More than 40 free nations, including the United States, have allied themselves in regional defense arrangements.

Collectively our allies are stronger today than ever.

The philosophy of our Government within this framework of alliances is to confront the world at all times with a willingness to deal in good faith, but to do so from a realistic position of strength, rather than weakness.

The best hope this Nation has for peace, along with its allies, is to maintain such a position of strength from which it can work to reduce world tensions.

For this we require a stable and predictable military-defense program free of the feast-and-famine expediency of other years, and providing a solid foundation for balance in all our service branches.

The alternative is to court fatal weaknesses which might some day mean an-

other, and far worse, Pearl Harbor right at our own front doorstep.

We must look at America's defense program today with a realistic and sensible eye to our world commitments, the nature of the times, and the uncertainties of the future.

The President has recommended the maintenance of an active-forces strength of approximately 2,850,000 at an annual budget cost of around $34 billion.

Within this framework, he has put emphasis on the existence of those forces and facilities for which the United States, uniquely among free nations, is best suited.

The proposed strength levels are based on world conditions at present.

They are based on the improved military preparedness of our allies, the end of fighting in Korea and Indochina, improved weapons, better use of our manpower, expected improvements in the future, the continuing Communist threat and a host of other factors.

With all these factors in mind, our preparedness picture will be incomplete without a revitalized and stimulated Reserve program which will serve as a ready backstop to our active forces, providing us with a swiftly mobilizable strength for either emergency situations or the long haul of a protracted cold war.

The reason why a national Reserve plan is being offered to Congress today is that the present situation of our reserves requires corrective action in accordance with the valid military requirements of this Nation.

Generally speaking, this involves the correction of six broad problems which currently prevent our reserve program from being all that it could be.

I should like to discuss these problems, and indicate how the national reserve plan will afford constructive action.

The first problem in need of correction lies in the area of the reserve structure.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 established two principal reserve categories, the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve, designating liability for service during emergencies.

As conceived, the Ready Reserve, within a 1.5 million strength ceiling, was to contain the units and individuals to be employed in an emergency proclaimed by the President, and to be mobilized first in a general emergency.

The Standby Reserve was to contain units and individuals which, together with those of the Ready Reserve, would constitute the reserve mobilization base for a general emergency or war.

But this Reserve structure has not functioned in practice in the way it was intended.

In practice as opposed to theory, the strength of the Ready Reserve has increased far in excess of its statutory limit, yet it does not contain those organized forces which it is supposed to have for its mobilization duties.

The Standby Reserve, on the other hand, has experienced a shortage of personnel, so that it has not been feasible to organize units in it.

It is interesting to note the reasons why this particular situation has developed.

Transfer from the Ready Reserve to the Standby Reserve is accomplished at the request of the individual.

Members serving in the Reserve under a statutory obligation are eligible for transfer only as a result of satisfactory participation in a Reserve training program.

But the great bulk of individuals who have moved into the Ready Reserve upon release from active duty to complete their obligation, have simply chosen to sit it out rather than join a training program.

The Ready Reserve has become in large part a Reserve pool increasing in size, but becoming relatively less ready from the standpoint of containing organized and trained forces.

Recent strength figures show that the Ready Reserve contains 2,546,000, including 330,000 on active duty, while the Standby Reserve contains only about 200,000 members, of whom 140,000, or 67 percent, are on the inactive status list.

In the event of mobilization, the task of determining which of these millions of reservists should be ordered to service, and which would be essential in civilian pursuits, would fall on the military, and would constitute dangerous delay in event of mobilization.

The national Reserve plan would see the Ready Reserve become an organized force of trained units and individuals.

It would be of size and composition to constitute the reserve base for initial phases of a general mobilization, and would meet Presidentially proclaimed emergencies as well.

The Standby Reserve would become a nonorganized reserve pool from which experienced personnel would be selected for those forces to be developed in the secondary phases of a general mobilization.

On the basis of current planned strengths of 2.88 million for the active forces, Ready Reserve requirements have been determined to be 2.9 million men.

The goal for meeting these requirements is the end of fiscal year 1959.

It is expected that the Standby Reserve will reach a strength of 2 million by that time, but since they will be subject to selective recall, not all of this 2 million will be utilized in a mobilization.

To assure that the Ready Reserve will in fact be available in the event of mobilization, and to make certain of the least impact on the civilian economy as well, members of the Ready Reserve will be subject to a continuous screening process.

Under this process, men with civilian skills excess to military requirements, men with jobs in essential civilian activities or government, and those with excess military requirements will be transferred from Ready Reserve to Standby Reserve.

First consideration for such transfer will go to combat veterans.

Under the terms of this bill, the President may summon up to 1 million of the Ready Reservists in an emergency which he proclaims.

Any larger number will require congressional action.

The Standby Reserve will be called on a selective basis only in an emergency declared by the Congress.

With these changes, it is plain that the overall Reserve structure will be vastly improved, and placed upon a more functional and ready-to-go basis.

Problem No. 2 involves the fact that under present law there is no effective and practicable means to assure participation in Reserve training programs, and the incentives to participate have not alone achieved the desired result.

Of the 2.2 million members of the Ready Reserve not on active duty, only 700,000, or, roughly, 1 out of 3, are participating in paid training.

And within the approximately 700,000 in training, there is an imbalance in grade structure and a disproportionate ratio of officers to enlisted men.

Much discussion has attended this question of compliance with the proposed Reserve program, but in the last analysis the question is one of achieving an adequate and worthwhile Reserve program, or none at all.

The national Reserve plan provides reasonable compliance measures, involving one basic change by the committee.

This was the rejection of discharge under conditions other than honorable for noncomplying trainees, and the substitution of a required training period in its place.

Thus, those individuals who fail to attend required minimum drills and training may be involuntarily ordered to active training for as much as 45 days annually.

Experience has shown that a purely voluntary Reserve program will prove inadequate to our needs today.

What the national Reserve plan provides is a means whereby men who have a statutory obligation to serve a period of training in the Reserves will actually do so, rather than ignore that obligation entirely.

A third problem area centers around the requirement for a supply of initially trained young men to the Reserves or the National Guard.

The national Reserve plan proposes a limited 6 months' active duty program, followed by 7½ years of Ready Reserve or National Guard service.

The program will be carefully regulated by Presidential quota to avoid any adverse effect on Active Forces volunteer programs.

H. R. 5297 provides that this quota shall have a net minimum goal of 100,000 annually and a maximum of 250,000 net annually.

Under present law, men below the age of 18½ may voluntarily enter the National Guard and be deferred from induction for active service—so long as their service is satisfactory.

But the problem centers around the fact that these men come into the guard with no prior training whatsoever; consequently, their entry into National Guard units means giving them such training.

One result is a general lowering of the unit training level, as officers and experienced men concentrate on providing them with basic training.

A high percentage of National Guard enlisted personnel have not had the benefit of basic training.

Add to this a well-nigh prohibitive turnover rate among such personnel and the constant problem of combat officers drilling green recruits becomes even clearer.

H. R. 5297 includes a statutory requirement that National Guard strength must be maintained.

This leads to the fourth major problem area which is the fact that the National Guard does not presently have an assured supply of trained men.

The bill departs somewhat from previous practices, and the exclusively volunteer character of the guard, to meet this requirement.

It is desirable to keep this volunteer character to the greatest possible extent, but if strength levels are to be maintained, some kind of insurance must be provided to accomplish this purpose.

There is provision in the bill, as the President recommended last January, to assure a supply of trained personnel to the guard either by transfer of obligated reservists or by voluntary participation under the 6-month program.

H. R. 5297 would, therefore, make it possible to transfer men with Ready Reserve obligations to the National Guard, for the duration of their service period.

Such transfer, however, can be accomplished only upon request or approval of the governor.

In addition to this provision, young men before age 18 may enlist directly into the National Guard, take 6 months' training with the active forces, and serve the remainder of a 7½-year obligation in the National Guard.

H. R. 5297 will provide the National Guard with two things: First, a supply of initially trained young men able to join units and proceed at once with advanced training, and second, insurance that if volunteer methods fail to provide adequate numbers to meet required strength levels, men leaving the active services may be transferred to guard units for the remainder of their Ready Reserve obligation.

Provisions of this kind are in the all-round interest of the National Guard and the general defense structure.

They will, in my opinion, provide us with a greatly strengthened and more appropriately trained guard organization.

The fifth problem with which H. R. 5297 deals, relates to the possibility of an attack against the United States coming at a time when National Guard units are required for duty away from their States.

Under present law States may not maintain troops in peacetime in addition to the National Guard.

Thus there is a period between the ordering of the National Guard into Federal service and the organizing of State militia, or home guard, when the State would have no troops available for internal security missions or support of civil defense.

The bill, accordingly, provides for the establishment of State defense forces in peacetime, in addition to the National Guard.

Here the bill clearly states that such State defense forces will be authorized in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and as provided by the laws of the State.

Their numbers will be determined under defense regulations.

H. R. 5297 provides further that in peacetime such forces will be on an adequate basis for planning and organization, capable of rapid expansion in the event the Army or Air National Guard are ordered to Federal duty, or in emergencies declared by the Congress or the President.

These forces, composed principally of men ineligible for other service, could render great community service in the event of an attack, and in the absence of the guard.

The last problem considered under the new reserve program is that of the ROTC in the schools and colleges where it applies.

Basically, this involves providing an answer to the fact that current production of the ROTC program for mobilization requirements is greater than our active force requirements.

Equity considerations rule out deferment of ROTC graduates from military service when other draft-liable persons have been and must continue to be inducted for 24 months of active service.

Under H. R. 5297, all qualified ROTC graduates will receive their commissions.

The Department of Defense proposed to handle this administratively.

The committee did not accept this view and instead wrote into the bill a guaranty to commission all qualified Army and Air Force ROTC graduates.

On graduation, those excess to requirements of the active forces will be given 6 months of active training duty, after which they will be in the Reserves for the remainder of their service obligation.

As the committee has noted in the report, "excess to requirements" refers to numbers, and not to quality.

Provision of this kind with respect to the ROTC program, in the opinion of the committee, will greatly stimulate interest in this program, and improve its value to the overall defense effort.

These, then, are the 6 broad problems which are corrected by the program legislation offered in H. R. 5297.

There are, of course, many other aspects of this legislation which are not covered in my remarks, but I have wanted to talk about these problems in particular as a means of showing the positive features of the national Reserve plan.

It is a corrective plan, not something wild-eyed and new, and not something totally at variance with past experience.

It seeks to make certain needed improvements within the general framework of existing legislation, with the ultimate single objective of providing this country with a real Reserve, instead of one which merely exists on paper.

I believe the new Reserve program is going to deal fairly and competently with the manpower needs of all component services, including the National Guard in its State and Federal status.

I believe it will greatly strengthen our country and place the Reserves in each State across the Nation in a strong position—well equipped and trained in extensive facilities.

A realistic Reserve program to back up our active forces has become a simple commonsense necessity in this day of danger and tension.

The national Reserve plan has been evolved after better than 1 year of hard work and consultation on all levels of Government and after 3 months additional study and revision in the Armed Services Committee.

I believe we shall be taking one of the most shortsighted views in the history of this body if we do not give our full support to this measure.

It will provide our Nation with a very sizable increase in necessary strength, and what is more it will serve notice on potential enemies that we are determined to maintain all areas of our military readiness on an up-to-date and strengthened basis.

It will reinforce our basic philosophy of going forward to reduce world tensions from a position of strength.

DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC-FUELED ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district and State and of the entire New England region are vitally concerned with the speedy development of atomic-fueled electric generating plants commercially competitive with plants which depend on water, gas, and coal as a source of fuel. The people of my district and State also recognize that an expanding economy in New England and in the Nation depends upon the availability of electric energy, from whatever source it may be generated. In New England especially, because of the lack of such fuels as coal, oil, and gas, we are anxious to encourage in every way consistent with the public interest the development of atomic power as a new source of energy. The Congress in 1946 under a Democratic administration and in 1954 under a Republican administration declared that it was the policy of the United States to promote the peacetime development of atomic energy within the framework of our free competitive economy.

In accordance with these basic concepts and considerations I have today introduced a bill, which is designed to remove a technical impediment to the expeditious prosecution of the program for the development of atomic or nuclear powered electric generators. As the Members of this House know, hundreds of millions of dollars must be spent in further experimentation and research before atomic fueled electric generating stations can be made commercially competitive with generating stations which depend on other types of fuels. Primarily because of the large sums which must be spent in research and on pilot

plants, groups of electric energy distributors, both public and private, as well as industrial companies have, with the encouragement of the Atomic Energy Commission, formed study groups to explore the commercial feasibility of producing electric energy with atomic power as the source of fuel. Some groups have applied to the Atomic Energy Commission for licenses for the construction and operation of dual-purpose nuclear reactors. As this House also knows, all nuclear material will, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, remain at all times the property of the United States. That act provides, however, that public and private agencies may, if they meet the standards and requirements of the Commission, in effect, lease, for a consideration determined by the Commission, a supply of special nuclear material. The special nuclear material would then be used to supply the heat to operate an electric steam generating station.

Under the pooling arrangement to which I have referred, the prospective applicant for a license for a supply of special nuclear material and for a license to construct facilities for its use in the generation of electric energy would be a specially organized entity acting on behalf of the members of the pool or group. It is at this point that the program's speed is deterred by the requirements of a law enacted 20 years ago to meet an entirely different situation but which because of its wording applies to the program of having one entity act on behalf of several companies or public agencies—such companies and agencies to share the financial burden and other risks. The law to which I refer is one for which I have the greatest respect and which, in my judgment, has been productive of a financially sound and independent electric utility industry. That law is the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. That act was properly enacted to break up scattered holding-company empires and to return the operating companies to the control of the State commissions representing the people served by such companies. These empires have now been broken up and most of the holding-company systems of the twenties and thirties have gone out of existence. The only ones now remaining are those which were able to meet the rigid geographical integration and corporate simplification standards imposed by section 11 of that act. As was intended by the framers of the 1935 act, the various States following the pattern established under the Holding Company Act extended the jurisdiction of their respective public service commissions until today almost every State has a commission which has jurisdiction over electric and gas utility operating companies in such matters as accounts, rates, standards of service, acquisition and disposition of assets, mergers, dealings with affiliates, service contracts, the issuance of securities, and the many other matters over which the Securities and Exchange Commission has jurisdiction with respect to holding companies and their subsidiaries. In addition to State regulation, electric utility companies which have facilities for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce are subject to the broad jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

I have touched briefly on the objectives of the Holding Company Act and have indicated that its principal objectives have, as intended by the framers of that act, been accomplished. The holding company systems have been broken up and the control and regulation of the local operating companies has been returned to the States. However, under the Holding Company Act, an electric utility is, in general, defined as any company which owns facilities for the generation, transmission, or sale of electric energy. A holding company is defined as any company which owns 10 or more percent of the voting securities of an electric or gas utility. Thus every company which participates in the pooling device for the development of an atomic-powered electric generating station may under the act become a holding company. Thus, under the law as it now stands, a company participating in the atomic energy program for the development of low-cost electric power could be subjected to regulation by one or more State commissions, by the Federal Power Commission, by the Atomic Energy Commission, and by the Securities and Exchange Commission. At the time the holding company act was enacted the pyramiding device was often referred to in the debates and reports. It seems to me that we have gone to the opposite extreme and are now in a period where there is a pyramiding of regulation.

I think we can all agree that because of the great public interest involved, every electric utility should be regulated by an appropriate agency of the State it serves; and that when it engages in interstate transmission or electric energy or operates facilities under license from either the Federal Power Commission or the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Government should effectively regulate such companies. On the other hand, I believe we can agree that duplicate regulation is expensive to the Government and to the ratepayers. Regulation can be carried to the point where, when as in the atomic energy program, speed is of vital importance the purpose of regulation—that is, the advancement and protection of the public interest—is not served but thwarted.

Make no mistake about this—the bill I have introduced today does not do away with regulation—it requires regulation. It does not free any holding company now registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission from regulation. It does not apply to any of the situations or abuses the Holding Company Act was designed to meet. It does not free any company from any of the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933. It merely says that any company not otherwise a holding company shall not be deemed to be a holding company under that act solely by reason of the ownership of 10 or more percent of the voting securities of a generating company if it meets these tests: First, all of the outstanding voting securities of the generating company are owned by 2 or more electric utility or holding companies whose facilities are interconnected and whose other utility assets are located within economical transmission distance of the generating company; second, all of the electric energy generated and sold by the generating company is sold to a public agency or to one or more of the companies owning its voting securities; and third, the issuance of securities by the generating company and by each of the electric utility or holding companies owning its voting securities is subject to the jurisdiction of a State commission or of any agency or instrumentality of the United States.

Under the definitions of "electric utility company" and "holding company" contained in the present act it is probable that many industrial companies which have no connection with the generation, distribution, or sale of electric energy would nevertheless, by participating in a pooling arrangement for the development of a dual purpose nuclear reactor, through a subsidiary, also become holding companies. To clarify the status of these companies another section of my bill provides that if a company's only connection with generation, distribution, or sale of electric energy is the ownership, directly or indirectly, of a nuclear reactor for the production of heat to fire an electric generator boiler, such company shall not be deemed to be an electric utility company within the meaning of the act and consequently industrial companies organizing subsidiary companies to own nuclear reactors would not become holding companies.

A final section of my bill provides that no other provision of the Holding Company Act is to be affected and that nothing contained in the bill is to be construed as relieving any company from any obligations imposed by the Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Mr. Speaker, according to Atomic Energy Commission officials, atomic powerplants in order to be made commercially competitive with large central steam-generating stations using conventional fuels, must be brought down to a boiler cost of from $40 to $70 per kilowatt—the cost of conventional boilers of the same size. The Atomic Energy Commission estimates that its first full-scale nuclear powerplant—the pressurized water reactor now under construction at Shippingport, Pa.—will have a reactor boiler cost of $37,500,000 for 60,000 kilowatts of electrical capability—over $600 per kilowatt. Public and private agencies should be given every encouragement to invest their funds to bring these costs down. It is probable that the hundreds of millions of dollars to be invested in the first several years will produce no return and will be in the nature of research. Duplicate regulation under the Holding Company Act will cost these companies hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Delays inevitable result from the mere fact of filing applications and clearing each step with several regulatory agencies. Perhaps other duplications in regulation should be removed. I am, however, at this time proposing only a technical

modification or clarification of the Holding Company Act because I am convinced that insofar as that act is concerned it was never intended when it was drafted and passed 20 years ago to meet a situation of the kind we face today.

I have called my bill the Electric Energy Development Act of 1955. While it is designed primarily to meet the situation which has arisen with respect to the need for the pooling of the resources of several companies, through subsidiaries, to speedily develop electric energy from atomic power there are other situations to which it will apply. On April 15, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced an upward revision of its electric power expansion goal, in suspension since December 3, 1953.

The revised goal is for a total domestic capacity capable of producing 150 million kilowatts of electric energy by the end of 1958. This is an increase of about 46 million kilowatts over the capacity scheduled to have been in place on December 31, 1954. In their announcement ODM officials noted that utilities have expanded their capacity tremendously over the past several years to meet the country's ever-growing need for electric energy, but encouragement of further expansion is necessary. They stated that at the end of 1954 the capacity total in the United States was approximately 103 million kilowatts and that in 1944, at the height of World War II, capacity total was only 49 million kilowatts.

The expansion of electric generating capacity by Federal Government encouragement was commenced through tax concession under President Roosevelt, continued under President Truman, and is going forward under President Eisenhower. Thus the dependence of an expanding economy upon an adequate supply of electric energy can properly be said to be nonpartisan and one which the members of all parties can work to promote. My bill would at no cost to the Federal Government—in fact there would be savings to the Government and to the rate payers—encourage further development of the Nation's electric energy resources from atomic energy, water, coal, oil, and gas. It would do this by recognizing that during the past 20 years the advancement in the art have been such that today the most efficient and lowest cost generating stations are ones costing in many cases hundreds of millions of dollars. In many areas the development of such large-scale plants are beyond the financial resources of any one company. My bill recognizes this fact and permits a pooling of financial resources by two or more companies in those cases where the public interest requires it. At the same time it preserves intact all existing regulation exercised by the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the various State commissions.

Great Britain, as many Members know, has announced that it proposes to spend $840 million to build 12 nuclear power stations with a capacity of between 1½ and 2 million kilowatts. Russia boasts that it already has a nuclear power station in operation. Many other foreign countries are said to be going forward with programs for nuclear reactors. I believe that we in the United States must stay ahead in this race. We can do it through legislation of the kind I have introduced today at no cost to overburdened taxpayers. I ask the support of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 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 SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK in two instances and to include an article in each.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.

Mr. SIKES and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include an article, notwithstanding that it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $300.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. CELLER on two subjects.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include an article by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mrs. KNUTSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 18, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

807. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, involving an increase of $3,734,735 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

808. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment for the fiscal year 1956 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

809. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

810. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

811. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Material), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

812. A letter from the Assistant to the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions relative to the registration and the regulation of the practice of architects and professional engineers"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

813. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 29, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Bad River, Wis., for flood control with particular reference to Mellen and Odanah and vicinities. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on April 6, 1946. It is also submitted in partial response to a preliminary examination and survey of all streams and rivers and tributaries flowing into Lake Superior in Ashland, Bayfield, or Douglas Counties, Wis., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 165), and ordered to be printed with three illustrations; to the Committee on Public Works.

814. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

815. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 246. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5715, a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4630. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 296. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the Winter Olympic Games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. Senate Joint Resolution 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2973. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education; with amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4576. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay indemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema; without amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6286. A bill to protect the public health by providing for grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 6287. 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 6288. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 6289. A bill to repeal the excise tax on the transportation of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6290. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6291. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 6292. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 6293. A bill to continue and extend Federal oil and gas lease No. 03607 under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 6294. A bill to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6295. 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; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 6296. A bill to amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 5 years the authority under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6297. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6298. A bill to amend section 601 (g) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes" approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit transfer of war housing projects to the City of Moses Lake, Wash., and to other communities similarly situated; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 6299. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 6300. A bill to amend section 1231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 6301. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 6302. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6303. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain real property by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6304. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make loans to assist students in pursuing courses at colleges and universities in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PROUTY (by request):

H. R. 6305. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "An act to aid to State or Territorial homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6306. A bill to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 6307. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 6308. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study the effect on the private shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government shipyards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 6309. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 6310. A bill to increase the income limitations governing the payment of pension to widows of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6311. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6312. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. J. Res. 306. 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; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 307. 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; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. J. Res. 308. 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; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Res. 247. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the advisability and feasibility of a governmental lottery; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 6313. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:

H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6315. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Andreas Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomye Kawase Macy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 6317. A bill for the relief of the Memphis Stone & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 6318. A bill to authorize Col. Jay P. Thomas, United States Air Force, to accept the Military Medal and Air Force Wings awarded him by the Republic of Chile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6319. A bill for the relief of Jean Taylor Wandish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Sook Chur Chiang, alias Sook Chur York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6322. A bill for the relief of Millard F. Blanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 6323. A bill for the relief of Friedel Fraas and her daughter, Shirley Ila Maria Fraas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6324. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kit Ling Wong Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6325. A bill for the relief of Lino Aguilon Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

266. By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: Petition of Charles B. Pritchard, president, Local No. 201, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, and 140 employees of the Cleveland Worsted Mills Co., Annevar plant, Ravenna, Ohio, urging the establishment of Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and labor.

267. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 141 residents of the State of Washington to exercise the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. By Mr. McVEY: Petition of F. H. White and 273 residents of Fourth District of Illinois who are desirous of seeing early enactment by the Congress of H. R. 3087 and H. R. 757, relative to railroad retirement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

269. By Mr. METCALF: Petition of citizens of Montana requesting an investigation of the administration of the Bankhead-Jones land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

270. By Mr. WATTS: Petition of various citizens of Lancaster, Ky., in support of legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

271. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, St. Matthew's Holy Name Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

272. Also, petition of the recording secretary general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution pertaining to the Bricker amendment, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

273. Also, petition of Leodegario M. Radaza, Poblacion, La Paz, Leyte, Philippines, requesting that service by his father in the Native Volunteers be considered as service in the United States Army, and that he be entitled to death claim compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

274. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Texas Medical Association, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted by the Texas Medical Association at its 88th annual session at Fort Worth, Tex., April 24–27, expressing its strong opposition to the compulsory extension of the social-security system of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Immigration and Naturalization Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, over the week-end, May 6 to 8, the executive board of the American Jewish Committee, a very fine and reputable organization, of which I am privileged to be an officer, held a meeting in Washington, D. C.

On the evening of May 7, the executive board sponsored a dinner at which Mr. Irving Engel, president of the American Jewish Committee, made a report on the current status of various public issues, and at which I, too, made a few remarks. A major portion of Mr. Engel's report dealt with our immigration and naturalization policies, which was also the subject of my remarks on that occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Engel's address dealing with immigration be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the remarks I made on the same subject.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY IRVING M. ENGEL

America's immigration policies—as reflected in the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and the operation of the Refugee Relief Act—cannot escape indictment as hurtful to the security of the free world. A 2-year review of their impact demonstrates that both have had the net effect of crippling our cold-war effort against communism.

The most hopeful sight in this dark picture is the fact that the Corsi affair has aroused nationwide concern that is shared by the administration and both political parties. Corsi's ouster should be understood as a final dramatic warning lest our so-called immigration and refugee relief acts be woven into a redtape curtain around the United States. Among the very people we should be welcoming to our side in the cold war are thousands of anti-Communists who have risked their lives to escape. Communist minefields could not stop them but the heartlessness of some American bureaucrats and lawmakers is preventing those would-be allies of the free world from joining us. Our own policies may thus prove the greatest boon to communism by setting up conditions that are practically impossible for refugees and escapees to meet. Communists are exploiting this opportunity militantly. With alarming success, they are propagandizing the thousands of people who fled from their rule but have been languishing in limbo for months and even years because we are denying them entry. The magnitude of this defeat cannot be underestimated because it will deter countless others behind the Iron Curtain from seeking asylum.

For its services in alerting America to these facts, the New York Times is to be commended. Its special reports from Munich on the plight of tens of thousands of refugees from the Soviet Union and its satellites should be studied by the Congress.

When Corsi sought to cut down the redtape curtain he not only encountered resistance, but was ousted as a reward for his efforts to bring about a long overdue liberalization of the law's operation.

Equally harmful is the McCarran-Walter Act which continues to deny us the benefits of a desirable flow of immigrants from the free world. Its racist and other repressive features are denying America fresh opportunities to attract people who will continue the process of enrichment just as has been done by immigrants in decades past. Apart from humanitarian reasons which urge us to admit these people, we should do so because it will be to our national interest. History proves how much of our well-being this Nation owes to immigrants and their descendants for their contributions to our economic and cultural progress and to our scientific preeminence in the fields of medicine, atomic research, electronics, etc.

Despite the fact that the President and members of both political parties have repeatedly emphasized the need to revise these harsh and unreasoning statutes and their administration, they remain unchanged. The American Jewish Committee believes that when the Senate Judiciary Committee opens hearings on measures to improve our immi-

gration policies, it will have the opportunity to emphasize the grave threats to American security that have resulted from these policies.

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, AT DINNER MEETING OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE BOARD, SHOREHAM HOTEL, MAY 7, 1955

I am glad to be able to be here tonight with you, Irving, and with so many old and true friends.

I had not expected to have this pleasure, but events arranged themselves so that I could.

There are many subjects I would like to discuss with you tonight, but unscheduled as I am, I am only going to discuss briefly one matter close to my heart, in which I know the AJC has a deep interest, too.

It is now 3 years since the passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, a bill which was passed over President Truman's veto in the summer of 1952.

Our experience with this dreadful law has fully justified the opposition which the American Jewish Committee and which I, and other Members of the Senate, expressed at the time of passage.

I will always remember one of the last appearances in the Senate of the late beloved Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut—perhaps it was the last one before his untimely death—when he spoke out and voted against the McCarran-Walter Act. How true was his vision and that of your own organization which fought valiantly against that law.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act, the name of the United States has been besmirched abroad. And here at home, we have seen numberless cases of injustice and heartbreak.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle here are treated. It is harder for them to be admitted into the United States than for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle—that is, unless they are Basque sheepherders.

Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of illegal immigrants have streamed across the Mexican and Canadian borders, unchecked and unscreened—without arousing major protest from the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act.

It is unnecessary for me to prove my point, although I wish I had time to tell you about some of the heartbreaking cases which come to my attention almost every day as a result of the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act—cases not only of aliens, but of American citizens—and not only of naturalized American citizens, but of native-born American citizens.

The victims of the McCarran-Walter Act are legion. But grant as the injury to individuals has been, the injury to the United States has been greater. That damage has been incalculable. We have given the Communists a club to beat us with.

We passed the Refugee Relief Act in 1953. We had to pass that act because the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act was obstructing the foreign policy of the United States. We were encouraging people to flee from behind the Iron Curtain, but could not admit any of them into the United States after they had escaped from tyranny.

When the Refugee Relief Act was signed, we told the world that we were going to do our part in providing asylum for the escapees from Soviet slavery. I need not tell you what happened after that. If a Nation could blush we should blush with shame, although there were some few of us who predicted what was going to happen under the Refugee Relief Act. It was a bad law, badly administered.

After the refugee relief program was shown to be a fiasco, the administration tried to cover up by hiring Mr. Edward Corsi, who was a known friend of immigration. Mr. Corsi didn't last very long. He lasted long enough to be disillusioned.

The refugee relief program has been a fiasco as far as bringing in refugees and escapees is concerned. In about two years, approximately 1,000 refugees and escapees have been actually admitted. Some relatives have been admitted, but they could have been admitted even under the McCarran-Walter Act if they waited long enough.

It is a scandal—a scandal at home and a scandal abroad. We should all be ashamed for our country.

But to be ashamed is not enough. We must act. There is still some time to salvage the refugee relief program by the enactment of appropriate amendments.

We can, and should intensify our efforts to overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act and to cut out the cancerous national origins quota system and to abolish the incredible encroachments upon the status of American citizenship.

I hope the American-Jewish Committee and all organizations will join with me in insisting on appropriate hearings on this legislation, and on congressional action. We can and should insist that the administration make good its pledges on this front. Noble sentiments by the President are no substitute for effective leadership on his part to get Congress to act—and to act now.

But I have no illusions. We have some chance of getting some minor amendments to both the Refugee Relief Act and the McCarran-Walter Act approved during this Congress.

We have very little chance—practically none—of getting to the heart of the matter during this Congress. And when I say the heart of the matter, I mean the national origins quota system and the second-class citizenship status for naturalized citizens.

Before we succeed in getting legislation which will remedy these defects in present law, we will need a long and intensive period of public education.

Members of the Congress will need to hear from the people back home; and the people back home—in the West, the Midwest, the South, and the Southwest—will need to know the facts.

I am sure that the American Jewish Committee will continue to do its part in this process of nationwide education and will join other organizations in furthering this vital cause.

This is imperative for us, not as Jews, but as Americans—Americans concerned above all for the principles of justice, equity, and humanitarianism at home and abroad.

Address Delivered by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Cleveland Engineering Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address I delivered last evening before the Cleveland Engineering Society, at Cleveland, Ohio.

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

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE CLEVELAND ENGINEERING SOCIETY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 16, 1955

Mr. Chairman, members of the Cleveland Engineering Society, and fellow Americans, Secretary of State Dulles has returned from Europe with a report of substantial progress of the free world as a result of recent conferences he attended. There have also been active and continuing Communist countermoves.

During the 2 years this administration has been in power much has been accomplished toward building an effective collective security system in Asia and in strengthening the defense of Europe.

On January 26, 1954, the Korean Mutual Defense Pact was added to the already existing Philippine, Japanese, and Anzus (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Pacts which were ratified in 1952. This year the gap was filled by ratification of the Southeast Asian Pact at Manila and by the Mutual Defense Pact with the Republic of China.

The effort of the Soviet Union will be the neutralization of Austria (already accomplished) and the same status for Yugoslavia, Germany, Norway, and Denmark.

The Soviet Union, in order to gain the neutralization of Austria, was willing to pay the price of having Soviet forces removed from that country simultaneously with the removal of United States, British, and French forces. The people of Austria are pleased to be free of Soviet occupation, even though they recognize their proximity to Communist satellite territory.

It appears that the Soviet Union intends to avoid the treaty requirement to get their "line of communication" forces out of Rumania and Hungary once the Austrian treaty has been signed by the simple expedient of having incorporated those countries into an eastern alliance as an offset to NATO.

Late this month Khrushchev and Bulganin will go to Belgrade. Their effort will be directed, I believe, toward the full neutralization of Yugoslavia. That country has never been a member of NATO but it has had a Balkan defense pact with Greece and Turkey which are members of the North Atlantic Alliance. If the Soviet Union could pull Yugoslavia away from this pact it would free Communist divisions from duty opposite the Yugoslavian frontier and make them available for other missions.

These two moves are only in preparation for the grand design of keeping Germany out of the western defense grouping. This would be considered a major Soviet victory, if accomplished. They are in a position to offer the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Germany if United States forces will move back to the United States. The Austrian example was and is expected to encourage Western Germany to follow the same example.

Soon we may expect a major Soviet diplomatic move to make a completely neutralized Scandinavian bloc. Sweden and Finland are not members of NATO while Norway and Denmark are allied with the West. If they could be induced to pull out it would weaken NATO (from a morale, if not a military viewpoint) and be considered a diplomatic coup to the credit of the Soviet Union.

These moves by the Communist world and our counterefforts will occupy much public attention during the balance of 1955 which may turn out to be one of the most decisive dates in world history.

Last Wednesday the Soviet Union proposed three United Nations resolutions as part of their effort to retain the initiative in carrying out their long-term policies.

When the veneer of propaganda is removed and the customary Communist technique of using words to confuse and obstruct

rather than to clarify and expedite is taken into consideration, the Soviet proposal is a fraud.

Their so-called disarmament proposal would:

1. Destroy freedom of the press, radio, speech, and public discussion in the free nations of the world relating to warning the public against the homicidal mania of communism against human freedom. It would gag the opponents of communism in the free world as they have been gagged behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control over such media of public information they have nothing to lose.

2. It claims a success for the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements both of which have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago, in which the Soviet Union joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of the country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. The proposals provide for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces in Germany back across the Atlantic to the United States (approximately 3,600 miles), whereas if the Soviet Union lived up to their agreement (it would be the first time in a quarter of a century that they would have), their forces would only be approximately 600 miles from the Elbe.

Such a withdrawal would also contemplate two Germanys (like divided Korea and Viet-Nam) each with its own police force. It would also require the withdrawal of the Republic of Germany from the western NATO defense alliance.

4. Under the proposal our overseas bases would have to be dismantled as a "requisite for discontinuing the arms race." We would trade a bird in hand for several in flight.

5. It contemplates that our industrial and scientific atomic know-how will be made available on an extensive basis to all Communist countries.

6. The proposal would result in yielding to Chinese Communist demands for Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, the Pescadores, Chinese Communist membership in the United Nations, and removal of the provocative Seventh Fleet from the Far East, all of which contribute in Communist eyes to the existing tense situation in certain areas of the Far East.

7. It would eliminate all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and their satellites, including trade in strategic materials.

8. All the above steps are to be carried out prior to getting down to the problems of an effective disarmament with adequate safeguards against Soviet deception.

During 1956, according to the Security Council resolution, the nations agree not to increase their armed forces and conventional armaments above the level of armaments and armed forces on December 31, 1954.

Since the free world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not it sets as the starting point for future moves a top-heavy Communist base.

In free countries the limitations on forces and appropriations is subject to debate and vote in parliament and Congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their "official figures" 1 month after the convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a "permanent member of the security council" the proposal is not meant to be effective.

Since without the balancing factor of the atomic weapon Communist power could already have overrun all of Europe and Asia, any limitation upon our development of this weapon and the testing of the same works to Communist advantage.

This is covered by the Soviet language in paragraph 5 wherein it states "simultaneously with the commencement of measures for reduction of armaments and armed forces * * * the States * * * assume a solemn obligation not to use nuclear weapons."

In the first phase of 1956, we are to abandon and dismantle all our air and naval bases abroad, and return 3,600 miles across the Atlantic and 5,000 or more miles across the Pacific whereas the Soviet Union pulls back 600 miles at the most.

The production of all atomic weapons to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Soviet locations are not known and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

The second assembly resolution makes clear that the effective inspection proposals of the United States in the atomic and conventional weapon field is still not acceptable to the Soviet Union.

With apparently no embarrassment, the Soviet proposal then sets up a limited type of inspection and control similar to that established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented any real inspection in North Korea, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

For the past quarter of a century the Soviet Union has violated 50 out of 52 international agreements it has entered into.

The $64 question is, "Has the Communist leopard changed its spots and carnivorous appetite and now becomes a milk-fed pussycat?"

I believe not. They now zag instead of zig, but their long-term strategic concept of the destruction of human freedom remains the same.

One of the most forthright statements of Soviet policy was made in 1930 by Dmitry Z. Manuilski in a speech to the international students of the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Moscow:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

By coincidence or otherwise, their present activities fit into this doctrinaire teaching of 25 years ago.

Just recently I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote, and I want to share it with you:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances, as well as those of my country and the entire free world, rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

We must not let our guard down. Our survival and that of the entire free world may depend upon how alert we remain to the fundamental strategy of world communism.

Early Returns in Registered Voters' Poll of Ohio Sentiment Concerning Formosa and the Coastal Islands of Quemoy and Matsu

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD results of a poll which I am conducting concerning the sentiment of Ohio registered voters with reference to defending Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

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

BENDER POLL SHOWS OVERWHELMING VOTE TO DEFEND COASTAL ISLANDS OF FORMOSA

Early returns in my 55,000 registered voters' poll of Ohio sentiment records an overwhelming majority in favor of defending both Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

My purpose in taking this poll is to ascertain the viewpoint of the people of Ohio on the three questions which are uppermost in everyone's mind today. First, should the United States defend the island of Formosa itself? Second, should we use American forces to defend the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu? Third, should we employ atomic weapons if necessary to repel any Communist attack on these islands?

To date, I have received responses from the first group to whom my questionnaire has been sent. This group includes approximately 19,000 Republican precinct committeemen, women and workers from all over Ohio. Their answers show that by a margin of approximately 10 to 1 they believe that our Government should defend Formosa. By only a slightly smaller margin, the same overwhelming opinion prevails with respect to the defense of the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

There is a substantial decline in the numbers of those who believe that we should use atomic weapons, if necessary, in defending these areas of the Pacific. Nevertheless, even here the opinion is over 4 to 1 in favor of using such weapons if we find it necessary to defend Formosa and the coastal islands.

The questions asked in the poll and responses received:

	Yes	*No*
Question No. 1: The United States should defend Formosa	13,723	1,282
Question No. 2: The United States should defend Matsu and Quemoy if Red China attacks these islands	11,425	2,829
Question No. 3: We should use atomic weapons, if necessary in repelling any Red Chinese attack upon Matsu and Quemoy	12,121	2,670

Here are some observations made by persons replying to poll:

"I cannot answer these questions as I feel that no ordinary person is in a position to do so correctly. I am perfectly willing to leave these decisions to our great President. If you and BRICKER will back Ike to the hilt, you won't go wrong."

Nos. 1 and 2: "Yes, if we have promised to do so."

"Please do all in your power to pass the Bricker amendment."

No. 3: "Tell them we will and if they continue, then do it. For once, let them know we mean what we say."

"We must make a stand—strike at military installations and save as much of population as possible."

"Give them the works."

"Supply Nationalist China with every weapon possible to defend themselves. We should use jets, atomic artillery—not atomic bombs."

No. 1: "Reason—Yes, for security and national honor."

"On Formosa, give all we got."

No. 2: "If necessary, for the safety of Formosa, use what is needed to do the job."

"I do not feel we should confer with Chinese Communists."

No. 2: "If necessary to defend Formosa."

No. 3: "We should use whatever necessary to save the lives of American soldiers."

No. 2: "Yes, if their loss would make Formosa indefensible."

No. 3: "Yes, if we are to defend them at all."

"We need the Bricker amendment. Please work for it."

"Thanks for listening to the public opinions."

"We have backed up so much now that no one is afraid of the United States any longer."

"We have given the Nationalists the cold shoulder too long now. Russia will use atomic weapons, if they have it, to help Commies."

"Kick h—— out of them."

"We've got to draw a definite line someplace."

"We must protect our interests. Protecting is not making war."

No. 2: "If deemed necessary for Formosa."

"Leave this up to Ike. He has access to important information which the layman does not."

"Unless a very good trade can be made"—No. 2.

"Only as a last desperate means"—No. 3.

"I don't know. I think I will trust our President and his advisers."

No. 2: "Might be sacrificed for cease-fire agreement."

No. 3: "Use for Formosa defense—not for Matsu or Quemoy."

"We should honorably avoid war if possible."

"No, we should never be first to use atomic weapons. Atomic warfare should be outlawed by all nations as barbarous."

"The real troubles of the world are economic and ideological."

"We appreciate your efforts to get the opinions of the public."

No. 2: "Think, depends on developments—leave it to Ike—with military intelligence."

No. 3: "Not unless they use them."

Nos. 1 and 2: "If it is part of our defense for the United States of America."

No. 3: "By all means, and with full force and effect."

"Whichever our President decides. He has the safety of United States in mind."

"Why wait until they use them on us first?"

No. 2: "It depends—did we agree to?"

No. 3: "If we're going to fight, let's use atomic weapons."

No. 1: "Yes, and the Pescadores."

No. 2: "But a negotiated transfer O. K. Not strategically located or important to defense."

No. 3: "Bad for propaganda in Asia."

"President's judgment should prevail."

"I will let the President decide."

"Sooner or later it will have to be done."

"Absolutely—we are committed."

"To destroy military positions."

"Let's go along with the President's decisions. I trust him, don't you?"

"Whatever the administration decides is necessary for the defense of Formosa. If we take part in defending the islands, we should use all weapons at our disposal."

"I do not think the necessity will arise, if we stop quibbling and let them know we mean business."

"Let's stop pussy-footing."

"Let's have more backbone in the administration."

"Yes, if it endangers protection of Formosa. Yes, if necessary."

"Atomic weapons—and use quickly."

"Defend islands if it endangers protection of Formosa."

"If not, they will soon take over the United States. I talk and meet a lot of people and they all think the Reds must be stopped."

"By all means, at all cost."

"Can't afford to back down again."

"I have complete faith in President Eisenhower and his administration to take action as they see fit in dealing with the Formosa situation. They have so many more facts and information at their disposal than I do that I frankly would be inadequate in expressing an opinion on these matters."

"Can't afford to back down now."

"It is about time we keep some promises we make. I think we should get out of the United Nations and get them out of here."

"I always sign my name. If I were ashamed to sign, I would not send it anonymously."

"Too big a question for a layman."

"Yes, if we must defend it."

"Atomic weapons only to protect our country."

"Atomic weapons if attack on Formosa or United States."

"The only thing I wish the United States to give the Reds is the atomic bomb by plane."

"Atomic weapons, but only if the military thinks this necessary, only on military targets."

"There is greater risk in doing nothing than in taking a firm stand."

"Referring to your communication, I certainly feel that Formosa should be our first line of defense in the Far East."

"Should pass Bricker amendment with 'which' clause."

"Use atomic weapons on Red bases, wherever they are. Fight the enemy wherever you find them."

"Pray to God that it won't be."

"Let's not ask our boys to fight with one or both hands tied behind their backs as Truman did. Sometimes I think Hoover's original plan might prove to have been the best for America."

"Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions."

No. 2: "If they are of great value for protection of Formosa."

No. 3: "If it takes atomic power to stop them, yes."

"To let them win here only means they will have confidence to go further. God gave us the atomic weapons to use; let's use them before they destroy the whole civilization."

"Let's let Ike alone. Certainly believe in democratic expression, but we elected a capable man as President."

No. 1: "Yes."

No. 2: "Whatever President Eisenhower decided."

No. 3: "I believe we not only should use A-weapons, but H-weapons if we defend these islands."

"Why debate about it? Haven't we become convinced by now that a leopard doesn't change his spots?"

"Our first defeat was when we supported Russia instead of Finland."

"You have the information, I don't. Use your own judgment."

No. 3: "Yes, if we defend Matsu and Quemoy."

No. 3: "Not unless the Reds start to use it first. I hope that atomic power bombs are never again used."

"God gave us atomic weapons. Let's use them with much forethought."

"Leave this to military leaders."

"I don't feel competent to answer these questions."

"Glad you are doing this."

"I feel a firm stand for our policy will prevent allout war. Communists cannot understand kindly consideration or gentlemanly conduct."

"Ike knows best. Only he knows about these people and what to do. If we go into this, let's win with bombs, not boys alone."

No. 2: "With reservations."

No. 3: "If the best military strategy says yes, then do it."

"How much longer do we have to put up with this treatment?"

"Communism must be stopped somewhere."

"We should be through playing."

"We have done too much appeasing, including that of our so-called allies."

"I voted for Ike believing him to be the man we as Americans need most for President and up to this day I still feel and I know I was right. So I have complete confidence in the decisions of Ike and Mr. Dulles. I thank God that they are in their respective positions. Success to you and Ike's administration."

"There is no possible compromise with communism, be it Russian or Chinese."

"We must draw a line somewhere and the loss of these islands could have a very serious effect on our allies. Atomic weapons as a last resort only and then only if it can be done without too many civilian casualties."

"Let's let them know who is boss, and quit fooling."

"They dictated first, second, and Korean wars; when are we going to say 'No' to them and dictate a little ourselves?"

"It is time United States does what she says she will do or else get out and stay out."

"Whatever the President thinks best—I agree with him."

"Are we committed to defend these islands? If so, yes."

"I have the confidence in you to make the decisions as the facts present themselves."

"Not qualified to answer."

"I am not a military expert—so do not know the problems involved. I hate war and do not know whether we could save Asia even if we did defend Formosa and the other islands. Let the President decide."

"If we do not intend to do this we had better withdraw from the Orient."

"Let us not lose any more of our world prestige, and we have done this the last 20 years."

"If we would all work for peace through prayer as much as war wouldn't that solve the problem?"

"Leave it as it now stands—in the hands of the President."

"Atomic weapons—yes, it would be a better proving ground than Nevada, and Ike should run for reelection. Show the world we mean what we say. Use some Teddy Roosevelt diplomacy."

"I certainly do not believe in wars to settle things, because wars never have, and our only son is now in the Navy, but what else is left to do?"

"As long as we did not have sense enough to stay out of this Asian territory we should keep what we already have."

"I do not feel as if I have enough information to decide such an important issue."

"Atomic weapons and anything else we can use."

"If we don't, we better quit and keep our mouth shut."

"Defend islands if it's necessary for the defense of Formosa. Atomic weapons upon military installations only."

"Atomic weapons—yes, if it is necessary. Especially V 4, I think we promised."

"Not with United States soldiers. Give them arms and ammunition. We had one nephew killed in service—we don't want any more."

"Would not trust Chou En-lai. Defend islands to have Formosa saved. Atomic weapons after opinion of Chief Radford and Secretary Robertson are given."

The Rights We Seek To Save

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention of the Members of this House to the receipt by one of our colleagues—the Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana—of a Freedom Foundation award. The award was granted for an article, The Rights We Seek To Save, which I am sure will prove worthwhile reading for all of us. I might mention, also, that Congressman BEAMER, in winning the 1955 Freedom Foundation award, finds himself in very distinguished company. Among other winners were General Ridgway, former President Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.; Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and Secretary of Interior McKay. The award-winning article follows:

THE RIGHTS WE SEEK TO SAVE
(By Hon. JOHN V. BEAMER, of Fifth District of Indiana)

Recently I spoke at a meeting honoring the Korean war veterans and it was a natural impulse to praise the valiant deeds of the soldiers of that conflict. At the same time, there was a realization of the honor that was due the more than one and one-half million battle casualties that have been spent by Americans since this Nation began defending its free way of life some 178 years ago. Many words have been spoken and many eulogies have been paid to these heroic sacrifices.

The impelling question thus posed is one that undoubtedly has been asked by each generation in each age of history. Why fight? And the answers have varied in different ages and in different countries. In some instances and, in fact, in far too many cases wars have been instigated by rulers with uncontrolled ambition to extend their authority, to enlarge their empire, and eventually to become world rulers.

The causes of conflict are varied even in our own history but, underlying the motives that appear only on the surface, there is one motive of a determination to fight for the rights we seek to save. Then, we wonder how we fight for these rights and which means of combat is the most important.

The struggle on the battlefield is the one method to which most and perhaps even first consideration is given. Those who serve in the legislative halls of the State general assemblies and in the Federal Congress are deeply conscious of the fact that we wage a continuous fight to retain the freedoms that have been our inheritance. The efforts of the soldier and the statesman are vitally important but the most important fight is in the minds of the people for the American state of mind.

Armed forces, perforce, must always be on guard. Men and women must be trained and be alert in their respective branches of the Armed Services to be ready to defend our land. The people who serve in the three constituted branches of our Government must be equally prepared to carry on a cold war against an enemy philosophy. This kind of preparedness requires planning, nerve and loyalty.

It has been stated very appropriately that the present time is not one to be devoted to a contemplation of the past nor an attempt to fathom the future. Today more properly is an occasion upon which we should repledge and rededicate ourselves to those enduring principles upon which our society is founded. It should be a time for a search of knowledge and free exchange of ideas in a spirit of mutual trust and confidence.

This planning concept of legislation should be surveyed briefly. The original concept of law making and, especially of Federal legislation in the United States was that there should be a minimum of laws; all laws should be fair, rigidly and impartially enforced, and that they should apply equally to all citizens. The concept that laws should be made for the benefit of any minority group—rich or poor; business groups or labor unions; white, black or yellow race; for any religious creed—has been resisted since the beginning of the history of lawmaking. When laws are made for individuals with an understanding that all have an equal responsibility under the law to look after themselves and their own property and family, and to respect the same right of others, then the signed concept will be retained to the improvement and the benefit of all.

The struggle for freedom thus is fairly definitely defined on the battlefield and in the legislative halls. But can we be assured of the same degree of certainty in the minds of people? Freedom has been classified in 5 phases: (1) a free mind; (2) free schools; (3) a free economy; (4) a free value system; and (5) free elections.

The earlier school systems developed and maintained a free mind when the schools were primarily concerned with the important proposition of teaching the elements of educating and developing the mind instead of attempting to build a new society. The free schools remain free only when they are public schools instead of being government schools designed to promote a special political philosophy that may be planned and plotted to perpetuate some particular group in power. Free schools are more nearly possible if conducted on a local level than on a national scale. Freedom of worship likewise is an important phase of this same freedom of education.

A free economy and a free value system in the current age are the complete antithesis of a totalitarian or authoritarian form of government. A controlled economy, especially in peacetime, conceivably is a determined and calculated step toward the abolition of man's freedom in production, conversion, and trade of commodities. It is apparent that national socialism and communism has as its first objective, the abolition of a free economy and free value system.

A realization of this condition and of the continuing fight for freedom raises the question—how can our Nation best defend itself? Armies and legislators may do valiant work but they cannot carry the entire load. The minds of the people well may be the strongest defense. After all, can our Nation afford to pauperize itself by maintaining enormously expensive armies and keeping the youth of our Nation constantly poised to enter conflicts against the forces of socialism and communism abroad while permitting the socialistic practices to be legislated into our economy? Of what value is the bravest and strongest American army on a foreign battlefield fighting against Communist aggression, if we continue to not only permit, but require, the Federal Government to interfere and force socialistic doctrines and practices on the economic and social lives of our people?

The conscience, the good sense, the minds of people must be awakened to the encroachments of these planners who would trade our freedoms for glamorous words, gaudy promises, and the ultimate slavery of complete Government controls.

Norway's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, today is the "Fourth of July" in Norway. Minnesota is noted for its high proportion of descendants of Nordic people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call your attention to the significance of this Independence Day celebrated by citizens of Norway in the Norwegian Embassy and around the world.

There is no national holiday in the world that is celebrated and honored more enthusiastically and sincerely than May 17, Norway's Constitution Day. And so it is this year, too. The day is marked by Americans of Norwegian descent at rallies in Brooklyn, Chicago, Minneapolis, and other United States cities as it is elsewhere in the world.

On this morning, every schoolboy and girl in Norway hops out of bed at the crack of dawn to look at the sky, hoping for a sunny day. But even if the winds are chill and the rain falls, they will march all morning in the school parade, to tunes played by the boys' brass bands, to celebrate Norway's greatest national holiday—the day in 1814 on which its constitution was signed.

The largest school parade is in Oslo, the capital city of Norway. Every year, at the end of their long 3-hour march, Oslo schoolboys and girls, pass under the balcony of the Royal Palace. Among the paraders are also students about to graduate from the secondary gymnasium school to enter the university. As the students march by, they cheer and spin their red and blue tasseled caps up in the air on the traditional bamboo canes.

Every May 17 from early morning on, the Palace grounds and the parade streets are packed with people. By 7 a. m. the churches open and crowds gather to listen to the choirs. Children from hospitals sit in special places

in front of the Palace. Everyone brings a package lunch, and grownups and children alike are excited and happy. Freedom and independence, celebrated this day, mean as much to Norwegians as they do to Americans.

In the afternoon, each neighborhood has a celebration of its own so that the children who are too little to join in the school parades may march near their homes. Everyone joins in the fun—waving the red, white, and blue Norwegian flag, leading dogs, pushing baby carriages—all heading for the place where they will listen to patriotic speeches and play games.

The Eidsvol mansion near Oslo, where the Constitution was signed, is now a national shrine. This neat, gray house with its rust-colored trim still stands as it was on that memorable day in 1814. Even the furniture is the same.

Freedom, independence, and self-government have long traditions in Norway. An ancient Norse statute proclaims:

> No one shall lay hands on another in his home, neither the King nor anyone else. If, nevertheless, the King does so, the summons shall pass through all the land and men shall advance against him and strike him. If he eludes them, he shall never be allowed to return to the land.

This and many other ancient rights were reaffirmed at Eidsvold. Four hundred years under foreign kings has not quenched the love of freedom. It was expressed in the nationwide call for a return to the law and to self-government.

The constitution of 1814 is one of the few charters of freedom of that era still remaining in force. Twenty years after its enactment, at a time when the tide of reaction was sweeping away all liberal constitutions on the European continent, a contemporary British writer and politician explained its lasting success in these words:

> All the essential parts of liberty were already in the country. The property was in the hands of the whole people. The ancient laws and institutions affecting property were in full operation, and they were conceived and administered in the very spirit of liberty. There was nothing in the condition of the people, the state of property, the civil or religious establishments which did not fit in with a free constitution. The new constitution was but a superstructure of a building of which the foundations had been laid and the lower walls constructed, 8 centuries before, by the ancestors of the present generation.

The Norwegian Constitution of 1814 provides for clearly separated legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. Inspired by the ideals of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution, the Norwegian Constitution lays down the following important rules: First, no person can be imprisoned without trial; second, freedom of speech, publication and assembly must be protected; and third, no law may be given retroactive effect. Norway is a free, independent, indivisible, and inalienable kingdom. Its form of government is a limited and hereditary monarchy.

Michigan Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to draw to the attention of my colleagues and the entire Nation an important civic celebration now in progress this week in my home State of Michigan.

As proclaimed in a concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature, Michigan Week is designed to focus the attention of Michigan citizens on past achievements and to instill a greater civic pride in our State and its people.

Michigan is proud of its achievements both in war and peace as America's industrial center. But Michigan Week affords an opportunity to outline some of our other activities equally important in providing a richer, fuller life for our people and the Nation as a whole.

The Nation's first regularly scheduled air service was started in 1926 between Detroit and Grand Rapids by the Stout Air Services.

In addition to automobiles Michigan ranks first in boatbuilding, auto trailers, gray iron, cutting tools, woodworking machinery, breakfast foods, and refrigerators. Eighty-one percent of all types of industry are found in Michigan.

The town of Colon is the "magic capital of the world," and Kalamazoo is known for its large paper mills. Midland and Wyandotte are leaders in the production of chemicals and at Fremont is located the Gerber Food Products Co., the Nation's largest maker of baby foods.

The only wooden shoe factory in the United States is located at Holland, Mich., which is also famous as a center of furnace production. Grayling houses the world's largest producer of quality archery equipment, and the largest packer of live bait is located in Port Huron.

Michigan ranks 10th or higher in the production of the Nation's 20 leading crops.

Michigan ranks first in the production of tart cherries, navy beans, cantaloups, celery, cucumber pickles, strawberries, and gladiolus for bulbs.

Michigan farmers have won the International Wheat King title in 2 of the last 4 years.

Cash sales of Michigan farmers topped $700 million in recent years, making agriculture one of the State's leading activities.

Michigan is proud of its record in education. Michigan State University at East Lansing is now celebrating its centennial year. MSU was the first land-grant college established under an act of Congress.

Michigan was the first State in the Union to provide for public libraries in its constitution. Michigan State Normal College in Ypsilanti was the first teachers' training school west of the Alleghenies. It was set up in 1849.

This enumeration is far from complete but it gives you a number of reasons why we in Michigan find satisfaction in marking Michigan Week.

But we are not living in the past. We look forward to the future with confidence. Our goal is to provide an ever-increasing abundance for more and more people so that our State may go forward with the Nation.

Following is the concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature proclaiming Michigan Week:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION URGING THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN TO TAKE PART IN THE OBSERVANCE OF MICHIGAN WEEK FROM MAY 15 TO MAY 21, 1955, PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ON APRIL 28, 1955

Whereas Michigan Week is a period set aside annually for citizens of this State to turn their attention to the social and economic resources of their State and examine thoughtfully the things that make it a good place in which to live and work; and

Whereas Michigan is abundant in the things which develop a great pride and loyalty in our State; and

Whereas Michigan workers have put Michigan at the top in skills and productivity, and Michigan has 365 of the 451 different kinds of manufacturing in the United States and the diversity of Michigan's manufacturing makes the State a leader in the production of gray-iron, cutting tools, jigs and fixtures, products of machine shops operating on a job or order basis, plating and polishing, automobile trailers, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparations, and salt; and

Whereas many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit, Pontiac, Flint, and Lansing—autos and parts; Battle Creek—cereals; Holland—furnaces; Grand Rapids— furniture; Kalamazoo—paper products and drugs; Midland and Wyandotte—chemicals; and

Whereas Michigan has in its Upper Peninsula one of the world's greatest iron ore producing regions and leads the Nation in the production of calcium-magnesium chlorides, gypsum and salt, ranks high in the production of numerous other important minerals and has the world's largest supply of fresh water for industry; and

Whereas Michigan's farmers have made our State the most self-sufficient food producer in the Nation, placing Michigan in the top 15 States in production of the 46 of the country's 50 major crops, giving Michigan an amazing diversification of quality agricultural products and an annual farm income of three-quarters of a billion dollars; and

Whereas Michigan produces the greatest amount of lumber of any major industrial State and consequently boasts of such great wood-dependent industries as the paper and the furniture industries; and

Whereas Michigan, bordered by 4 of the 5 Great Lakes, has the country's longest shoreline, contains more than 11,000 inland lakes, and more than 36,000 miles of streams, enjoys forests of unspoiled beauty, possesses an unparalleled number of State parks and excellent resort facilities, and offers visitors from other States and countries an ideal place for recreation and vacations; and

Whereas Michigan is the only State in the East North Central census district predicted by the United States Census Bureau to have a greater share of the country's population in 1960 and 1965 than today; and

Whereas Michigan residents are blessed with unusual opportunities to enjoy a vigorous cultural, intellectual, and religious life, with thousands of fine churches, schools, colleges, and libraries located within the State; and

Whereas Michigan possesses a long and illustrious history which began only 14 years after the landing of the Pilgrims; a history during which both war and peace Michigan's agricultural and industrial might and the industriousness and ingenuity of its people have stood in the ready service of our country; a history marked by a strong tradition of courage, freedom of spirit, and firm endeavor displayed by Michigan people; and

Whereas Michigan's residents should know and appreciate their State's unlimited advantages and opportunities in industry, natural resources, agriculture, recreation, and culture, and their State's fine historical background: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature urge all people of Michigan to take part in the observance of Michigan Week, May 15 to May 21, 1955, a period in which residents of our State may become better acquainted with the boundless opportunities present in Michigan, as well as all sides of Michigan's past and present greatness which may help bring about a deeper pride in our State's many accomplishments and an increased feeling of unity among its peoples.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower spoke the other day of an easing of international tensions, it was, of course, good news to everyone to have the President's encouraging analysis of the situation.

But there is nothing in the President's words to lead anyone to think that the danger of war is now over. While there is room for optimism, there is no room for complacency.

Responsible officials of the Government—in the military services, in the intelligence agencies, in the State Department, and in the various mobilization bureaus—are proceeding on the assumption that war is an ever-present danger. It is their job to act accordingly, and to base their decisions on policies which will assure maximum safety for our country under any circumstances.

This sense of preparedness, however, does not seem to carry over into the field of civilian defense. We are not prepared. We seem to have a phobia about civilian defense—a reluctance even to think about it.

Somehow this attitude reminds me of some folks we know who refuse to consider the purchase of insurance. They feel that if they buy life insurance, this will in some way cause their death—that the purchase of fire insurance will likely lead to a fire, and so on. Do you not know some people who seem to feel the same way about writing a will?

But I think most of us recognize that sensible preparation is still the best policy—that the Boy Scout slogan "Be prepared" is about as good as any we can devise as individuals or as a Nation.

But in the realm of civilian defense, our slogan seems to be "Be unprepared and maybe the danger will go away."

In our own West Virginia, we have learned through experience the value of disaster training. The coal companies and the Mine Workers Union have cooperated over the years on mine safety and mine disaster training which have been of invaluable help to the local communities not only in case of mine disasters but of any type of local emergency. It has meant saving hundreds of lives.

The Red Cross has also done magnificent work over the years in rescue and first-aid training.

The national civilian defense program, instead of concentrating on the development and expansion of this kind of work, however—training work which would help to prepare a community for any kind of emergency—seems to have been more concerned about developing some magic formula. First it was mass air-raid shelters; then it was mass evacuation of cities. Neither scheme seems to be practical.

In case of danger from attack, most of us would have to know how to assure our own survival. Our communities would have to know how to keep on functioning.

This kind of training has a big plus in its favor. It is this: No matter what happens internationally—whether there is war or enduring peace—it is information and skill which is always helpful to the local community—training for peace as well as for war. In other words, it is training for a better community no matter what happens.

New Merger Efforts Made by Bethlehem and Youngstown; Action by Brownell Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Brownell on September 30, 1954, disapproved a proposed merger between Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. on the ground that it would violate the Celler Antimerger Act. Bethlehem and Youngstown now propose to get around that ruling by suggesting that they would increase their combined capacity by 12 percent—adding 2 million tons of capacity in the Chicago district and 1 million tons in the Youngstown area—if the Attorney General will immunize their merger from antitrust prosecution.

How can the augmentation of a wrong excuse that wrong? It is to be hoped that the Attorney General will assert that such a transparent subterfuge gives no basis for reversal of his stand thus far.

The officials of Bethlehem and Youngstown have the temerity to say that unless their merger is approved and a violation of law condoned, the public will not get additional steel capacity. That must not be sanctioned by the Attorney General. Although the public needs more steel, the price proposed—immunity from antitrust prosecution—cannot be paid.

To allow this merger on the basis now suggested would decrease competition in the steel industry all the more, and would exacerbate the evil.

I urge Attorney General Brownell to make known immediately his condemnation of this proposal to get around his ruling.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, an excellent and stirring address on the subject of the free enterprise system of business, delivered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], on May 12, 1955, before the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce, prompts me to ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ARIZONA, BEFORE THE BALTIMORE JUNIOR ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE, BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 12, 1955.

Your invitation to address the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce this evening honors me deeply, for in doing so I am once again able to come to this State which figured so prominently in the establishment of the freedoms of our Republic.

While it is an impossibility ever to convey to you, to whom the State of Maryland is home, the immensity of the debt that we of the other States feel toward the valiant and successful efforts of your forefathers in the cause of liberty, the theme of my remarks tonight is such that they can be most appropriately delivered in this citadel of man's freedom.

I am honored, also, to have the opportunity to pay tribute, publicly and before their friends and neighbors, to your two outstanding Senators, JOHN BUTLER and GLENN BEALL. Last year, it was my pleasure to have worked with Senator BUTLER during his successful efforts to establish legislation which would give labor unions the mechanism with which to rid themselves of Communist domination, and I have long admired, as well, his tireless efforts on behalf of his State of Maryland.

The fact that Senator BEALL and I both belong to the same college fraternity—we are Sigma Chis—establishes an immediate bond, but my observation of his sincere work on the Banking and Currency Committee has nurtured the added element of respect for a job well done.

As I have already indicated, my remarks tonight will be directed toward an important aspect of our basic freedom: the freedom of enterprise—our economic system. My choice of that subject has been prompted by several years of concern over the attitude of the American businessman toward that system which has made this Nation prosper, and which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by any people.

In fact, it was primarily because of this concern that I ventured on to the rough sea of politics; and the more I travel that sea, the more I am convinced that the bland and careless acceptance of this system as something that will go on and on, without due diligence on the part of the business community, is the one thing that might ultimately destroy it.

It has been said that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. That not only applies to our everyday freedoms, but also to the freedom under which our business system operates. This is not to say that either one segment or one or two groups can maintain this vigilance in the protection of these economic freedoms; rather it means that you young businessmen gathered here in Baltimore tonight, and the millions like you across this land, must be constantly standing guard lest the soldiers of socialism overcome our fortress.

You might well ask at this point just why the Senator is so disturbed this fair evening. Is not the economy running at its highest rate in history? Are not the ranks of the unemployed extremely small? Is not the national income and the gross national production at a new all-time high? Why, then, should the Senator be disturbed to the point of berating you concerning your attitude toward the system which has produced this situation?

If that question exists, I can answer it by telling you that I am concerned because we, as a people, always seem to be relaxed in our vigilance when the going is the easiest. It is easy now to feel safe, to be complacent, but I assure you that those forces who would replace this free system of ours with the system of socialism are not relaxed or complacent. Theirs is a constant and persistent effort to lull the business minds into the acceptance of Government domination and regulation of our method of doing business.

Perhaps you have already so much accepted the extent to which Government has crept into your daily business lives that you now feel that nothing can be done about it. Perhaps you have forgotten the regulations, the edicts, the forms, and the reports of Government that now affect your daily business activities. If you have, then I suggest that you have been slightly brain-washed either by complacency or, worse yet, by an idea that we can be half socialistic and half free enterprise.

Still, I cannot bring myself to believe that you businessmen, living in this State which is part of the bedrock of freedom, actually feel that way. I know that businessmen from across the length and breadth of this land share your concern—and mine—and for that reason I feel that you and I should take the time to discuss our freedom of business tonight, and to discuss, also, the alternative to it.

Of course, businessmen across this Nation share your concern. As we in the Senate sit, day after day, through committee hearings, we listen to this concern and to the anxious queries of these brothers of yours from elsewhere in America. Listening to a series of witnesses appearing before the Labor Committee last week testifying as to their concern over various changes proposed in a law, I couldn't help but note the oneness with which they spoke. There was the crisp and clean accent of the New Englander; the slow and broad accent of our friends from the South; and, then, from across the mountains and the plains, came the voices of westerners. They all spoke of one concern: What would these proposed changes do to them and to the daily conduct of their businesses?

The law on which they were testifying was one of the many that, while originally intended to serve a good and laudable purpose, offers subtle inroads to the very vitals of our system. Almost inevitably, laws that have been enacted with lofty purposes, directed at correcting known evils of the moment, have to be changed time and again in order to justify their continuation, and, in so doing, in so trying to make corrections to corrections that are no longer needed, the laws become confusing and their effects on the business of this country become sharply evident.

One witness that appeared expressed this confusion and concern so well that I want to read now what he said. Mind you, this was a businessman of this country, speaking before a committee of the United States Senate. He said:

"However, where do I stand under this act? Where do these contractors stand under it? I asked my lawyer. He doesn't know. I could conceivably be the employer of the contractors and their employees. If I am, I'd at least like to get their names, because I'd like to know who's working for me. But, I may not need their names either, because maybe I am an employee of the paper mill. But, in that case, I'd like to know which mill, because I want to know where to look for my check. If it weren't so serious, it might be amusing to be an employee, who is also an employer of individuals who would be my employees."

That, remember, was an individual American businessman, who came to the Congress because he didn't know where he stood under the law, and because his lawyer was unable to tell him. It was never intended, under our system of government, that government should so inject itself into the daily lives of its business and professional people that such confusion and question would arise. It was never intended that government should inject itself into our business structure at all, except as outlined by the Constitution.

Yet, it has, and this example is only one of hundreds that I could recite. You, as business and professional men, know that Washington must enter into many of your economic decisions. You know that a safari to Washington is not an unknown activity, either by you personally, or by a lawyer representing you. We in the Congress know that a great amount of your time is spent trying to solve the puzzles that are bound to occur when the Federal Government oversteps its bounds, regardless of the purpose, and gets into the daily lives of the States and their business activities.

This is only a sample of the dependence the business of this country would have on the Federal Government if our free enterprise system were to be replaced by that system we know as socialism.

You may ask why worry about it. You may say that it can't happen here; that things are better than ever; that we will take care of socialism when the time comes. But let me tell you, the time has come; for there will never be a time when it isn't imperative that we defend and extoll this economic system of ours.

I suggest to you that Fabianism, which later became socialism, took a long time to take over in England; but when it did, it all but wrecked that once great force in the world's markets. It took from the 1870's to the 1940's, and all the time English businessmen said there was nothing to fear from those crackpots. What they didn't realize, of course, was that those crackpots were dedicated to one cause, that of replacing England's free system of business with socialism, and, being dedicated to that, they never let up in their efforts.

Why must it be that people who have, as we have, the greatest personal freedoms in the world, and the most productive free business system in all history, are so bland in our acceptance of these precious possessions?

These highly prosperous times in which we live today have come about because of our economic freedom, and it was the loosening of the shackles which bound this freedom that stimulated investment and confidence in our business structure. "What shackles?" you might ask. I would answer: the shackles of wage and price controls, and the overburdening load of taxation which was lightened somewhat a year ago, but which still needs more of its bulk pared off. These are but two of the shackles. There are others which, though less tangible, are in their own right, productive of profound effects on the economy.

One of the important things that has happened in the years since Korea is that American capital has been put to work, and American labor has responded with increased output, to the end that we are growing economically at a proper and safe rate today. Another—and, to my mind, this is equally as important—has been the realization that we are not dependent on a beneficent government which, by taxing away our potential future, has been trying to suggest that it, and only it, is the source of our economic muscles. We must never lose sight of this proven fact: the normal and free operation of our enterprise system has produced and will produce an increasingly higher standard of living for all of our people.

Now, let us compare the nebulous suggestions of those who would replace our business system with one that they suggest might be new, but which, to me, has all the old earmarks of socialism, with that proven fact which I have just mentioned. Mind you, I am called a reactionary for wanting to cling to our proven methods of government and business; but let's see who the real reactionaries are in this country of ours today.

I hold that they are those who profess to be liberals. They are the ones who want to go back to the days of bureaucratic government and a big central government with full control over our lives. These are the reactionaries. They want to return to what was discarded when your glorious pioneering grandfathers came to these shores seeking relief from the tyranny of big government.

No, I am not a reactionary; but I am a conservative, because I recognize that, after over 5,000 years of man's efforts to govern himself and to run his business, there have developed some fundamental truths. These are that the dignity of man and his freedom, which comes from God, are the ultimate ideals of any government, and that this dignity and freedom can best be expressed in the economy of the country when that economy runs as free from Government edict and regulations as it can. Being of that mind, therefore, all of us who would prefer progress under our proven system are conservatives; and I reiterate that the true reactionaries are the eggheads and the socialists who want to go back to the dark ages.

Remember that these people who advocate Government intervention in our business either wittingly or unwittingly go along with a large bureaucracy, because it is not possible to inject Federal monies into our business life without corresponding Federal regulation and control. In fact, it is not improper to emphasize here that whenever the Federal Government gives money to people in the form of subsidies, it is only giving back to

them, at a greatly reduced proportion, money which it took from them in the first place in the form of taxes; and with that same money goes the inevitable regulation and control by the Government.

Now who are these people who advocate a radical change in our economic system, and what, specifically, do they suggest as a substitute? We can best identify them as those who have gathered together under the banner of the Americans for Democratic Action, the ADA, although I will be the first to admit that there are others of their kind to be found in each of the two major political parties, and among a few of the national leaders of organized labor.

Business Week, in 1952, said of this clique: "ADA is too well organized to be called merely a group, too loose to be called a real organization. It is not a political party, but has backed men in political elections. It is left-wing but anti-Communist."

Now, ignoring their political manifestos, directed toward the social or the international scenes, I want to call your attention to that phase of their philosophy which applies directly to your business—to our economic system. One of the leaders of the movement, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., said in the ADA World, in 1948: "When ADA came upon the scene a year ago, it struck the American liberals with the impact of a new idea. The idea was simply this: That a liberal movement should properly devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties and to the democratic control of economic life."

To further develop the philosophy contained in this suggestion of the "democratic control of economic life," let's turn to a statement in this organization's program as adopted by its second annual convention in April of 1949, and I quote: "Government action is also required to eliminate bottlenecks of increased production. Government subsidies and financing and, if necessary, Government plants must be used to provide more steel, more power, and other vital necessary raw materials."

In short, what is proposed by the ADA is socialism, on the one hand, with the pious suggestion, at the same time, that they have some as yet undisclosed formula whereby this socialism can "devote itself to the maintenance of individual liberties."

The failure of socialism has been not only in the fields of economy but, by the very nature of its requirement of Government controls, it has also denied to the individual the freedom that our system guarantees as the dominant feature of both our Government and our economic life.

Certainly these facts are not news, as any student of history well knows. We have all read of the controls imposed by the nations of history on their economies and the resultant collapse of those governments. Babylon, Egypt, and the Roman Empire, of the days long gone, are glaring examples of the dangers involved in following the siren call of the Socialist, who promises everything to everybody. Modern England, who, thank God, saw her mistake in time, is graphic proof, at close hand, of the catastrophic impact of socialism on the economy of a country.

Despite these urgent pleas of mine, however, you may still be inclined to say tonight, as we gather here in this festive mood: "It can't happen here." If I were sure of that, and if I were not certain that great inroads have already been made into the thinking of not only our business fraternity but, more importantly, into that of our children, I would not be addressing you on this subject, nor would I be so personally alarmed.

I have seen enough, though, of the dependence of businessmen on the bureaus in Washington, and I have read the writings of too many businessmen who would accept part or all of these doctrines, not to be concerned.

Recently, I read a report of Opinion Research of Princeton, N. J., which gives me the greatest reason to pause and ponder. It is a report that I want to pass on to you at this time. Opinion Research Corp. conducted a poll of high school seniors in 83 communities throughout the country. When asked the question, "Is the theory, from each according to his ability to each according to need a valid basis for an economic system?" 55 percent replied, "Yes." Thus, over half of the high school seniors, the citizens of tomorrow, accepted the very theory that is the basis of Marxism.

Sixty-one percent said the profit motive is unnecessary to the survival of our system. Sixty percent said that the owners get too much of the profits. Eighty-two percent of the pupils said we do not have competition in business. Seventy-six percent believe that owners get most of the gains from machinery. Sixty percent said that a worker should not produce all he can.

This, gentlemen, will give you some indication of what we are up against, of how fertile the soil is for the Reuther-Keyserling propaganda.

How, then, shall we counterattack? Let's steal a page from the enemy's book. Let's live our convictions in everyday life. The enemies of freedom seize every opportunity to discredit our system. Let us seize every opportunity to lambast theirs. Indeed, not only to lambast theirs, but—and this is more important—to extol ours. It is far better to be for something than merely to be against something without offering a positive alternative; and by ardently advocating our own proven and successful system, we can drown out the lilting song of the sirens of socialism who would wreck our good ship on the dark rocks of their philosophy.

We must tell our employees and the public how our system operates—how they fit into the scheme, and how they benefit when capital benefits—how investment is the lifeblood of the system, and how investment creates purchasing power.

We must insist upon private capital developing the resources of the Nation, without reliance upon the Federal Government to accomplish this.

We must, as businessmen, become concerned with the problems of our communities, and with their politics, and with the politics of the National Government.

We must continue to demonstrate that free enterprise, when operating in its full and proper sense, contributes the most to the workingman, to the investor, to the public, and to management, and that all four are a team, each dependent upon the other for the success of all.

Profit is a necessary element in this operation; not only profit in terms of money, but the profit of advancement, and the profit of the maintenance of man's dignity through his ability to achieve for himself those things which need to be accomplished.

Deny Americans this reward, try to place all Americans on a basis of "from each according to his ability to each according to his need," and I suggest to you that the dignity of man will vanish from the American dream; and those noble aspirations of liberty, for which the famous men of Maryland's history gave their blood, will become another page in the history books of tomorrow—a page reminding men again, as they have been reminded in the past, that time and experience have given us the things on which we should hang our faith—that man does have freedom and dignity, and that these come to him because he is a child of God, and not through the directives of a bureau of the Federal Government in Washington.

Albert Woolson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay certain hospital and medical expenses incurred by Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., the last surviving member of the Union Army, resulting from his recent illness, and future expenses for his care and treatment. The committee report accompanying this bill points out that no precedent whatever will be set inasmuch as Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Union Army and the passage of this legislation is necessary and should be expedited.

Mr. Speaker, the beneficiary of this bill is a grand old man. I have always admired him. He is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. Today, at the age of 108 years, he lives with his daughter and son-in-law in Duluth, Minn. The closest VA hospital is in Minneapolis, 165 miles away. It is a long trip for an old man in an ambulance. Mr. Woolson's recent illness was a lung congestion, a dangerous condition in a man his age. When it became evident that his condition warranted hospitalization there was no time to go through the usual VA channels to enter the hospital at Minneapolis plus making the long trip by ambulance, about a 3½-hour drive. Considering Mr. Woolson's age and the gravity of his condition, the only thing to do was admit him to a non-VA hospital in Duluth. There is serious doubt that he would have survived the trip to Minneapolis, and it seems unreasonable to say of a man of Mr. Woolson's age and condition that he should have taken that long trip to Minneapolis thereby endangering his very life so he could take advantage of VA hospital care.

Under these circumstances special provision should be made to take care of the hospitalization and medical expenses incurred by Mr. Woolson during his recent illness and subsequent illness he may suffer. For instance, because of his age and condition, special nurses, oxygen, and other extraordinary hospital and medical expenses were incurred. The hospital bill for his last two illnesses is estimated not to exceed $1,200. Mr. Woolson will have to pay this large amount out of his own resources, or will have to rely upon friends, neighbors, and relatives, unless special provision is made under this bill. Inasmuch as VA services were unavailable to Mr. Woolson because of his great age and the distance involved, such special provision should be forthcoming in his case.

I think it appropriate to call to the attention of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Mr. Woolson is the last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic. He is the last of an era—of an Army, and if for no other reason that that he

alone represents a whole era of American history, we should make some special consideration in his case. He should not be forced into the position of forfeiting his veteran's privileges merely because he is too old and sick to travel all the way to Minneapolis—nor should he be taken away from his home and friends in the sunset years of his life.

Mr. Speaker, we always honor Albert Woolson on Memorial Day and on his birthday with speeches and words of acclaim. He asks for nothing more. But this is our opportunity to provide more than words, but rather a real helping hand in time of need to this grand old gentleman, the last representative of a grand old army.

A Brief Survey of Some Early Roots of the Agricultural Extension Service in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

I. THE FARMERS' SOCIETIES, FAIRS, CLUBS, ETC.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the beginning of agricultural extension work, broadly defined as the popular education of farming people, has been set as early as 1785, with the organization of the Philadelphia Society.[1] As might be expected, these early attempts to reach dirt farmers included discussions, exhibits, and fairs. They were more or less indigenous and local in keeping with the facilities of the period. Some attained more than local status, becoming in name at least a State society, board, and so forth. Several such groups existed before 1800. By the eve of the Civil War, some 900 local and county agricultural societies, and so forth, were more or less active.

In our State of Iowa, the Iowa State Agricultural Society was organized in December 1853 at Fairfield, Iowa, and held its first annual State fair at that place in October 1854.[2] The State fair was permanently located at Des Moines in 1879. It represents, according to Morgan, a step leading to the development of the present Extension Service:

> The education of the adult farmer and his wife was organized on a Statewide basis and received tax money for its support.

In addition to the direct education which may have been derived by the participating members and others in attendance at the several types of events sponsored, there were still other results, expressed by Dr. True:

> * * * brought a considerable and growing body of the most intelligent and progressive farmers into active relations with a nationwide movement for the advancement of agriculture. Through meetings, fairs, correspondence, publications, and articles in the agricultural and other papers they sought to make the public feel that the interests of agriculture and farming population were entitled to more consideration by Congress and the State legislatures. They were increasingly active and influential in the efforts to establish State boards of agriculture, a national Department of Agriculture, the teaching of agriculture in schools and colleges, the carrying on of experiments and scientific investigations for the improvement of agriculture, and the building up of agricultural journals and books.[3]

It is not perhaps surprising to find that public funds in modest amount were in some places appropriated for these groups, or that they sometimes were allowed part of the proceeds from the fairs and proceeds of sales of escheated lands.

II. THE STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES AND THE OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Other developments which contributed greatly to the later emergence of the Extension Service were the State colleges and the associated experiment stations. Early education was not always wilthout its agricultural aspects, even a strong agricultural core, witness the Gardiner Lyceum established in Maine in 1821 and the Agricultural School of Josiah Holbrook in 1824 at Derby, Conn. Private colleges, such as Rensselaer Institute at Troy, N. Y., and Washington College—now Trinity—at Hartford, Conn., were in part agricultural establishments as early as 1824. These and other such developments were not highly successful. The movement toward public support for agricultural colleges continued to develop slowly. Ideas involving an integrated agricultural college and experimental farm are credited to Elkanah Watson as early as 1819.[4]

It is not the purpose of this paper to cover the history of the developments which preceded—the Iowa State Agricultural College and Farm was established by law on March 22, 1858, and followed the establishment of the land-grant colleges under the Morrill Land Grant Act of July 2, 1862. That is in itself a long and interesting story. What we are interested in here is that these colleges strongly nurtured the experiment stations as well as agricultural education.

Agricultural experiment stations had been established at several or most of the land-grant colleges prior to the Hatch Act of 1887. Professor Hilgard organized such a station as soon as he went to the University of California; in 1875 he equipped a laboratory for research in agricultural chemistry and began field experiments on deep and shallow plowing for cereals. It was the staff of such colleges with their associated experiment stations, together with a portion of their trainees who were in due course to carry education by extension to the dirt farmer.

The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations was formally organized in October 1887. Departments of agricultural extension work were organized in some of the State agricultural colleges in the early nineties. Extension leaders in the State agricultural colleges who had been appointed to assist in farmers' institutes and other early forms of extension work attended the meetings of the college section—organized in 1890—but as their numbers and influence increased in the early 1900's, it became necessary to give them recognition by appointing a special extension committee in 1905 and by creating a separate extension division in 1906. By 1907 State agricultural colleges in 39 States were carrying on some form of agricultural extension work.[5]

The Smith-Lever Extension Act of May 8, 1914, which we will not discuss here, has an interesting history beginning at least as early as 1908, when a rising demand was indicated for Federal appropriations for extension work, partly to stimulate increased State appropriations for the same. An early voice in the discussion was that of the committee on extension work of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Sations which made such recommendations in November 1908. However, only the recommendation: "That each institution represented in this association organize as soon as possible a definite scheme of extension work in agriculture" was approved.[6] Much debate and delay followed before the Smith-Lever Act itself came into existence.

III. THE COUNTY AGENT AND DEMONSTRATION FARMS

In one fashion or another experiment station farms no doubt served as early demonstration farms. Even secondary schools sometimes had major farm enterprises. Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1903 report mentions that the Mount Hermon School, near Northfield, Mass., founded by the late D. L. Moody, had decided to establish an agricultural department and to offer courses of instruction in agriculture. It already had a farm of about 1,000 acres, a dairy of 200 cows, fruit orchards and a cannery for putting up vegetables.[7]

It remained for a transplanted upstate New Yorker to inaugurate what came to be recognized as a new and significant departure in agricultural education. Dr. Seaman A. Knapp, who after wide public agricultural experience in the East and Midwest had turned to a private agricultural venture in the South in 1886, used demonstration farms, about

[1] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 15, October 1928. He also mentions that a group of South Carolina planters interested in indigo began to hold meetings about 1740. Agricultural fairs were held as early as 1644 in New Haven, Conn.

[2] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, 1934, p. 3.

[3] Alfred Charles True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, USDA miscellaneous publication No. 36, July 1929, p. 24.

[4] True, op. cit., p. 47.

[5] See Gladys Baker, The County Agent, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939, p. 4.

[6] See True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 100–101.

[7] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1903, USDA Rept. No. 76, Washington, 1903, p. 72.

one per township in southwestern Louisiana to show not only that the area was suited to general farming but how it could be done.

Later, in Federal service working with the Bureau of Plant Industry, he set up several demonstration farms in the Gulf States to show that diversified agriculture could be feasible. All of this experience, both public and private, was basic to his new efforts, beginning perhaps about 1901 but clearly underway in 1903, to rehabilitate cotton areas which had been devastated by the boll weevil. Burritt says of Knapp's educational system:

To aid in securing local cooperation from the farmers themselves, Dr. Knapp established districts with local agents in charge, the district agents being lieutenants for the State agents. These local agents were preferably and usually local farmers in good repute with the people who had been practically successful with the control methods (for the cotton boll weevil) advocated by the Department and who had local knowledge of the problems and the methods of the people with whom they worked. They traveled from farm to farm and gave personal instruction to farmers who by actual demonstrations showed that cotton could be profitably grown in spite of the weevil.[8]

Another statement, by Dr. True, on this development is:

Professor Knapp established headquarters at Houston, Tex., in January 1904 and took counsel with farmers, bankers, merchants, railroad presidents, and other businessmen. Contributions of money, railroad trains, passes, and other aids were received. On February 19, 1904, W. D. Bentley was appointed as agent and served on an agricultural train of the Fort Worth & Denver Railroad for 2 weeks. Meetings were held in towns along the route, and lectures were delivered on cotton, corn, fruit, and forage, and other crops. At first farmers were unwilling to agree to undertake demonstrations, but after Mr. Bentley joined the farmers' union he had better success and gave demonstrations in about 10 counties in the northwest part of the cotton section in Texas. W. F. Procter and James A. Evans were appointed February 12, 1904. The latter has remained in the Government service in prominent positions in connection with demonstration and extension work and at present is assistant chief of the Office of Cooperative Extension Work. Over 20 agents were employed in Texas in 1904, 3 in Louisiana, and 1 in Arkansas. That year over 1,000 meetings were held, and 7,000 farmers agreed to demonstrate. In the fall a meeting of agents and more than 200 representatives of farmers was held at Houston. Profits from the demonstrations were reported, and the benefits of pure seed, deep plowing, frequent shallow cultivation, and the growing of home supplies were the chief topics discussed. In general, getting ahead of the weevil with early planting, early-maturing varieties, and treatment of the soil to promote rapid growth was the secret of success.

In 1905 the work was expanded to include Oklahoma and Mississippi.

In the early days agents worked in districts of 10 to 20 counties, and the demonstrations were carried on largely along the lines of railroads. The agents visited representative farmers, obtained their cooperation as demonstrators, furnished them with working plans, and instructed them in keeping records and making weekly reports. Each demonstrator was expected to grow from 5 to 20 acres of cotton under direction of the agent, who visited him at least once a month. Farmers met to see the demonstrations, and many of those present agreed to manage a part or the whole of their land under directions sent out by the department. Such farmers were called "cooperators," to distinguish them from the "demonstrators." A "demonstration" was the growing of a single crop under direction of the agent on a portion of the farm. The term "demonstration farm" was at first used to designate a farm on which there was a demonstration, but later was applied to a farm wholly worked according to the department's instructions.[9]

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1904 report called atention to this cooperation with farmers:

With a view to bringing directly home to farmers of Texas and Louisiana, especially those in the boll-weevil districts, the advantages of better methods of cultivation, the value of early maturing seed, etc., the Bureau organized an extensive line of propaganda work. The farmers in the various counties were organized and were brought into cooperation in such a way that large plantings were made under the direct supervision of the Department. Tracts of 5, 10, 15, and 20 acres were handled by individual farmers, under working plans furnished by the Bureau, the object being in all cases to demonstrate the practicability of growing cotton despite the presence of the weevil.

More than 5,000 farmers were engaged in this work, and the results have been highly satisfactory. At a recent meeting held in Houston, where more than 200 representative farmers from all parts of the State were present, records were presented showing the yields of cotton under the plans of the Department compared with old methods. The increased yields, ranging all the way from 25 percent to 100 percent in districts badly infested by the weevil, show that by proper methods of culture, the use of early maturing varieties of seed, and the application of proper fertilizers, excellent results may be obtained. A complete record of the yields from the various farms conducted under the direction of the Bureau has been kept, and a report embodying these data will soon be published.

As another feature of the work in the South, plans were made and put into operation establishing diversification farms at various places. The object of these farms was to show the value and importance of diversified agriculture. It was found unnecessary for the Bureau to expend any funds in the development of these farms, except in minor ways for the purchase of certain special seeds, and sometimes for special fertilizers where such were to be used. In all cases the business interests of the respective communities gladly cooperated with the Bureau to the end not only of securing a desirable farm for the purpose, but assuming all responsibility for its support. In every instance efforts have been made in organizing these farms to make them not only self-supporting but profitable. The main object of the work is to show that by diversified agriculture the lands may not only be improved, but more money can be made than in farming with a single crop.

Thirty-two of these farms have been or are about to be established, of which 16 are in Texas, 5 in Louisiana, 3 in Georgia, 2 in Alabama, 3 in Mississippi, 2 in South Carolina, and 1 in Florida. The general method employed in locating, organizing, and conducting these farms is to first determine in what section of the State the various farms are to be located. An effort is then made to find a progressive farmer who is desirous of encouraging diversified farming in his section, and who is willing to permit the Department to aid him in doing it. When a suitable arrangement has been made, a representative of the Department and the State experiment station make a thorough study of local conditions with reference to cropping possibilities, markets, advantages, etc. A system of records is instituted, which enables the Department to secure detailed information regarding every phase of the management of the farm and the results secured. After the farms are established, other farmers are encouraged to visit them, this being done largely through the cooperation of the State experiment station.[10]

A somewhat coordinated but not wholly distinct branch of the work was inaugurated under W. J. Spillman. The Secretary in his report for 1902 said:

As the work of reorganizing this Bureau developed, the need was felt for properly coordinating all the varied lines of plant work in such a way that they could be brought directly home to the practical farmer and fruitgrower in all parts of the country. To this end, I have approved the establishment within the Bureau of an office of Farm Management, which shall have for its object the bringing together in concrete form of all the facts developed in the Bureau as a whole, sifting the results, and applying them in a practical way where they will do the most good. To enhance the value of this work general studies have been inaugurated in the matter of securing facts regarding the way in which the best paying farms in the country are being managed, and what are the relationships of surrounding conditions, such as proximity to markets, ways of leasing or controlling the lands, soils, and climate, and the methods of farming followed. With the knowledge thus secured it will be practicable to lay out a working plan for a particular farm in a particular region, the object being in all cases to have such plans serve as object lessons for type regions rather than for individuals. In line with this plan there is now being undertaken in different parts of the South demonstration experiments for the purpose of showing the possibilities of more diversified farming.

With the cooperation of farmers, working plans are being devised whereby the present system of growing only one crop will be changed so as to secure more diversification, thus insuring greater profits and the building up of the fertility of the land. There are many thousands of acres in the South where the same system of farming has been carried on for years and where it would be a great advantage to inaugurate changes which would lead to the building up of the fertility of the soil and give broader opportunities to those handling the same. As a specific example of this work there is now being developed in the South, as object lessons, a system of what will be called "one-man" farms. These are small areas of land in the pine woods region upon which a system of farming is being developed of such a nature as to appear directly to the class of farmers who must necessarily handle such land. Instead of a single crop, simple systems of rotation are being put into operation, and the question of the proper stock to keep is being considered, all being of such a nature that the work can be handled by one individual. In other regions, where the conditions are different, more elaborate plans are underway whereby considerable tracts of land which have for years been cropped to cotton are being arranged for a regular rotation, introducing stock as an element for the purpose of showing the possibilities of

[8] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1922, pp. 154–155.

[9] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., pp. 60–61.

[10] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1904, USDA Rept. No. 79, Washington, 1904, pp. 27, 23.

such diversification and its bearing on the welfare of the different communities.[11]

The county agent in any form approximating the present was long missing. Nevertheless, his future place and function in the education of farmers was slowly but certainly evolving.

Burritt[12] states that the first county agent in the South was W. C. Stallings in Smith County, Tex. True dates this as of November 12, 1906, and indicates that the appointment resulted from a local demand for more demonstrations and more information than could be given by agents whose territory included several counties.[13] Burritt further states:

It was in Broome County, at Binghamton, N. Y., on March 1, 1911, that the first county agent in the northern and western States was permanently established; and this was by the chamber of commerce.[14]

The man was John H. Barron.

IV. THE FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND SIMILAR ACTIVITIES

Farmers' institutes were a major root from which the Extension Service eventually developed. They appear to have evolved at an early date. The duties of the secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, established in 1852, included visiting the various agricultural districts of the State and delivering lectures on the practice and science of agriculture. The idea was to have meetings rather similar to teachers' institutes, but upon agricultural subjects. The purpose of such early group meeting appears to have included at least the following:

First. To discuss agricultural matters among themselves.

Second. Establish a series of lectures on agriculture, agricultural chemistry, and geology.

Third. Conduct classes, especially for young farmers and women.

Fourth. Purchase agricultural books, to be read and commented on at meetings.

This early period may perhaps be best characterized as one of modest beginnings but one fecund with ideas foreshadowing much which was to come later. Consider the suggestions of George Boutwell in 1857 that six professors be appointed, representing different branches of agriculture, and assigned on rotation to districts, to visit farms, institute experiments, advise farmers, give lectures, and hold institute meetings. Some farm papers drew special attention to information regarding the institutes, among them the Farmers Institute, published at Mason City, Iowa.

Some statements by Dr. True perhaps provide a general summary.

The extension work of the agricultural colleges was an outgrowth of the addresses delivered at meetings of agricultural societies, at fairs, and at other gatherings of farmers during all the 19th century. From the beginning these addresses included some on the more technical phases of agriculture and its relations to the sciences, delivered by college teachers or persons having special knowledge of the subjects they treated. In 1861 the Michigan Legislature passed an act which contained a provision that "the professors of the college may give lectures to farmers away from the college."

About 1870 meetings called farmers' institutes began to be held in Iowa and Kansas, and these were gradually developed into a regular system of meetings under public control, organized and managed by the agricultural colleges or State boards or departments of agriculture, and supported by public funds. Whatever authority controlled the institutes, the officers of the agricultural colleges quite generally participated in them in the several States. The experiment stations made large use of the institutes for the dissemination of the practical results of their investigations. The Office of Experiment Stations therefore promoted the institutes and in 1903 under a special appropriation by Congress established a division for its work relating to them.

Following the decline of the lyceum movement, partly as a result of the Civil War, there began in 1874 the more systematic Chautauqua movement. This was not connected with educational institutions but consisted largely of literary and scientific circles, which were to a certain extent assisted by summer schools and correspondence courses managed by university professors. * * *

In 1896 the extension work was expanded in the State of New York to include (1) itinerant or local experiments as a means of teaching, (2) readable expository bulletins, (3) itinerant horticultural schools, (4) elementary instruction in nature study in rural schools, and (5) instruction by means of correspondence and reading courses. This plan was so successful that the legislature in 1897 broadened the scope of the work to include the whole State and agriculture in general. The appropriation was increased to $25,000, to be spent under the supervision of the director of the New York College of Agriculture.

That year, besides the horticultural investigations, 200 local experiments with various crops were conducted, 10,000 teachers were reached through visits to schools, lectures at teachers' institutes, and distribution of nature-study leaflets, 15,000 pupils were enrolled for nature study, and 1,600 young farmers took correspondence courses.[15]

By the end of the century institutes were held in all of the then existing States. Financial contribution from public funds were substantial, about $150,000 in 1899. In 19 States, mostly in the South and West, the institutes were directly under the auspices of the agricultural colleges or experiment stations, but in 16 States were connected with the State Department of Agriculture; and in 3, including Iowa, with county organizations.

Farmers' institutes were not initiated in Iowa until relatively late—1870—and then by the State Agricultural College as a more practicable method of meeting an urgent demand from outside the institution for a winter session. Thus the policy of disseminating information by means of lectures and demonstrations was early established. Farmers' institutes at Cedar Falls, Council Bluffs, Muscatine, and Washington were conducted during the winter of 1870–71. However, at a later period the sponsoring organization was the Iowa Association of Agriculture and Industrial Instruction.[16]

The Secretary in his 1903 report summarized the situation and the support which the Federal Government had been able to provide.

In my last annual report I recommended that an appropriation of $5,000 be given to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to undertake work connected with the promotion of the farmers' institute system in this country. The appropriation was to be used in employing an officer who would devote his time and energy to this work, visit institute workers and advise them regarding the ways in which the Department might help the institutes, study the problems of institute management at home and abroad, and seek to shape the Department's work for the institutes so that it might be most helpful to this enterprise. As the matter was finally fixed in the appropriation act, only about $2,000 of the income of the Office of Experiment Stations for the current fiscal year can be used for this purpose. This is entirely inadequate for the work planned, but will be used in gathering statistics of the institute movement and in employing, during a part of the year, an officer who will be retained as farmers' institute specialist, if Congress shall provide sufficient means for continuing the work.

Farmers' institutes are now held in 44 States and Territories, including Hawaii. Nearly complete returns from 40 States and Territories show that in the areas reported about 2,300 institutes are held annually; that the funds expended by the different States and Territories in support of these institutes (not including expenses incurred by local authorities) amounted to about $196,000 per annum, and that about 709,000 people attended the institutes. The number of students taking the agricultural course at the agricultural colleges in the same States and Territories during the year ended June 30, 1901, was 9,623, including those who are recorded as attending courses in household economy, dairying, and veterinary science.

The total number of persons reached by the farmers' institutes and the agricultural colleges (about 720,000) is, however, only a small percentage (7.2 percent) of those actually engaged in agricultural pursuits (about 10 million). The publications of the experiment stations are sent to about 500,000 farmers. A great need of our educational system is, therefore, wider dissemination of the results of agricultural study and research among those now actually engaged in farming.

I recommend that an appropriation of $6,000 be made by Congress to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to aid the farmers' institutes during the fiscal year 1904.[17]

Early in 1903 occurred an event which has been called the beginning of the county farm demonstration work. It is of interest to all those dealing with agricultural education but of very special and peculiar interest to Iowans. But before we plunge into it we must lay some groundwork. Iowa in 1902 had the great

[11] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, Washington, 1902, pp. 8–9.

[12] M. C. Burritt, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, op. cit., p. 154.

[13] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 63.

[14] Burritt, op. cit., p. 160.

[15] True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, op. cit., pp. 276, 277.

[16] True, A History of Agricultural Extension Work in the United States, 1785–1923, op. cit., p. 14.

In his other work, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785–1925, p. 119, he indicates 1871–72 as the beginning date but p. 158 says 1870–71.

[17] Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, op. cit., pp. 78–79.

fortune to acquire Perry G. Holden from the neighboring State of Illinois.

Of him, Russell Lord has said:

That a man of science, a promoter, a politician, and a stimulating teacher can dwell and labor within one mind and body is illustrated by the extension career of Perry G. Holden, whom "Uncle Henry" Wallace attracted to Iowa from Illinois in 1902. Iowa State College had no adequate appropriation for a professor of agronomy. Wallace's Farmer put up part of the money for Holden's salary for the first 2 years. At the end of that time Holden had 5 counties cooperating in the growing of corn, oats, and alfalfa and in the eradication of quack grass, and he had launched his famous "seed corn Gospel Trains." By 1906 his demonstrations, made on the farms of county poorhouses, were put on in 10 counties; and his corn-gospel trains touched every county in Iowa.[18]

But to return to 1903 and the origin of county farm demonstration work in our fair State. The Sioux County Farmers' Institute met in Hull, Iowa, on February 16, 17, and 18, 1903. On the final day, its assembly passed the following resolution urging the county board of supervisors to establish an experimental—demonstration—farm.

The resolution adopted reads as follows:

Whereas it has been proposed (proposal made by Professor Holden of Iowa State College who was present and participated during 2 of the 3-day sessions) to the members of the Sioux County Farmers' Institute now in session at Hull this 18th day of February 1903 to establish an experimental farm in Sioux County; and

Whereas it is believed that the board of supervisors upon request will set aside a portion of the poor farm for such experimental farm and appropriate money to purchase seed and to pay the extra expense incurred in carrying on such experiments as may be deemed best to be made; and

Whereas Mr. Harry McKee, the present superintendent of the poor farm, has kindly offered his services as far as possible without any extra compensation; and

Whereas it is believed that such experimental farm will be of great value to the farmers of Sioux County: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor such an experimental farm provided that:

1. The poor farm or a portion of it can be secured for the purpose.

2. That the money necessary for carrying on experiments can be secured.

3. That the experiments for the first year be limited to the growing of cereals, grasses, and vegetables.

4. That the amount of money to be expended be limited to $250; and

Resolved further, That upon the adoption of this resolution, a committee of two be appointed to present this matter with a copy of these resolutions to the board of supervisors together with a plan of action.

The Board of Supervisors of Sioux County did comply with the request of the Farmers' Institute as recorded in the county auditor's office, as follows:

April 8, 1903: On motion the board made an appropriation of $150 to be used for an experiment station at the County Poor Farm. The committee appointed to superintend this work is: J. C. Emery, H. J. Vander Waa, and H. H. McKee, county farm superintendent. John Boeyink, auditor; William Dealy, chairman of the board; Charles Harmelink, member of the board; William Shimp, member of the Board; J. H. Blatherwick, member of the board; John Smith, member of the board.

In the conduct of county demonstration farms the county furnished the land, labor, storage space, travel necessary in getting samples of corn and living expenses of college people while in the county and in addition the cash fund for incidentals.

We should perhaps note that Barton Morgan in his history of the extension service of Iowa State College, discussing the official creation of the extension service and its early development under Holden, says:

In 1903 Holden started the county farm demonstration work near Orange City in Sioux County. In 1904, 5 counties cooperated; and in 1906, 10 counties cooperated. The projects were with oats, alfalfa, corn, and quack-grass eradication. This county farm demonstration work, according to Holden, was the beginning of county agricultural agent work.[19]

But perhaps we should supply the story of that major event as Morgan was able to reconstruct it:

The county farm demonstration plots, or experiment stations as they were sometimes called, seem to have grown out of a discussion at a farmers' institute in Sioux County, at Hull, in the winter of 1903. The farmers were in the midst of a sharp argument when Holden entered the meeting. A Mr. Hawkins called upon Holden to give his opinion on the question of whether or not Ames was too far away and conditions too different for the experiments of the college to be of value in Sioux County.

Holden replied (Morgan, Barton, Notes on a Personal Interview with P. G. Holden. Ames, Iowa, May 23, 1932.), "Mr. Hawkins, you are discussing one of the biggest things in the world." Holden took the view that every county should put on demonstrations and have someone in the county to direct the demonstration projects. He would have this man advise the farmers as to the best solution of their problems and also to work with the boys and girls.

As a result of this discussion, county farm demonstration work was started on the county farm in Sioux County in the spring of 1903. County farms were chosen because they belonged to all the people and were centrally located. Field demonstrations and simple experiments were conducted with oats, alfalfa, corn, and the eradication of quack grass. Corn, however, received the chief emphasis. Holden was often called the Corn Man because he stressed corn so much.

In the fall of the year, large gatherings, or picnics, were held at each of the county farms to view the results of the work. From 400 to 3,500 people usually attended these gatherings. The plan followed was for those interested to visit the plots in the forenoon and listen to an explanation of the work by some member of the extension department. At noon the people gathered for a picnic dinner, in family or neighborhood groups. After the dinner, programs of general interest were held in which some local people and 1 or 2 from the college took part. (Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, op. cit., pp. 37–38.) Data from these plots were published in circular form up to 1915.

From a beginning in Sioux County in 1903, the work grew rapidly for a number of years. In 1904, there were 5 counties; in 1906, there were 10 counties; in 1908 there were 14 counties; and in 1910 there were 16 counties. (Iowa State College. Annual Reports, Superintendent and Specialists of the Extension Department, 1911. Unpublished, Ames, Iowa.)

While section 2 of the first extension act in Iowa made provision for experimental ork, the college trustees decided against experimentation in the extension department as it was otherwise provided for in the experiment station setup. The county farm demonstrations had in them an element of the experimental, but this work was finally discontinued in 1915. The county demonstration farms were however, a forerunner of the county agent plan of extension work which a little later came to occupy such an important place in Iowa.[20]

Thus, not only Professor Holden but J. C. Emery, president; G. A. Sheldon, secretary; B. F. Hawkins, N. E. Williams, and E. S. Boomer, of the program committee, and others, including substantial attendance from the Dutch population of that area, initiated a much larger "wave of the future" than they could have realized.

For it appears that Sioux County in cooperation with Iowa State College established more than 50 years ago the fundamental basis of support that is now being carried out in cooperative extension work throughout the United States. The Sioux County demonstration in 1903 was a significant event in the development of extension work.

The Sioux County Demonstration Farm of 1903 qualifies for the high national honor of beginning county farm demonstration work because it was:

First. Organized at the request and on the initiative of a group of farmers—Sioux County Farmers' Institute.

Second. Supported by county appropriations and land at the request of farmers.

Third. Conducted in full cooperation with Iowa State College and this cooperation also included support from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Marketing of Midwestern Fluid Milk in Eastern Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I noted an article in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune for May 11, on the editorial page, in a column headed "Minnesota Editors Say" which quotes from an article by Mr. W. F. Schilling of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

Bill Schilling, as he is known to all of us in the Midwest, is one of the pioneers

[18] Russell Lord, The Agrarian Revival, American Association for Adult Education, New York, 1939, p. 49.

[19] Barton Morgan, A History of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, June 1934, p. 24. Inasmuch as Morgan says "according to Holden," rather than taking a stand on the matter himself, we should note that the reference he gives is: Data Regarding the Organization of the Agricultural Extension Department, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa. Unpublished notes, Extension Service files, 54 pp., no date.

[20] Morgan, ibid., pp. 32–33.

in the dairy cooperative movement, and in the development of the splendid processing plants these farm cooperatives have.

Bill Schilling was attending meetings throughout all of the Midwest and oftentimes speaking to dairy producers' groups in the New England area when I was a very young man. I always admired his ability to present to any audience, in an understandable manner, the problems with which the farmer was confronted. He strove to improve the farmers' produce marketing. He was a great influence in the development of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, which is one of the largest cooperatives in the Midwest, supplying approximately 90 percent of all the fluid milk consumed in the Twin Cities.

W. F. Schilling's article has referred to the question of breaking into the eastern markets by Minnesota dairymen, and I commend attention to this article because Mr. Schilling has spent many, many years observing the question herein involved, "Can midwestern fluid milk be marketed in these eastern markets?"

This is a question requiring most careful study. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should make a very careful study of this very involved question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

But W. F. Schilling, of the Northfield Independent, is confident the best display of unthinking legislators in Minnesota was their vote of $30,000 for attorney hire to break into eastern markets with Minnesota dairy products. After paying $1.20 in transportation costs to New York, this veteran in building Minnesota's dairy industry says our farmers would have lost 77 cents on all their milk.

Although this proposal was simply political "bunk" Schilling heard no legislator raise his voice against it, although it would disturb the market and pit one group of farmers against the other and that spells disaster. If the country would spend a few millions making farmers get together instead of trying to keep them apart we would not hear so much about parity and farm relief, Schilling concludes.

The Precarious Status of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Struggle for Survival," pertaining to the precarious status of our merchant marine, which I prepared for the May 1955 issue of Marine News magazine.

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

STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

(By Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

That the privately owned American merchant fleet is engaged in a fight-to-the-death struggle for continued participation in the transportation of the world's ocean cargoes is a fact too clearly discernible to admit of any question.

Even the most cursory consideration of the possible outcome of that struggle immediately brings to mind a number of questions, the answers to which would shed a great deal of light upon the matter.

In somewhat logical order, these are some of the more urgent questions:

Why, basically, is it that United States-flag vessels, particularly in the so-called "tramp" trades, are at such a competitive disadvantage in their ceaseless quest for ocean tonnage?

Why are the coastal and intercoastal shipping lines, which do not have to face foreign competition, unable to achieve the prosperity they enjoyed in prewar days?

Are wage and overtime rates on United States-flag vessels the prime reason that our merchant fleet is being priced out of business, as has been alleged?

If wages are a factor in the difficulties of our shipping, is it the only differential, or are there other contributing reasons of importance to explain why United States flag vessels are unable to operate, much less operate profitably, without Government aid?

Once these salient points are brought into focus, other queries naturally follow. For instance—

If American shipping cannot make its own way unaided, is there justification for Federal financial participation, when there is an abundance of foreign bottoms available to serve our Nation's needs?

Will Government be willing continuingly to spend millions of dollars each year for shipbuilding and shipping, to equalize costs of constructing and operating vessels of the American merchant fleet?

Will these Government aids diminish in amount, or are they likely to increase over the years ahead?

Or—is the American Fleet of such importance to the Nation's interests, in peace and war, that it must be maintained on an adequate basis, cost what it may?

Exploring this matter of costs further, it might reasonably be inquired at this point—

Just how much has shipping cost the Government in the period since the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 enunciated the broad policy of Government participation to assure, in the national interests, development and maintenance of a privately-owned merchant fleet adequate to transport "a substantial portion of its waterborne * * * foreign commerce * * * and capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency"?

Is Government itself guilty of helping to depress the shipping industry by competing, through its Military Sea Transportation Service, for the commercial cargoes which the privately-owned vessels should be carrying?

What return have the Nation, and the Federal Treasury, received from the contributions made to the maintenance of the shipping fleet?

If you are somewhat groggy by now, as a result of all these questions, it is perfectly understandable. Maritime operations are most complicated. The problems are so varied, and their implications run so deep into every phase of American life, that one can readily rationalize the lack of appreciation of those problems on the part of the Congress and citizens alike.

Make no mistake about it, however, all the questions listed above and many others will have to be considered, and answered, if our privately-owned merchant marine is to survive.

If each of the foregoing problems could be resolved satisfactorily, one huge obstacle to survival would still project itself into the shipping picture. It is simply this—

Four-fifths of the merchant ships presently operating under American registry will have to be replaced within the next 10- to 12-year period.

At today's inflated prices, such replacement will cost 5, 6, or possibly even 8 billions of dollars, of which the Federal Government, under the provisions of the 1936 act, will normally subscribe between 2 and 4 billions.

A considerable sum of money indeed for the Government to pay. However, it is no more than Government spent to build a fleet of useless ships in World War I. And it is far, far less than the fantastic $13 billion expended for ship construction in World War II.

Orderly replacement of the present fleet, likewise, would prevent another recurrence of the obsolescence problem that plagued our Nation after World War I, and that hangs like an oppressive storm cloud even today.

There, as briefly as I could summarize, are the urgent questions that must be considered in any discussion of the American Merchant Marine and its chances for survival.

Now let's review some of these points more fully.

First, why are American ships at such a competitive disadvantage with respect to foreign vessels? The reason is simple. Because of higher wages and greater benefits to our seamen, and because of higher costs of supplies of all kinds and types used in shipping; and because, too, in great measure, of loading and unloading costs at American ports. Even in the case of American tankers, where stevedoring is not a factor, I am told that operating costs average approximately $1,000 per day higher than foreign costs on similar tankers.

A comparison of wage costs on American and foreign ships is most revealing. Data compiled for the year 1953 shows all too clearly the disadvantage under which United States-flag ships were operating in the world transportation field.

The monthly cost for wages on an American-flag ship, with a crew of 48, the report shows, averaged $29,426 during 1953. This was almost 6 times the cost on a British ship with a mixed crew of 80 men; it was almost 5 times the cost on a British ship with a white crew, or on a Japanese ship carrying 56 men; it was about 4 times the costs on similar ships of Norwegian, Netherlands, Italian or Danish registry, with crews of 41 to 55 men; and it was almost 3 times the costs on a French vessel, with a crew of 47.

On no foreign vessels were monthly costs for wages anything like the costs on American ships.

The coastal and intercoastal lines, while not faced with foreign shipping competition, run into bitter competition from all types of surface transportation, and are particularly burdened with high port costs, because of their many calling points. A promising development in this field is the roll-on-roll-off type of vessel, capable of transporting loaded tractor trucks and freight cars. The lessened labor costs, and greater security of such shipments, help to accelerate turnover and reduce port charges. But, of course, the initial cost of vessels and of the necessary adjustments in terminal facilities are factors that may prevent rapid adoption of this concept.

Recent conferences on coastal shipping problems, staged by the Maritime Administration, may help to bring this segment of this industry "out of the doldrums" of recent years. Certainly these conferences illuminated the basic problems in this field. That

is the initial step in any effort towards improvement—knowing the nature and extent of the problems.

Coming to Government aids and attitudes toward shipping, I would express several firm personal convictions which, if more widely held, would definitely clear the atmosphere. These are, first, that the majority of those who refuse to give reasonable support to shipping, or who do so reluctantly, are simply not conversant with the true facts in the matter.

Secondly, many of these persons, while champions of shipping or any other phase of our economy that is useful in war or emergency, promptly forget such service once the emergency ends. In the case of shipping, particularly, they will applaud the building of 5,000 vessels to win a war, but refuse to consider the harm they've done to the shipping industry by completely upsetting the normal supply and demand, and normal replacement procedures.

Our shipbuilding plants, so vital in war, have been reduced to an irreducible minimum since 1945. Their irreplaceable skilled workers have been scattered to the four winds. Ship construction expenses have "sky-rocketed," because, in the pressure of wartime, we were forced to build, and build, and build, regardless of cost. Now, with all those ships on hand, many of them anything but modern, we have been unable to carry on a gradual modernization of the merchant fleet, and the other maritime nations have far outstripped us. Our ships, the great bulk of them, are slow of speed, costly to load, costly to maintain—all of which adds to the competitive burden of wages, and so on, already cited.

In justice to the maritime industry, and for the information of our taxpayers whose tax payments are involved, the Government should revamp its fiscal accounting so that it could be determined precisely the extent of maritime operating differential payments.

As it is, there is much clamor each year over budget appropriations of funds to cover the operating differential payments due to the various subsidized lines. The House cut these funds last year, and the Senate restored the cuts. Now the House has cut them again. It has chopped $25 million from the $60 million requested in the supplemental budget to put these accounts on a current basis.

The basic reason for this reduction—which merely defers the payment of the $25 million debt to the lines—is that it holds the total payments for the year to exactly $100 million. Some of the committee members apparently felt that $100 million was enough to pay in 1 year.

Not a very businesslike or even fair manner for the Government to transact business, it seems to me. And it must seem so to the ship operators who must carry that $25 million of accounts receivable for an additional period, paying interest to the banks all the while.

One reason why so many people, in and out of Congress, question and sometimes vigorously oppose such payments to the ship operators is that they simply do not understand the complete procedure. A man who makes watches, perhaps, or bicycles, or any one of many other items affected by competing imports, will think it perfectly reasonable to request imposition of a tax on similar foreign items, to protect his company or his industry. Members of Congress oftimes will join in such efforts, to serve their constituents.

Farm groups demand, and secure, parity payments to equalize their net incomes with those of other groups. Operating differential payments to ship operators are in exactly the same veing as parity payments to farmers, or protective tariffs. They make it possible for American shipping lines to compete with foreign shipping whose costs are vastly lower than those of American vessels.

There has been a most regrettable lack of understanding among our people, and even in the Congress, as to the actual operation of the so-called subsidies by which the Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and other maritime nations.

I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recently the results of an audit by one major shipping line showing the favorable results to Government of this particular subsidized operation. Over the 1936 to 1953 period, from the very initiation of the subsidy program, this shipping line actually has paid back to Government $31 million more than it received in subsidies. This profit to Government was in the form of subsidy recapture, charter hire for use of Government-owned vessels, and corporation income taxes.

In addition to this direct return of the Government's "investment" in that line, there was a huge indirect return stemming from the continued operations of the line—the millions of dollars paid to its officials and employees, the millions of dollars paid to other firms for supplies, ship repairs, and so on, and the many subsidiary businesses wholly or partially supported by these payments.

While on the subject of subsidies, it would be an omission of importance if I were to pass over the question of ship construction differential payments. Over the 20-year period, such payments have totaled $105 million to shipyards in the United States, to equalize construction costs here with those abroad.

The Government has profited from these payments also, but no one has ever been told about it. Of the 107 vessels for which construction subsidies were authorized, more than two-thirds—74 to be exact—were taken over by the Government for use in World War II. Some were requisitioned during construction; others were purchased under the terms of the subsidy contract.

The actual savings in money, I venture to say, resulting from such requisitioning and purchase, would equal or far surpass the net cost of the subsidies, for wartime costs on such vessel were vastly higher. Even more important was the fact that the Government made use of these vessels many months earlier in the war than they could have, had it been necessary to build them.

Always overlooked also is the fact that the owners from whom these ships were taken must replace these vessels at premium costs and values.

One significant difference between so-called ship "subsidies" and subsidies paid directly to agriculture or, indirectly by tariffs, to many businesses, is little known or completely unrealized generally. The payments made by Government to the shipping lines are subject to recapture and actually are recaptured in large measure.

A little known fact unfortunately, for while all operating differential payments must be budgeted, and appropriated—usually after much discussion and occasional loud howls—the amounts recaptured are never publicized. They simply revert to the Federal Treasury as "miscellaneous" receipts.

Take the example as cited above; of $50 million paid to shipping for operating purposes from the inception of this procedure in 1937, through 1942, a total of $31 million was paid back into the Treasury by the shipping lines, through the "recapture" provision of the law.

From the time when such payments were resumed, following the war shipping boom through 1951, a total of $96 million additionaly has been recaptured, but again, without pubicity. Few Members of the Congress, I am confident, and almost no one outside the Congress, realize this state of affairs. And that is partly why there is so much resistance to these payments which have helped so tremendously to keep our American ships operating.

Nor is there any general awareness, in the Congress or among our citizenry, of another vast recovery of funds through the operations of American shipping. Because of previous neglect of shipping, our Government found it necessary to expend more than $13 billion for new ship construction during World War II. More than 5,000 vessels were launched, of which approximately 40 percent later were sold to citizens and to foreign nationals. The remaining 3,000 vessels went into the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

In the years since World War II, more than $500 million have been paid into the Federal Treasury by American shipping companies for charter hire of vessels from this fleet—whose only purpose, otherwise, is to serve in case of war or emergency. Again, most of these payments went into the Federal Treasury unpublicized. Only the payments to the ship operators were given prominence.

Which returns us to the thought expressed earlier, that our people should be furnished the full information on the net cost of Government participation in the financing of ship operations. Now they hear only half the story—the bad side, as far as America's shipping is concerned.

The basic shipping law, the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, authorizes a reasonable method of providing this information, and at the same time providing a continuingly replenished fund for Government's participation in the financing of new vessel construction. It is the ship construction revolving fund, which has been inoperative in recent years, but which should be reactivated as one positive step to aid in the tremendous vessel replacement program now confronting all shipowners. This revolving fund, once again in operation, would remove one great obstacle now hindering new construction: It would make it unnecessary to include construction subsidy funds in the budget.

Legislation which is proposed to reestablish this revolving fund would provide for deposits to be made therein of (1) appropriations for ship construction, (2) receipts from sale of ship mortgages (now totaling several hundred million dollars), (3) interest and principal payments on ship mortgages, and (4) charter receipts. Thus, as mortgages on new ships are repaid, the funds would go back into the revolving fund, instead of into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and there would be a continually available source of funds for new construction, with full information always available as to the net cost of Government aid to the industry.

Is the answer to all our martime problems, as has been suggested, even by some leaders who should have known better, to rely on foreign vessels to carry our commerce? I say, "No," on many counts. First, the allegiance of their owners and crews would always be elsewhere—as past experience has shown only too clearly. Once they had the field to themselves, they could, and would, charge us whatever the traffic would bear.

Remember when ocean freight rates were increased as much as 2,000 percent, and American docks everywhere were piled with rotting cargoes? And in war, these vessels would go dashing back to serve their own countries—possibly to be used against us.

Many a husband, father, son, and brother would be alive and with their families today, I am sure, if the United States had been reasonably well prepared with ships to supply our military forces throughout the world in the early months of World War II. We not only did not have the ships but we did not have the shipyards or skilled workers with which to build the ships so vital to our security.

No; it would be tragic to make that mistake a third time. Even though the total of operating and construction differential pay-

ments to shipping should continue to increase—as I suppose they will. Everything else has. And a point to bear in mind is that if we take all the alleged subsidies that have been paid to shipping since 1936—say $400 million in all, net—and if we were to add an equal sum annually for construction and operation aids each year during the next 10-year ship replacement period, it would not equal the amount we wasted through hasty, inefficient vessel design and construction in World War II alone.

Again, I am confident that the benefits to our peacetime economy during this next 10-year period—in jobs for shipyard, steel, and countless other workers, as well as the taxes that would be paid by the plants and their employees—would equal or come close to matching the funds paid out.

And we could look forward with confidence to any shipping needs the future might bring—competition to our foreign commerce in peacetime, logistic demands of our Military Establishment in war or emergency.

The struggle for survival will not be lost by the American maritime industry if our people can be given the full truth about the need for, and the needs of, the American privately owned merchant fleet.

And if management and labor in the industry, appreciative of their separate and joint responsibilities, will work hand in hand with Government in a planned program based on efficient operation and honest devotion to the interests of all.

Lack of Adequate Detention Facilities for Juvenile Delinquents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in my work as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am in an advantageous position to view the accomplishments of civic groups all across the country in their fight to control the growth of juvenile delinquency.

During the subcommittee's hearings last year, we found that one of the worst situations was lack of adequate detention facilities for juvenile delinquents. Recognizing the situation, the May 1955 issue of Woman's Home Companion has named Mrs. Nellie Maze Broderson, of Palo Alto, Calif., as clubwoman of the year for her work in leading a fight for better facilities in Santa Clara County, Calif.

Through her work with the women's clubs, she has been able to complete a program which would stagger the imagination of most people. Mrs. Broderson discovered a situation at the Santa Clara Juvenile Detention Home that needed correcting. There, she found delinquent children herded like animals, crowded together with criminals and perverts. Some officials shrugged off her complaints about the conditions, branding her as another "do-gooder."

But Mrs. Broderson would not tolerate this complacency. Instead, she went forth and rallied the people of Palo Alto. A minor miracle was wrought through the help and cooperation of the women's clubs, and of worthy citizens like Mrs. Albert Bonnell, Mrs. Frank Johnson, and Mrs. Jack Tuomy, presidents of the Palo Alto Women's Club; Mrs. Harry Larmour and Mrs. Harry Cox, presidents of the Santa Clara County Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Harold Kay, secretary of the federation; Mrs. James Corcoran and Mrs. Charles Burr, the Rev. Joyce Farr and the Rev. R. Marvin Stuart, Attorney Norman Stoner, Novelist Kathleen Norris and Manufacturer John Crummey.

Santa Clara officials recently set aside $750,000 for the construction of new facilities. It was a victory for Mrs. Broderson and a victory for all the women's clubs of Santa Clara County who coordinated their efforts to insure better facilities for wayward youngsters, in trouble with the law.

Mrs. Broderson has shown what an aroused citizenry can do to help solve the very complex and serious problem of juvenile delinquency. She has shown the way to thousands of other Americans who face similar situations in their own community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part of the article published in the Woman's Home Companion.

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

"KIDS ARE BETTER THAN PIGS"

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

Nellie Maze Broderson, unanimously elected the Companion's clubwoman of the year, is a gray-haired grandmother of 65. But don't let her age, nor her gentle—almost fragile—appearance fool you.

Complacent officials in California's Santa Clara County made that mistake 3 years ago—when she began to ask questions about the overcrowded juvenile detention home, the dungeon that passes for a county jail and the tax millions being siphoned off into the county fair—they dismissed her as "just another do-gooder." Today, sadder men but wiser, they know that—for energy, judgment, insight, and sheer bulldog perseverance—Nellie Broderson can outmatch most men and women half her age.

When she asks for the floor at a meeting she may seem merely a small unostentatious, shy woman with a trim, 5-foot-3 figure that belies her years. But as she puts on her spectacles and backs up her words with facts and figures, the room becomes hushed. Everyone in the region knows that her quiet, measured, persuasive voice echoes the consciences of thousands of aroused Santa Clara mothers.

Her persistence has proved catching. Dozens of women, hesitant and timid at first, have followed her example and emerged as leaders in a struggle to put the welfare of troubled teen-agers ahead of providing luxurious county-fair pens for prize hogs. Tens of thousands more, who joined the battle last fall forced through a $750,000 appropriation to replace the worst jail in California with a modern structure.

By a 2-to-1 vote they scotched an almost accomplished plan to install pari-mutuel racing at the local fair and thus prevented big-time gambling from capturing Santa Clara County.

* * * * *

Nellie Broderson is the first to insist that despite last November's victories, the women of Santa Clara County still have a long way to go. "The project for a new jail seems to be moving ahead," she told me. "The county has actually hired an architect. If we keep after it, we may yet see plans for a new building. And after that, if we maintain the pressure, the structure itself may actually materialize.

"But that," she continued, "will still be only a first step. We've got to win an appropriation for the new juvenile detention home. To retain or remodel the obsolete home is unthinkable. As we put it in a letter to the board of supervisors: as many as 10 boys must share 1 small room, sleeping in tier bunks. If a child has a cold there is no possible way in which he can be segregated for observation. Boys from 9 to 18 are kept in the juvenile home. Should a teenager be brought in under the influence of liquor there is no room where he can be isolated.

"The only play space available for 25 to 50 boys is a tiny yard. On rainy days these boys must remain in a small room 14 by 16, which also doubles for a dining room. Boys of this age have a superabundance of energy. Can you imagine the problem of supervising 50 boys in such a small area through 7 days of inclement weather—as has happened?

"We've got to move those neglected children out of their crowded warren, out into the country where they will have space to play and classrooms and all the other things that make for reformation, instead of hardening any delinquent tendencies.

"We women have got to recognize that our real problem, here and everywhere else, is the kind of complacency that locks kids up for months in iron-barred prison cells and converts neglected youngsters into permanent enemies of society.

"The greatest joy I've gotten out of this whole campaign has been that, here at least, thousands of men and women have learned that we adults are really responsible for our juvenile delinquency problems."

Statehood Vote Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES J. DELANEY, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times on Tuesday, May 17, 1955. I believe it to be a very satisfactory and comprehensive explanation of the vote on the Alaska-Hawaii Statehood bill:

STATEHOOD VOTE EXPLAINED—HAWAII AND ALASKA'S ENTRY OPPOSED BECAUSE OF THEIR NONCONTIGUITY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of May 12, Statehood Will Come, seems to infer that I voted against statehood for Hawaii and Alaska on the grounds of opposition to civil rights legislation. Certainly my record in support of civil rights is clear enough, and I cannot believe that this inference was intended.

Among the many reasons for my opposition to statehood for these 2 territories at this time is that of their noncontiguity.

On July 15, 1947, the New York Times published a letter from the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in which he said: "It is my judgment that to admit one or more of these distant territories to statehood would be the beginning of the end of our historic United States of America. We should soon be pressed to admit the Philippine Islands,

Cuba and possibly even Australia. We now have a solid, compact territorial Nation."

On March 17, 1954, Walter Lippmann wrote in the New York Herald Tribune: "* * * the admission of outlying territories to statehood would mean a radical change in the structure of the Union and of our external relations."

PART OF LAND MASS

The argument is often made, as in your editorial, that in the past various States were admitted to the Union which, at the time of admission, were not contiguous with the other States. However, no Territory was ever admitted as a State which was not part of the land mass which is now the United States, thus making possible the compact and contiguous aspect of our country as it now exists. No present State is noncontiguous.

To an appreciable extent our economic strength has resulted from contiguity. While air transportation is an important modern development, our highways, railroad systems and inland waterways carry the load of most of our commerce. Being noncontiguous even with itself, Hawaii will never have the advantages of these means of transportation, and Alaska not for many years to come.

As Dr. Butler pointed out, the admission of noncontiguous territory might well give rise to certain future problems. If the classic pattern of our country is violated, there is no reason why other noncontiguous commonwealths and possessions should not petition for statehood. To be sure there is the precedent that only incorporated Territories have heretofore been admitted as States.

FUTURE PETITIONS

However, that is not a constitutional provision and if the precedent of contiguity is broken in favor of Hawaii and Alaska, then Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa could well maintain that they would be discriminated against if denied statehood. Indeed, if the principle of contiguity is abandoned, it is not at all certain that future petitions for statehood would be confined to areas now under the United States flag.

Statehood is irrevocable—once granted it cannot be rescinded. Considering the present state of the world I do not believe that this is a propitious time to experiment with the basic structure of our country.

JAMES J. DELANEY, M. C.

WASHINGTON, *May 12, 1955.*

The Future: Sound as a Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an 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.

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

THE FUTURE: SOUND AS A DOLLAR

(By George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury)

It is easy to be too conservative when we think about the kind of world we will be living in 25 years from now. If we project recent trends, we are likely to picture 1980 merely as a "souped-up" version of 1955. This can be misleading. For the really significant features of 1980 are likely to be the unpredictable contrasts with the present rather than the similarities. If we picture ourselves back in 1930 trying to form an idea of the world of 1955, we can readily see how a conservative approach would have led us astray. Who, 25 years ago, could possibly have predicated the vast changes that have taken place in the world's political and economic structures; who could have foreseen the fantastic developments in electronics, antibiotics, or atomic energy?

I have always been skeptical about flat economic predictions; our economy is a sensitive and complex mechanism and any one of a thousand factors can affect its behavior. So I would like to base this look at the coming quarter-century on certain assumptions. There are, after all, some factors in the outlook that seem reasonably predictable even though they can't be projected exactly—the growth of population, the quickening rate of technological development, the rise in productivity and employment, the stead improvement in living standards. Assuming these basic trends, we should give them every encouragement in the years ahead. We must aim not just to maintain but to accelerate the favorable trends of the present. We can't possibly control all the factors bearing of the future, but we can work toward helping the world of 1980 become the kind of world we would like to see.

CHECKLIST FOR CONFIDENCE

A goal that may overshadow all others in importance to our Nation is the maintenance of confidence—living, enthusiastic confidence both for today and for the future. It must be shared by everyone—businessmen, workers, investors, and consumers alike. It must be contagious confidence and it must also be practical and justifiable. With such confidence, our Nation can move to new heights of production and services, create new and better jobs, and constantly push ahead on a sound basis to an ever finer future.

The confidence displayed last year by American citizens was a main reason the economic readjustment was not more serious. Consumers ignored the gloomy predictions of some economic forecasters and went on to spend more money than ever before. Investors kept making risk capital available. Businessmen went boldly ahead with development and expansion plans. They put large sums in plant, equipment, and research with the firm objective of improving their competitive positions in future years.

All of this helped to create new jobs, to raise incomes, and to advance the Nation's productive capacity. It enabled the economy to meet the needs of our growing population and was an eloquent demonstration of the life-giving role confidence can play in a free-enterprise economy.

How can this essential confidence be maintained and strengthened during the next 25 years? We shall have to keep working at it all the time. What is required most of all, I believe, is that people develop assurance on the following five major points. They must be convinced:

1. That their Government is working fervently—and successfully—for the blessings of lasting peace.

2. That the management of Government is in the hands of men of integrity and high moral purpose.

3. That the value of the dollar, with which all transactions are made, will be preserved.

4. That the dynamics of a free competitive economy will be stimulated by Government encouragement of private enterprise.

5. That future business declines can and will be held within moderate limits.

I would like to discuss the prospects for the coming quarter century largely in terms of these basic objectives.

A LESSON TO LEARN

The present high degree of national confidence derives in large part, of course, from the belief that business readjustments now can be kept within tolerably narrow limits, and that, in the future, serious recessions can be avoided. Certainly, events of the past 6 months have given people new faith in the ability of the Government to help moderate economic fluctuations. The fear of a reserve recession that was prevalent a year ago has disappeared, and for this the Government's monetary and fiscal policies can take partial credit. Will the next 25 years justify the belief that economic adjustments can be kept within reasonable bounds? I happen to believe that if we continue to pursue flexible and sensible financial policies the current optimism may prove to be warranted.

One major lesson concerning recessions is still too little understood, however. We have learned that when business begins to slacken—as a result of excessive inventory accumulation, overbuying by consumers, or for any other reason—an easy credit policy is helpful. The lesson that still needs learning is that credit restraint is equally necessary during periods of expansion, when the seeds of future troubles are sown.

If we are to reach 1980 with our confidence undiminished, and with the economy continuing to operate at highest efficiency, restraints on credit may be needed just as often as easings of credit. This is something to be expected, to live with, and to take into account in making business plans. In this way the Government can help diminish the maladjustments and excesses responsible for serious recessions.

A major factor in the maintenance of national confidence is people's confidence in what the dollar is worth. During the decade prior to 1953, the severe decline in the purchasing power of the dollar robbed people of nearly half the value of their savings. This inflation has been brought to a virtual halt, and during the past 2 years consumers' prices have remained practically unchanged.

We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not reappear. We must work to insure that the dollar of 1980 will buy at least as much food and clothing as the dollar will buy today—preferably and properly more. If that is done, all will share the benefits of increased productivity, and the saver who puts away a dollar for his retirement, to buy a house, to educate his children, for an emergency, or for any other purpose, will still have a dollar that is worth a dollar when he needs it.

THE STAKE IN STABILITY

This goal of a sound dollar has gained tremendously in importance during the past half-century. This Nation, since 1900, has gone through an economic transformation that far exceeds any other in the long history of man's efforts to achieve a better life. The United States today is a nation made up, overwhelmingly, of small-to-medium savers and investors. It is a nation of "haves" rather than a nation of "have-nots."

Since the turn of the century real income per man, woman, and child in the United States has tripled. And the lower and middle income groups have received the greatest share of this increased income. Early in the century, only 10 out of every 100 American families earned as much as $4,000 a year in terms of today's prices; now 55 do. Most families now have enough money not only to live adequately, but to save besides. That is the basic economic development that has enabled this country to reach fantastic heights of material prosperity as compared with the rest of the world.

The flow of small savings into an ever broadening investment stream during the past 50 years has been truly remarkable. Ownership by individuals in life-insurance policies has increased from under $2 billion in 1900 to more than $80 billion today. Small investors' holdings of United States savings bonds now total nearly $50 billion. More than 10 percent of all families today own stock in American corporations. Whereas in 1900 individuals had liquid savings amounting to less than $10 billion, now such savings total more than $225 billion.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the individual and the family in our wonderland economy. The "average" man in America has acquired a financial stake in the future such as no other "average" citizen anywhere ever had before. We need a completely new set of standards in thinking about ourselves and in defining the "general interest." This Nation's economy only has grown right over, and left in the dust, both socialism and communism.

FROM THE BOTTOM UP

We all want the great beneficial development of the past half century continued in the next quarter century, and in many quarter centuries beyond that. But the progress won't be continued unless we follow national policies that allow the healthy advance of the day-to-day process of "betterment from the bottom up." By this I mean not only policies that will safeguard individual savings against the corroding effect of inflation but also policies that will encourage investment in job-creating plant and equipment and insure rising production and employment, and so prosperity for our ever-growing population.

Confidence that the value of the dollar will be maintained in the next quarter century will encourage the investment necessary to finance the power and tools for the economic development of the next 25 years. The total of the small sums deposited in savings banks, insurance companies, investment trusts, savings and loan associations, pension funds, and other financial institutions will become the large investment to build America.

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

To maintain a sound dollar in the years ahead we must continue the sound and flexible monetary and fiscal policies the Eisenhower administration has been following during the past 2 years. Our methods of strengthening confidence in the dollar have been simple. We are steadily curtailing unessential Federal spending. And we are increasing the efficiency of Government operations.

Cuts in Federal expenditures enabled us to travel two-thirds of the way toward a balanced budget in fiscal 1954. And in the coming 1956 fiscal year, net budget expenditures will be an estimated $11.9 billion below the postwar peak spending of 1953.

We have cooperated with the Federal Reserve Board to assure a smooth meshing of the Government's debt-management and monetary policies. While the Federal Reserve Board has used flexible credit and monetary actions to see that the Nation's supply of money and credit was kept in line with the needs of the economy, the Treasury has worked toward making the $278 billion Federal debt less inflationary and less of a threat to the soundness of the currency.

The Eisenhower administration inherited a public debt heavily weighted in short-term obligations (the average maturity of the debt in January 1953 was less than 4 years). Since short-term debt can add substantially to inflationary pressures (even at times approaching the liquidity of printed money), we have taken action at every appropriate time during the last 2 years to extend the maturity of the debt by issuing intermediate and long-term securities.

Last February the Treasury offered a 40-year 3-percent bond, the longest-term security offered by the Treasury since 1911. The 1995 maturity date was chosen to give the bond wide appeal to such long-term investors as pension trusts and insurance companies. It was designed to supply a real need for a Treasury issue in an area beyond the primary demand for mortgage funds. Long-term investment money was available, and the economic situation permitted long-term refunding of this essentially neutral type without danger of unsettling the economy.

If in the next 25 years we use proper opportunities to lengthen the average maturity of the Federal debt when we can do so without disrupting the money markets unduly, we can hope that 1980 will find us with a Federal debt better balanced than at present as between short, intermediate, and long-term issues, and widely distributed among various classes of investors. We can devoutly hope also that the total amount of the Federal debt will be somewhat smaller than at present.

A SMALLER TAX BITE

What about Federal tax policy? Within the next 25 years it is possible that the threat of Communist imperialism will be reduced to such an extent that we can substantially reduce national security spending. This would give us a long-sought opportunity to lighten substantially the Federal tax burden that today consumes nearly a quarter of the total national income. This objective is continually before us. For a cut in the tax share of each income dollar—the maximum cut consistent with the requirements of national defense—would do much to encourage individual initiative and economic growth.

In spite of heavy defense spending, we have already been able to reduce taxes. Sizable cuts in Government expenditures made possible a tax reduction last year of $7.4 billion, the largest dollar cut in our history. Moreover, the broad revision of the Internal Revenue Code last year brought long-needed improvements in the Federal tax structure. Much remains to be done, but the 1954 Revenue Act removed many of the inequities and hardships for individuals that had crept into the tax laws over the years, and reduced some of the worst tax hindrances to business incentive. Thus our tax program to date has not only smoothed the 1954 transition from a high to a lower level of Government spending but has helped provide a more favorable climate for economic growth over the long run.

In the next quarter-century we must continue working in the direction of reduced taxation. And we must do so in ways that will not only take a smaller percentage of our total national income but in ways that will most encourage the initiative and enterprise which are the very foundation of our economic progress.

GLOBAL GOALS

Another important goal for the next quarter century should be the strengthening of our economic relationships with other free countries, that we may all prosper together and together build increasingly strong barriers against Communist imperialism.

Efforts to improve economic output here and in other free countries have particular significance in view of the prospect for a rapid increase in world population. By 1980 the United States population of 164 million may be increased to well over 200 million; the population of the world, now about 2.5 billion, will exceed 3 billion at the present rate of increase. The United States population growth will affect our entire economic life. It will require more plants and homes and stores and may change the whole face of urban and rural America.

A 20-percent rise in world population will press increasingly upon the world's land resources and food supplies, and will influence many foreign economic and political problems. It will undoubtedly bring increasing demands for more efficient methods of providing food and other necessities for the people of the world and will provide exceptional opportunities for the application of modern technical knowledge and methods to the production of food, clothing, and other consumer goods.

WHOSE ALLY IS TIME?

Contrary to the popular view, I believe time is working in our favor in the cold war against communism. As we build up the strength of free people throughout the world, we are erecting barriers to the spread of Communist doctrine. As the free nations are able progressively to improve the welfare of their people, to promote individual freedom and initiative, to raise living standards, improve transportation and communication, encourage international trade, the Communist countries will find themselves operating under increasingly severe handicaps.

The present and future of free-world people in this year of 1955 look good. An America of confidence, prudence, and imagination will mean that free men of 1980 will see a present—and a future—finer than our minds of today can even dream.

Reemployment Rights for the Disabled Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have reprinted herein an article appearing in the April 1955 issue of Performance, a monthly publication distributed by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, the Chairman of which is my very good friend Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, retired.

The Committee is a voluntary citizens' committee which seeks to create a proper climate in which physically handicapped men and women workers can seek and find gainful employment suited to their skills and abilities. Under the able leadership of Chairman Maas, a native of my home State of Minnesota, the Committee is making an invaluable contribution in the field of the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. We are all deeply grateful to Mel Maas for his many contributions to the betterment of his fellow man.

I also want to call my colleagues' attention to the article below, inasmuch as it tells the very heartwarming story of how the people of Cloquet and Carlton, Minn., both situated in my district, are helping a blind Korean war hero and his blind wife toward a normal and self-sufficient life.

Jack Thornton, of Carlton, Minn., who became a hero when he tried to save his foxhole buddies from an exploding hand grenade, and was blinded permanently, married Joyce Ann Campbell, who is also blind, last year and the community built a home for them. Today Jack Thornton

is learning a new job at the Wood Conversion Co. plant in Cloquet, Minn., thanks to the work of Mr. Maas' committee and the farsightedness of the management of the Wood Conversion Co. Jack has memorized the specially built control panel which enables him to operate a shredder at the plant. Signals from other parts of the production, normally relayed by flashing lights, will reach him via horn system.

The article is as follows:

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR THE DISABLED VETERAN

(By Adelbert C. Long, liaison officer, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, U. S. Department of Labor)

History will look back on section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act as a significant milepost in the long history of veterans' benefits and rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

It took the medical profession hundreds of years to progress from the pegleg of Long John Silver and the iron claw of Captain Hook to the ingenious prosthetic appliance of my fellow worker who, unknown to most of his close friends, lost a leg in northern Africa. And it took society equally as long to accept any real change in its concept of veterans' benefits from the land-grant reward that Rome gave Horatius:

"They gave him of the cornland,
That was of public right,
As much as two strong oxen
Could plow from morn till night."

to the right that Napoleon gave his old veterans to live out the rest of their lives at the Hotel Des Invalides. For it was not until Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 that there developed a brandnew philosophy that a government which could constitutionally compel a person to leave his employment to enter military service could also require his employer to reemploy him upon his release from service, "since the life and property of the employer as well as the lives and property of everyone in the United States are defended by such service."

It took Congress only 8 short years to take the next epoch-making step and add these important words to the reemployment rights section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act: "If not qualified to perform the duties of such position by reason of disability sustained during such service but qualified to perform the duties of any other position in the employ of the employer, be restored to such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status, and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

But it is not enough to just pass a law to fulfill the intent of Congress and really assist the thousands of ex-servicemen who come under the protection of the reemployment rights statutes. The Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights in the United States Department of Labor is faced with the difficult task of the day-by-day administration of this important law.

The significance of this bread-and-butter veterans' benefit to the entire field of industrial relations was recognized when Congress in 1947 placed the responsibility for administration of the program with the Secretary of Labor through the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.

Reemployment rights encompass much in the field of industrial relations, involving the management practices of business and the professions, wage and salary structures, and the collective bargaining agreements between management and labor; also, they are defined, clarified, and sometimes muddled by several hundred court decisions. Thus, the task of assisting a nonhandicapped veteran often ranges from simple compliance actions, such as providing correct and applicable information, to roundtable conciliatory negotiations or referral of the cases to the Department of Justice for court action. But this is relatively simple and easy compared to the efforts often expended on restoring a disabled veteran to "such other position the duties of which he is qualified to perform as will provide him like seniority, status and pay, or the nearest approximation thereof consistent with the circumstances in his case."

Such situations often require a review of his Veterans' Administration medical history (with the veteran's permission, of course), consultation with other medical authorities, a study of jobs in the plant, conferences with vocational and rehabilitation specialists and job analysts, and the utilization of many other community facilities to try and find a suitable job for such handicapped ex-servicemen. But while this section of the law taxes the ingenuity and experience of the Bureau's staff, they are repaid many times in their personal satisfaction of finally placing a handicapped veteran in a job which will put him once more in the labor market as a full-fledged, self-supporting member of his home community.

Vincent McCoy, the Bureau's area representative in Minneapolis, simply glows with Minnesota pride when he tells how a veteran's hometown, his employer, the Veterans' Administration, two veterans' service officers, the newspaper and, in fact, everybody, all worked together to welcome a totally blind Korean veteran home with a wife, a job, and a new house. Jack Thornton was fighting with the Thunderbird Division (the 45th Infantry) in Korea when he seized a hand grenade thrown by the Reds and attempted to hurl it back to save himself and three other soldiers in his foxhole. It exploded and Jack Thornton won the Distinguished Service Cross but lost his sight.

When Jack got back home there was no reluctance on the part of G. F. Allen, personnel director of the Wood Conversion Co., to give him his full reemployment rights. It was only a question of finding the right job, converting a machine so he could handle it, clarifying his seniority rights to a different job classification, and other little details of a similar nature.

Mr. K. S. Rondesvedt, Veterans' Administration Rehabilitation training officer, surveyed all the jobs in the plant and suggested necessary technical changes and a machine conversion so that Jack could operate it. Mr. Allen had some of his engineers get busy on this. Meanwhile, Carlton County Veterans' Service officer, Charles Buehre, and Veterans of Foreign War Post Service officer, Howard Melde, kept a close eye on all the efforts to put Jack back on the job. "Vince" McCoy, the Bureau's area representative, clarified the industrial relations problems of seniority and job classification.

While this was all going on, Harry Lawrence of the Carlton County News Graphic and the Pine Knot, local weekly newspapers, sparkplugged a community drive to provide a new house. Because Jack Thornton wasn't just loafing around all this time, he was busy courting and finally marrying pretty Joyce Campbell. To top it all off, Pope Pius XII sent a scroll with his personal blessings.

Of course, all reemployment rights cases don't have the glamorous trimmings of a blind hero, a romantic wedding, a good boss, and a charming new home in a wonderful town like Cloquet, Minn.

Harvey Driscoll, the Bureau's regional representative in Atlanta, spent a lot of time and effort in reinstating a veteran who had lost his left hand and couldn't perform the heavy duties of his former job. With the employer's cooperation, however, the veteran is once again employed and with the protection of his full seniority.

V. J. Meyl, the Bureau's regional representative in the Washington, D. C., office, became quite familiar with workmen's compensation laws and second injury claims before he got a veteran with defective vision back to work in a steel mill.

Jack Warshaw, in the Cleveland office, had lengthy negotiations with company officials and two different unions before he was able to restore a veteran who had lost the use of his left hand.

And sometimes employers don't cooperate. Jim Higgins, regional representative in Kansas City, insisted upon the reemployment of a diabetic veteran whose employer was most reluctant to reemploy him. The veteran thanked him for his efforts, and wrote, "They (the employer) said they would have to put me back to work or face a court fight, so the next day, November 18, I was called back to work. I again wish to thank you for all your help."

And so it goes in all 17 offices of the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights every day throughout the country. A good law on the books and the earnest, sincere efforts of these specialists in reemployment rights spell self-respect and gainful employment for hundreds of returning handicapped veterans.

Putting the Blame Where It Belongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the many requests I have had for transcripts of what I said before the House Banking and Currency Committee on May 13, 1955, on the subject of who has bungled the Salk vaccine distribution problem, I am inserting that statement in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Mr. MULTER. Dr. Scheele, there isn't any confusion in my mind as Mr. Widnall indicated there may be in his mind. I can see a clear division here of the overall problem into two different problems. One problem is to make sure that we have a safe vaccine that can be used for the purpose intended. The other problem is one of distribution of the vaccine. I wish you would correct me as I go along, if I am wrong in anything I say.

I have taken the trouble to send for the United States Government Organization Manual, the current manual, which sets forth the purposes and duties of the various departments in the executive branch of our Government, including all of the Cabinet officers, and under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have the Office of the Secretary, a member of the Cabinet, Mrs. Hobby, and she is charged with the overall management of that Department, and the purpose of that Department is, and I quote "to improve the administration of those agencies of Government, the major responsibilities of which are to promote the general welfare in the fields of health, education, and social security." That Department breaks down into various subdivisions, one of which is the Office of the Surgeon General, which you so ably and competently head, as the Surgeon General.

Your office, under your jurisdiction, is charged with the duty of making sure that whatever new is developed involving the

health of the public can be safely used. I haven't any doubt that as long as you are the Surgeon General and you are given the right to perform your duties as required of you by law, you will make sure, within the realm of possibility, and within that degree of certainty that a human being can have, that only safe vaccines will be used, as well as serums and everything else that come within the jurisdiction of your department, and that the minute you discover something is wrong, either in a plant or a laboratory or with a product, you will stop its use until you are sure it is safe. I think you have been doing that.

But there is another problem involved here, and that problem was pointed up by the introduction of bills in this Congress as early as April 18. That was 6 days after the vaccine was released for use throughout the country, and I think, in accordance with the requirements of the law, there has been consultation back and forth between our health officials, headed by yourself, and others, in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Canadian Health Department, because simultaneously on the same day, April 12, both the Canadian Government and our Government released this vaccine for public use.

With this difference, however—and I won't pull any punches—I join with every last one of my colleagues in this Congress in laying the fault right in the lap of Mrs. Hobby. If she has been preoccupied with other things, including Cabinet meetings, I don't think any of them were so important as giving her attention to this problem. It was certainly more important that she attended to this problem rather than to making so many speeches, whether to political organizations or otherwise. She is your superior, so I don't ask you to comment on that, but I join my colleagues in saying that she is primarily responsible for this situation.

The Canadians love their children no more and no less than we Americans, and I am sure the Canadian Government has no more and no less interest in the health of their children and their people than our American Government has. They were able, the day they released it as we did on April 12, at the same time to put into effect governmental regulations as to the distribution of the product. They made sure that they wouldn't have to wait for the head of the Government to say that "if and when"—and the statement doesn't impress me one bit—"he hears that some child can't get this vaccine because they haven't the money with which to pay for the inoculation, he will make people listen."

The time for this Congress to make people listen is in advance of that. And as long as I am a Member of this Congress I am going to fight for the enactment of laws in advance of the happening of the contingency, and that is what should have been done here.

Mrs. Hobby, I charge, was derelict in her duty in 1 of 2 respects: Either she has the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in not acting, or she doesn't have the power under the law to act, in which event she was derelict in her duty in not coming before this Congress and saying, "Members of the Congress, we need a law so that we can regulate this thing."

That is where all the confusion and confounding of the public has come in.

As early as April 18 Mr. RAINS, of this committee, and other Members since, have introduced bills, not trying to tell you, Dr. Scheele, or your Department, how to operate to determine whether this vaccine is safe, or who should make it, but to make sure that there be no black market at any time, to make sure that this went into the channels of distribution properly, in accordance with the way the medical men, the scientific men, think it should go, and there should be no ifs, ands, or buts about that.

We have been trying, our chairman has three times invited Mrs. Hobby to come here, and she has found it impossible to be here.

Yesterday this committee adopted a resolution requesting her to come here, but the vote was declared out of order because it was taken while the House was having a quorum call. I am sure she knows about that. She still has not been able to find the time to come in and tell this committee whether she has the authority to act, and will act, or she needs a law under which to act.

Now, I think you have made it very clear, Dr. Scheele, that within your jurisdiction you are doing everything you and the men under you can do to make sure the public will be protected.

But we, as Members of the Congress, have a duty to perform, too, and I say the first duty of this Congress is to hear the responsible official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary, to have her come in here and tell us why she wasn't ready with some plan, on the day this was released, on April 12, just as the Canadian authorities were, and to tell us why she is not ready with some plan now.

No one can blame the National Foundation. They have done a good job, and they will continue to do a good job. But I think you indicated to us when Congressman DAVIDSON last week read to you a section of the law which he thought gave you the authority to control the distribution, and you very properly pointed out that that law does not apply. Now, whether the law does or does not apply, somebody—and that somebody is Mrs. Hobby—should be in here to tell this Congress, in no uncertain terms—let us forget about why she didn't do it up to April 12—she should come in here now and tell us, "This is the way we are going to distribute this and make sure there is proper and equal distribution throughout the country to those who should get the vaccine in accordance with the best scientific and medical thinking and direction." It is time she had such a plan. If she doesn't have one, then this Congress should work one out for her.

With reference to that very matter—and I hope, Dr. Scheele, that you won't think that I am taking this out on you. I have the highest respect for you. I don't mean any of this as being critical of you. I can't say too frequently or in too many places how good a job you have done in the years that you have given yourself to this service. But this matter needs attention, and needs attention now.

Delegating it on a voluntary basis to the 48 States, in my opinion, cannot possibly solve the problem. We have already been told that there are State governments which do not have any funds. We know they can get the vaccine for nothing. They don't have the funds with which to employ the technicians, the doctors, or the nurses to do the inoculating. You, yourself, told us that your Department does not have the funds with which to do that kind of work. It is not supposed to be your job. But somebody has to do it. And if my State has the funds with which to do it I am not going to be very proud, if an adjoining State, or a State a thousand miles away, hasn't the funds to do it. It is my duty as a Congressman to see that the children of every State get these inoculations as fast as it is available.

With your releasing the product in the manner you indicate it is going to be released, it necessarily is going to be in short supply. I can see how you must decide that the vaccine is going to be released in small quantities as each batch is found safe. But somebody must decide who is going to get it. Is it going to go into New York State because we have the money, and another State that doesn't have the funds must wait? That is not my idea of how to treat our children. I think it is Mrs. Mobby's duty to come here and tell us how she is going to handle that. You have enough to do. You are doing a good job to make sure that this vaccine is going to be safe, and that is a full-time job in itself.

As I say, I have tried to take you off the hot spot that you are sitting upon, Dr. Scheele. You can or cannot comment as you please on what I have said, and if you wish to correct any statement that I have made that you think is wrong, I will be happy to have you do it.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Aluminum Companies Refusal To Sell to Independent Aluminum Fabricators Examined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 17, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds of aluminum from the quota previously designated for the defense stockpile was to assist the independent users of aluminum, many of which face business disaster because of current shortages and the aluminum producers' retention of most of their output for their own plants. In spite of this, Reynolds Metals Co., as well as Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., have refused to make their shares of the cutback available in full to the independents.

The Government entered into contracts a few years ago with both Reynolds and Kaiser whereby those companies promised to sell to the independents certain amounts of aluminum produced from new plants and facilities to be established with Government assistance. One intent behind those contracts was to protect the independent segment of the aluminum industry. Instead of complying with this intent the companies are now claiming in effect that they are not required to sell the contract amounts to the independents if their normal pattern of sales to them equals or exceeds those amounts. This specious rationalization is in direct conflict with what is commonly known to have been the intent and purpose of both the contracts and the cutback.

The refusal of Reynolds to perform its duty will have a serious adverse effect upon the independents. Its policy is an anomalous one indeed in view of the fact that the Government enabled Reynolds after World War II to get started in the aluminum business by financial assistance, and, it should be noted, for the purpose of establishing competitive conditions in that industry. Yet, Reynolds now pursues policies which increase its control over the fabricating segment of the industry and thereby lessen appreciably free competitive conditions. If such control as now exercised by Reynolds, and the other primary producers as well, in aluminum fabrication is not altered, antitrust action must inevitably be the consequence.

I have advised the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Administrator of the General Services Administration of my concern in this matter and have requested them to take such action as will protect the nonintegrated users of aluminum and insure their receipt of the amount of aluminum intended by the cutback.

My letter to the Reynolds Co. reads as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Mr. MARION M. CASKIE,
Executive Vice President,
Reynolds Metals Co.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASKIE: I am writing with reference to your letter to me of May 2, 1955, and particularly with reference to the refusal of the Reynolds Co. to sell to nonintegrated or independent users of primary aluminum the full increased supply of aluminum to be made available by the Government's recent cutback of 150 million pounds in its stockpile requirements.

Unquestionably, a paramount consideration in the proposed stockpile cutback was an alleviation of the very serious shortages in primary aluminum facing the nonintegrated users. The Antitrust Subcommittee has received numerous complaints from the nonintegrated users and it is apparent that many in that independent segment of the aluminum industry face financial ruin if they are not to have greater access to the aluminum production of this country.

Reynolds' contracts with the Government require you to sell to the independents up to two-thirds of the aluminum produced from the expansion facilities recently developed by the company in cooperation with the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These contracts quite obviously contemplated that the independents would be benefited to the extent the Government did not take Reynolds' production from the expanded facilities for stockpiling. It is equally obvious that the independents would be little benefited if you were to discontinue your pattern of sales to them prior to the expansion and substitute sales only in the amounts that were left after Government stockpiling. Thus, even if there were to be no stockpile demands during a particular period, two-thirds of your expanded facilities could hardly equal the amount formerly sold to the independents. And if the Government took the full amount of stockpiling, the independents, under your theory, would be entitled to nothing at all.

You state in the penultimate paragraph of your letter that Reynolds has planned to sell to the independents an amount in excess of its contract requirements. An examination of available data indicates the illusory nature of your position and the inequitable effect on the independents if it were to be accepted. In 1954, Reynolds sold to the independents over 144 million pounds, or 72 million for a 6-month average. Reynolds has sold or plans to sell for the first 6 months of 1955 a total of roughly 80 million, including the 41 million cutback amount allotted your company. Therefore, if there had been no cutback, you would sell to the independents at the rate of 39 million for a period of 6 months, appreciably less than the 1954 amounts.

Whatever the precise data may be there can be no doubt that Reynolds is not selling to the independents at the 1954 rate plus the recent cutbacks. Thus a paramount purpose of the proposed cutback will be defeated and Reynolds will use for its own purposes a substantial share of the released amount.

It is my opinion that the action of Reynolds is most unwise in view of the effect which will result to the independent nonintegrated users of aluminum and is a rather shortsighted policy, in which not all of the primary producers are in accord. The Aluminum Co. of America, I understand, has agreed to sell the amount of the cutback applicable to them to the independents in addition to the amount they already had planned to sell.

I have no alternative but to advise the proper representatives of the General Services Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization of my feelings in the matter.

My letter of May 31, 1955, to the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as to General Services Administration, was as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: I am enclosing a copy of a recent letter I wrote as chairman of the House Antitrust Subcommittee to the Reynolds Metals Co.

The attitude of both Reynolds and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. with respect to the recent cutbacks from aluminum stockpiling is, of course, fully apparent to you, as are the theories by which they rationalize this attitude. I wish to emphasize to you my concern in this matter. These companies should not be permitted to relegate to their own uses the aluminum cutback of 150 million pounds as proposed last April. If the Government's needs for defense purposes do not necessitate the stockpiling of that amount, then measures should be adopted to insure that the nonintegrated users get it. Reynolds and Kaiser should not be permitted by a jumbling of statistics and technicalities to acquire the metal for their own purposes to the detriment of an important segment of the aluminum industry.

I trust that the Office of Defense Mobilization will see to it that the assistance and protection intended for the independents by the contracts with the producers and by the proposed cutbacks will not be frustrated as will be the effect if Reynolds and Kaiser are not abruptly checked in their present actions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Eternal God, our Father, in whose divine wisdom, righteousness, and love we trust, we beseech Thee to lead us by Thy Spirit in our halting and stumbling quest for the right solution to our many difficult national and international problems.

We humbly confess that, in the tumult and confusion of our time, we do not know where and how to find that solution. Our diplomats and statesmen assemble in conclave and counsel but there seems to be so little of real concord.

Help us to see that perhaps the rancor and misunderstanding, the misconceptions and the failure to find that right and satisfactory solution may be because we talk so much and take so little time for prayer to listen to Thy voice of gentle stillness.

May we continue to be full of hope and courage, and grant that the leaders of all the nations may have in their minds and hearts the spirit of good will and consideration, of sympathetic patience and interpretive understanding as they sincerely strive for peace on earth.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5239) 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."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–16.

CHRONIC LOW INCOME AND ITS EFFECT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Government announced this week that the American economy in the first 3 months of 1955 had broken all records in the value of output of goods and services, or gross national product. The figure for the first quarter of this year was at a rate of $370 billion a year.

This is a slight increase over the previous record rate of $369 billion a year reached in mid-1953, and a very substantial increase over the levels in effect during the last part of 1953 and through most of 1954 when we had recession.

What it all means is that we have now bounced back to where we were 2 years ago. We are producing goods and services in the same amount—but we are doing it with fewer people in many manufacturing processes, which is why we still have such large unemployment.

Under normal circumstances—if the expansion previously accomplished in the economy had continued through 1953 and 1954 instead of being interrupted by the recession we went through—our rate