encourage the growth and development of Iowa is moving 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 pardons due to talk over some little difficulties which have been a problem, when they feel the amount of time available for supervision of the children has now in the new order become limited in a number of homes.

He 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 in their 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 weight of the world压 on their shoulders.

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early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became evident and were not ignored or perhaps withdrawn conduct.

A child does not turn into a juvenile delinquent overnight. There are many danger signals 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 discipline. It is where he begins to learn to rule by being ruled.

The guiding hand of the father and mother working together as a partner team, in facing 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 vitally influence his later relationships.

The father's role is not an easy one. The solution is fairly obvious and quickly achieved.

Family life is actually the child's first experience in group living, in learning the tasks, which 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 the time to set the course of this day, as we face its demanding offense and the royalty of inward peace and confidence above all the pedestals, of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

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 I know you know, is the 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. H. 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.
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 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. 1968. An act to authorize the execution and payment of the treaty of July 3, 1952, relating to the 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.

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, move that the Senate proceed to consider 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 executive 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:

By Mr. CONGEE, for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

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

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 the district of Kansas, vice George Temple, 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. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. President, 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.

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Members may proceed, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate recognizes with deep regret the passing of that gallant old soldier, Gen. Charles Pelot Summerrall. This afternoon he will be buried with full military honors in Arlington Cemetery.

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, Summerrall covered the advance of the 14th Infantry storming the Imperial City—Pekin. During the assault Summerrall and his platoon wheeled 2 field pieces alongside the infantry and planted them on the 4 successive walls and the Forbidden City gate.

In 1918, as commanding general of the famed First Division, Summerrall 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 20th 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 its development. He made many improvements, and supplied at a time that area became one of our most vital and important military commands. Likewise, General Summerrall'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 tanks, and develop the effectiveness of tanks and armored cars.

In March 1931 General Summerrall retired from active service and returned to his native Florida. His sojourn at home, a period of 7 years, 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 family of General Summerrall's. 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 by this grand old soldier.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, since we last met on Friday, death has removed one of the Nation's foremost soldiers. General Summerrall was a beloved and revered citizen—Gen. Charles P. Summerrall, Army Chief of Staff during the Coolidge administration.

General Summerall was a soldier whose career was symbolical of the American tradition in the Pacific. After being wounded in the Boxer Rebellion of 1900 through the bloody battles of World War I, and into the trying and pacific 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 84, General Summerrall became president of The Citadel, South Carolina. His three year career contributed much to the standing role played by him as an educator in our State. After serving his country for approximately 40 years as a soldier, General Summerrall then began another distinguishing service 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 whom we all respected.

For over 2 decades he contributed the same peerless leadership to that historic South Carolina institution, 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 M. Dougherty, of the Second Florida Congressional District.

He entered the Academy June 16, 1888, and graduated June 11, 1902, as first captain of the Cadet Corps.

From then until 34 years later, when he was named Chief of Staff by President Coolidge, General Summerrall 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.

Despite these honors, his life was one of earnest country service. Under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches, I ask unanimous consent that the Members may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes in commenting on the life and service of General Summerrall, who passed away last Friday.

Without objection, the Members may proceed, the Senator from Florida may proceed.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.
respected—sometimes grudgingly—of those who served with him, or under him. He had little patience with, or understanding of, the 'fad men'; always, he had 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 resonated his autocratic methods, there were hundreds who revered his name and who, henceforth will cherish his memory. If there be some who felt the sting of his discipline, there were others who would retain the benefit of his stern, fatherly advice. 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 his thoughts, more than in the 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 task to preside over the troubled wood. They were a French Huguenot family mother's family, the Pelots, are from the 1700's, which came to the US and established residence at Whitehall on June 1900. When he retired as Chief of Staff, Summerall became president of The Citadel, full of scholarship and character, in S. C. He maintained a fine record during his 22 years there before retiring in 1953. Gen. Douglas MacArthur succeeded him as the Army's top officer. CLARE 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 said: "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 grieved over the passing of the great general, "a distinguishing 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 Whiskey Road. The house was deeded to The Citadel by 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 is the home of my family, whom I love, my mother's family, the Pelots, are from Greenwood. They were a French Huguenot family which moved to South Carolina in the 1700's, and moved to Greenwood in 1832." He loved Whitehall, its spacious rooms where he had on display his many relics of his military career. He also loved the Aiken Rotary club of which he was a 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 love him. May his high standards be carried aloft by the many men who have come under his influence.

[April from the Augusta Chronicle of May 15, 1955]

SUMMERALL LEST RITES TO BE HELD AT WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON, May 14—Death today overtook another of the Nation's famous old soldiers—Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall of Aiken, its 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 May 2, operated on April 29 for a lung condition. A son and daughter-in-law, retired Army Colonel and Mrs. Charles P. Summerall Jr., of Belmont, Mass., were at the bedside.

Colonel Summerall's grandson, Charles P. Summerall III, a student at Harvard Medical School, and a granddaughter, Mrs. John C. Smith, R.N., of Belmont, were with him.

FOLLOWING 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 Thursday.

General Summerall was Chief of Staff of the Army in 1929-30. He had been the country's highest 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, full of scholarship and character, in S. C. He maintained a fine record during his 22 years there before retiring in 1953. Gen. Douglas MacArthur succeeded him as the Army's top officer.

CLARE 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 said: "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 grieved over the passing of the great general, "a distinguishing 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 Whiskey Road. The house was deeded to The Citadel by Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, with the understanding that it be a retirement home for Summerall. It will now be used by 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 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 converted the Army into 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 four-star general in 1929, possessor of at least 15 ribbons for major decorations from many nations, in addition to numerous citations for personal bravery, leadership and efficiency conditions.

Soon afterward he became president of South Carolina's State military college at Charleston, where he made one of his biggest contributions to the military.
France, Belgium's Grand said that due to his great courage and heroic efforts.

mation 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 1892. Their son, Charles, 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 the man 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 are today still are guides for thousands of men in all walks of life.

A man could not know General Summerall in life, and a man 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, the story of small towns 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 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 of his country. I respect 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:...
Whereas the decrease in watershed areas combined with the present lack of flood control facilities render the San Bernardino area susceptible to flood damage; and

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

Whereas unless immediate steps are taken to provide flood control facilities there is a real danger of flooding by the floods which are dangerous to public health and safety in the San Bernardino area due to floods; and

Whereas in order to protect the people of California from further loss of life and property and to prevent great harm to our national defense facilities in the San Bernardino area, the Congress of the United States is directed to direct the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to

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. 197), 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 annual 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 there is confusion as to the extent to which the federal government pays for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in facilities operated by the board of health in the Territory of Hawaii and to all citizens of the United States through the furthering of research in this field; now, therefore, be it

"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 this joint resolution, to provide continued reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in Hawaii, as provided in the law from the time it became effective upon its approval.

"Approved this 11th day of May, 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."
from the abandonment of roads, railroads, or ditch rights-of-way, or portions thereof, and the taking by the Territory, under its police power, of any abutting landowners; and it is hereby, respectively, requested that the States of America be, and it hereby is, requested to enact legislation ratifying and confirming the provisions of that needed for public purposes, because public policies or other justifiable cause necessitates such taking; and

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

"Whereas the legislature has enacted statute providing that the same shall be disposed of, the 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 is hereby respectfully requested pursuant to the act of Congress enabling the Territory of Hawaii to guarantee or insure loans made to persons who are required to borrow money to restore or preserve any remains of natural force such as earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tidal wave, drought, or flood.

"SEC. 2. Pursuant to the terms of the foregoing statutes are hereby ratified and confirmed, 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."
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 property which was lost.

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

A letter was transmitted to the Secretary of Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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 letter was transmitted to the Secretary of Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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 letter was transmitted to the Secretary of Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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 letter was transmitted to the Secretary of Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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 letter was transmitted to the Secretary of Service Wives, Inc., of California, relating to present laws governing survivors' benefits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
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, Kan., a letter transmitting a resolution adopted by the city of Kansas City, Kansas, in re flood control in Kansas.

Howard Payne, City Clerk.

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

The statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA, a resolution referring the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for consideration:

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

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, should be provided by Federal means. Graduate nursing programs may be more readily developed with rapidly changing health needs of the population.

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 graduate nurses, to provide the necessary funds and in the approval of projects for the following areas of critical need in education and research in nursing.

2. Application of science to the techniques and art of nursing: Such research should continuously add to the body of knowledge of nursing, to assure the conservation and advancement 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.
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 more effective the practical use of their nursing and related skills. The cooperation of specialists in business administration and nursing 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. Research should be given to educational programs for each type of personnel, research in selecting students, the tools of teaching and evaluation.

Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

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 entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Wisconsin with respect to civil and criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and a suit for the recovery of damages"; 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 Interl and commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 358).

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


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 before the Senate, and all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims for the purpose of hearing and determining the same, and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1984. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for other purposes; and

S. 1992. 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. 1984. 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 authorize the Secretary of the Interior 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 separate headings.)

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-Yen Tchen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1988. A bill to authorize the issuance of postal commemoratives in honor of the armed forces who have died while on active duty subsequent to September 16, 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BILL:

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. 1989. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1940 to 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. 1990. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, to authorize production payments, limit price-supports eligibility, and provide 90-percent price support 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 separate headings.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1992. A bill to provide for the conveyance 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 Armory and the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Piatte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of Nemoran McFarland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1996. A bill to amend subdivision b of section 62—Unclaimed Moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and to repeal subdivision f of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1988. A bill to amend section 70a (5) of the Bankruptcy Act; and
S. 1999. A bill to amend section 70d (5) of the Bankruptcy Act; and
S. 1990. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary;
S. 2001. A bill to amend the National 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. Andrew Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: S. 2003. A bill to authorize 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, and in accordance with the provisions of, the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians Act of New Mexico; 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 nursing homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
By Mr. JOHNSON 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. 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. 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 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 other 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, 1955.

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 the cost thereof, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $28 million, to remain available until December 31, 1955. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States for the costs of administration, paid 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 amount by which the 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 of Health, Education, and Welfare, 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, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District of Columbia the allotment percentage for each of these States 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) includes a program for the use of the poliomyelitis vaccine purchased with funds paid to the State under this act, which provides that no child, or, if (and for so long as) any priority groups are established by the Secretary under this act, that no child in a priority group, or groups, will be denied vaccination against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the cost thereof; Provided, That the Secretary shall not certify a State from providing for the free vaccination against poliomyelitis, without regard to ability to pay, for the children within any one or more groups determined by the Secretary, 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 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 check 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 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 was actually paid to the State for such prior period under this act. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Secretary shall 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 by the Secretary in lieu of the allotment of such State (or such portion thereof). Vaccine so furnished shall be subject to the provisions of Federal law, and purchased from payments to States pursuant to this act.

PRIORITIES AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

ings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary. Such compensation shall include travel, time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, indemnification for loss of time, and, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 735-9),

DIVISION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Sec. 9. Whenever the Secretary, after research and investigation, makes an adequate certification of the order in which the children of the State are to be vaccinated, he shall divide the funds available among the States for the purpose of paying the cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine, without regard to ability to pay, for such prior period under this act.

Division of funds shall be made as follows:
(a) Such State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions of this act or the conditions of its approved application; or
(b) Any funds paid to such State or supplies of vaccine furnished to it for 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 h is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply or correction 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) The term "child" means any individual who has not attained the age of 20 years;
(c) 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; or
(d) The cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine shall be determined by the Secretary as of such date or dates as he may select for purposes of this act; or
(e) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.
(f) The cost of the poliomyelitis vaccine shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the price paid 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 the 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 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 this matter 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,

Otto Culp Hobart
Secretary.
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 bill, the balance of 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 most of the criticisms that I have mentioned, and provide the required infrastructure for our national economic stability.

For additional farm production with a gross value up to $50,000, farmers would be eligible for price supports of not less than 90 percent of parity. 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. In fact, it is the only measure that has ever been passed by the Congress to help extend opportunities for economic protection must be more in line with the direction of effective, constructive price-support mechanism.

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

Our current fight for agriculture has been very properly been an economic one, but it is also 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.

In view of this, I believe that the 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 farmers near and far. We need these young people in American agriculture 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. I believe that direction 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 agriculture 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 program.

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

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

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.

In all, 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 the right direction.

For so long I have contended that farm prices alone cannot and would not 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 the unused cropland to 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, linked to so much 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 persons a year, and the productivity of our farms 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 abundant agricultural potential, 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 reevaluate the credit needs of agriculture. We must encourage young farmers to step up the efficiency of our training and knowledge by making sure the producers of food and fiber.

I urge careful consideration of the farm price problems. 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 greater abundance, and supply 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 is moving towards and the fact that 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 Mr. President, and thought-provoking article, entitled "Farm Program of Abundance." At that time I wrote to Mr. President, and President, and President, and thought-provoking article, entitled "Farm Program of Abundance." At that time I wrote to Mr. President, and believe it charts an improved course. At that time I wrote to Mr. President, and believe it charts an improved course.

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 of achieve our international goals and authorize a sound program to 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 need for accelerating the opening of new markets abroad for our agricultural commodities. Likewise, we should explore some form of international food and fiber reserves or world food bank, to help 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, and of our attempts to earn higher prices 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 of achieve our international goals and authorize a sound program to 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 need for accelerating the opening of new markets abroad for our agricultural commodities. Likewise, we should explore some form of international food and fiber reserves or world food bank, to help 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, and of our attempts to earn higher prices 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 of achieve our international goals and authorize a sound program to 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 need for accelerating the opening of new markets abroad for our agricultural commodities. Likewise, we should explore some form of international food and fiber reserves or world food bank, to help as an international stabilizing device.

...
boundary lines. To them it is unthinkable that United States surplus 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, but not because we are, under God, stewards, not absolute owners, of our rich resources; and that these resources are intended primarily for the considered management, to satisfy the needs of all.

After this criticism of the basic philosophy of the present support programs, the delegate naturally felt obliged to offer an alternative. In rough outline, here is what they propose:

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 that free and fair competition and investment is merely an exercise of distributive justice. Though the NCRLC approves the ends, it is against the means. For the present price-support programs, it also recognizes the shortcomings of these programs. It is ready to concede that present machinery is not entirely adequate, that it has satisfied the consumer and the taxpayer nor solved the major problems which beset the farmer. There is therefore a fundamentally new approach is needed.

A NEW APPROACH

Such an approach should be fair to consumers as well as to farmers. It should encourage farmers to produce more than they need, and as much as they can, and sell it at prices which will enable them to earn a living and pay their debts. The system would work in this way. Farmers would produce anything they wanted to, within the boundary lines. To them it is unthinkable to 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 food 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. They are, in effect, a method of securing for the farmer the prices he would receive for his products if he were not handicapped by the present system. They would, however, include a variation. Farmers would pay for labor equipment and overhead expenses which the farmer pays for labor equipment and overhead expenses. Since it is the Government which finances these expenses, they would pay only once in the form of taxes at the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Agriculture-----------------------$35,430
Construction (est. additional)---------26,100
Oil (eat. refined product)--------------23,000
Automobiles--------------------------$104,987

The life of natural yarns so treated can be increased, in some instances, as much as 10 to 20 times. Such synthetic fabrics is a fact accompli. Less well known is the successful use of lady fingers and other Atomic drugs and sheep. Estimates of the savings in grain which result from these drugs and sheep, however, are not accurate. One should also mention the increasing use of dyes in the human diet of eonicomargins, saccharin, sucaryl, various extracts, etc; this type of synthetic food is just beginning. The farm products will undoubtedly increase as time passes. Also increasing is the national consciousness of the wastefulness, the persistent recommendation by expert dieticians of the desirability of reducing the intake of waste products and of the need for an effecive 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 June prices with those of the same date of our five leading industries (construction figure for 1954, the rest for 1953):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Price in June 1955</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$35,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil, (eat. refined product)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>104,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only must we protect and stabilize our leading industry; we must protect and stabilize our huge farm investment, the aggregate of which is over $150 billion. While farm indebtedness is, percentage-wise, comparatively small (roughly 18 billion), it is nevertheless the third largest group of debtors up to 50 to 75 percent of their current market value; hence, it becomes an elementary economic necessity that, farm values be maintained in the directions and 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 in maintaining our international bargaining power is evident. In agriculture, 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 past, are capable of inflicting severe and lasting damage to other sections of our economy. The farm situation today is not healthy. It is therefore, perhaps the most vital means of measuring economic health. In
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 set as the limit of income from which production payments would be made. The following example will make the difference between parity and market, or a net total payment of $500.

Farmer A raises 1,000 bales of cotton ($600,000), but sells only 700 bales ($420,000), at $2,000 a bale. He is entitled to a subsidy payment of $10 cents a pound, the difference between the parity price and the price the farmer received for his cotton.

If certain wealthy individuals and/or corporations wish to engage in this business, I would direct them to do so by all means. But they should depend on the open market, rather than on the Government for the sale of their products. The present system, which wholly unneeded products for sale to the Government should cease forthwith.

The above is as equitable as any distribution of support payments which Congress might see fit to include under the price-support system. It would seem to me, fairer than any other approach. The above program should be fully parity on his production up to $7,000 of gross annual product and stop all payments. The Government should also set a minimum limit on how much a farmer could receive to a maximum of $2,000 an year. I would allow the individual farmer annual. I would allow the individual farmer payments to the individual farmer $2,000 a year.

Certain economists have suggested a food-stamps plan as a means of disposing of our unmanageable surpluses. 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 of small farmers whose need is vital. Such a farm program would simply do for the small farmer what is being done for the bigger farmer. It has also been suggested that a graduated support system might be established with the payments, lowered by stages, up to a total of $2,000. In this case, the difference between market and parity would exactly equal the $2,000 maximum.

This exodus from the farms means that small towns and villages are suffering a similar rate. The shrinkage of farm population means that small towns and villages—professional men, merchants, and a great variety of service tradesmen—are losing population. If the labor force is being annually augmented from this source by another 30,000 or 40,000 workers.

There is nothing that should cause labor leaders to take heed, especially in view of the fact that urban population and employment are constantly increasing and rural population—professional men, merchants, and a great variety of service tradesmen—are losing population. If the labor force is being annually augmented from this source by another 30,000 or 40,000 workers.

The latest census figures indicate these startling facts: Of the nine-tenths of the Nation's farmers received more than 25 percent of the total price-support benefits. Ninety-one percent of our farmers received less than a third of nonfarm income; it was about a third of nonfarm income; it was about 44 percent just after World War II, farm income has shrunk by far short of its major purpose—stabilization support readily reveals the inequity and unfairness of the system.

The present farm price-support program is both inequitable and ineffective. It fails 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 unfairness of the present program.

Since 1935, the number of farms of 1,000 or more acres has increased by 37 percent. The number of farms of less than 500 acres has increased from 504 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all United States farm land. The trend toward gigantism and, at the same time, toward the intensive use of small acreage are astonishingly fast. When we moved armies of occupation into Italy, Germany, and Japan, among our first tasks 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 eliminate the cumbersome system of purchasing and providing non-recourse loans on farm products. I would substitute a simple payment to the individual farmer—in an amount sufficient to give him and his family a reasonable basic income. Furthermore, the Government should establish the limit of production payments which any individual farmer could receive to a maximum of $2,000 an year. The farmer would receive full parity on his production up to $7,000 of gross annual product and stop all payments after that amount. The raw materials of the farm would be permitted to seek their own level in the open market. Production payments should be made only when the parity price is higher than the price received by the farmer in the free market.

While it is true that even this inequitable distribution of the amount spent for food-stamps as un-American in concept, basic tenants of automation, has reduced employment by some $4 million for the first 9 months of a recent speech before the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune, how are you going to collect union dues from these workers? 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 today, and a process of transition to a new world order should be directed toward meeting this challenge—without delay. I had a feeling of intense frustration and deep disappointment when I read the President's 1955 Economic Report and found not a word on this all important subject.

The President now has no better place to start attacking the problem of automation than on the farm. All the facts of the urban labor situation spell the need for a new approach—how to improve and conserve rural life by every means possible. We should keep the door of opportunity open not only for the small, family-owned farms 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 prices...
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 and to operate it in accord with the fundamental laws of nature and the common good of providing storage, conforming to acreage allotments and all of the many regulations that are now in force.

Third, we would once more be in a position to compete in the markets of the world for the share of the world trade that was once ours. A third, I believe, is the most we least need and seek.

The question of the cost of such a program is, of course, proper. But, in evaluating its costs, let us bear in mind the benefits of this program to the health of our agricultural economy and its proper priority in relation to other major governmental expenditures. There 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 believe that the benefits of this program would be fully as great as those gained by the health of our educational system and of our political democracy. Our present farm-support program has substituted a high degree of regimentation and an insidious type of creeping socialism, both of which are utterly distasteful to the rank-and-file of our farmers. 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, regrettably, even the present Secretary of Agriculture himself—to criticize American farmers for the abundance which 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 Aberdeen program brought the cost of production to a level near that of mass purchasing power which we are able to maintain.

Yet what about agriculture? We called upon them to expand production for wartime needs. They did it—without the benefit of a new agency to all the time of mass purchasing power which we are able to maintain.

It is impossible to state with any positive degree of accuracy 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 $760 million a year. But this program would take the Government completely out of the picture. Insofar as buying, selling, and storing the Government is no more and no less a part of the problem than is the family. It's right that we must meet the cost of these programs (all of which, for the purpose of this discussion, may be accepted as necessary) by any national revenue system that may be needed.

But our moral obligation was the same. Here we have an opportunity to improve the economic status (purchasing power) of some twenty-odd million of our farm population through a reduction in the cost of living to some twenty-odd million of our farmers. It was an important agricultural law to protect the farmers of this Nation. It was an important law to protect them from being overproduced, that they have overproduced, that they have produced for the Government. Well, that last
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 introduce a copy of the Record at this point an editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald-Review, published by Larry A. Rossman, entitled "Help the Farmer:"

That being the 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 same 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 proposal is weak thinking, and the foolish talk from the National Capital suggests that some million farmers of a so­called marginal type are not to be seen as a menace and that many of them be moved from the farm into town or placed on the roads of industry. No proposal could be more out­side the basic concept of the American peo­ple and welfare of so many deserving citizens.

First, who is the marginal farmer? There are certainly some farmers who are not suited for farming. They have been injured and are not suited to do what they have been doing. There are a small proportion of such people who are problems on the farm and who 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 in the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be the one for which 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:

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 in the farms as those which we gave you in our preliminary statement last March. Your position of today will be the one for which the Senator 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. TRÜTHSCHER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

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?

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


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 think the farming center or farm office of this one program collapses, all farm pro­grams will be shaken to their founda­tions, and farm prices will collapse.

Mr. President, no greater encour­agement can we address to farmers than 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.
An adverse vote in the July wheat quota election could well have far-reaching consequences. Price supports would drop from the present level of 90 percent of parity. With world supplies of wheat, including our own, cash prices would drop near the new support level of $1.19 a bushel.

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

Increasing dissatisfaction among farmers who believes it is unreasonable to have wheat supplies increase out of all proportion to the percentage of our wheat producers are rightfully concerned about the higher levels of support price for our red winter wheat than is available for top quality baking wheat. Invariably, low quality wheats and middlings are sold at prices below 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 surplus. The average farm price for wheat was $2.01 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 dropped to $1.14 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 the setting of our farm prices, to the following questions: 1. What is the best price for wheat when the house occupied by him and his wife, a Japanese-style house at Hayama, Honshu, Japan, was destroyed by fire on November 15, 1953, for which he has received no compensation? The records of the Department of the Army show that Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., was born at Chicago, Ill. on December 3, 1929; 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 to the rank of master sergeant; that he was honorably discharged on February 1, 1952, as a master sergeant; and that on February 2, 1952, he entered on active duty under the arms of the United States as a master sergeant. Warrant Officer (jg) Pierre, W2151033, completed 10 years of service for pay purposes in 1952 and his pay aggregates $574.49 per month. Pursuant to competent orders, Warrant Officer Pierre departed the United States on September 14, 1951, as a master sergeant with duty assignment in the Far East Command, and, thereafter, he was assigned to the United States as a master sergeant with duty assignment in Japan, for which he was honorably discharged on September 14, 1951.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

MRS. FORD. 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 they 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 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., as compensation for the loss of his home in the Far East Command, and for his personal effects, which he was honorably discharged on February 1, 1952, as a master sergeant; and that on February 2, 1952, he entered on active duty under the arms of the United States as a master sergeant. Warrant Officer (jg) Pierre, W2151033, completed 10 years of service for pay purposes in 1952 and his pay aggregates $574.49 per month. Pursuant to competent orders, Warrant Officer Pierre departed the United States on September 14, 1951, as a master sergeant with duty assignment in the Far East Command, and, thereafter, he was assigned to the United States as a master sergeant with duty assignment in Japan, for which he was honorably discharged on September 14, 1951.

The records of the Department of the Army show that Nemoran J. Pierre, Jr., was born at Chicago, Ill. on December 3, 1929; 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 to the rank of master sergeant; and that on February 1, 1952, as a master sergeant; and that on February 2, 1952, he entered on active duty under the arms of the United States as a master sergeant. Warrant Officer (jg) Pierre, W2151033, completed 10 years of service for pay purposes in 1952 and his pay aggregates $574.49 per month. Pursuant to competent orders, Warrant Officer Pierre departed the United States on September 14, 1951, as a master sergeant with duty assignment in the Far East Command, and, thereafter, he was assigned to the United States as a master sergeant with duty assignment in Japan, for which he was honorably discharged on September 14, 1951.
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 extinguish the fire. I was able only to retrieve one arm load of assorted clothing, 2 footlockers, and 2 suitcases which were still burning.

"At approximately 12:05 hours the building was completely burnt out and down and I proceeded to telephone my unit and request it to be on the scene of the fire.

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 any way 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) or his agents.

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

On September 10, 1954, Warrant Officer Pierre was referred to the United States Army in the amount of $4,762.05, for the damages sustained by him on account of the destruction of his personal property by fire which was not under his control and not within the continental United States. After a careful consideration of all the evidence adduced, it was concluded that the fire damage caused to the household goods and other personal property destroyed by the fire amounted to the sum of $4,762.05, 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 (50 U. S. C. Title 24, section 1001 et seq.) as amended by the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 321), which provides:

"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 makes 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 b of section 66a 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 makes 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.

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 Seventh Circuit in the last of 1953 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, 1953, pp. 11 and 12.)

The special committee, consisting of United States Circuit Judge F. Ryan Duffy, chairman, United States District Judge Charles G. Bringle 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 1955. The Judicial Conference, in accordance with its usual practice, directed that the report be circulated to 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; and that the report be referred to the Committee on Bankruptcy Administration of the Judicial Conference for its consideration at its 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, after due consideration and approval of the section 66a be amended by adding a sentence at the end thereof so 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 dividends and other moneys 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 creditors or in case dividends have been allowed but not paid in full, and after such claims have been paid in full the balance shall be paid to the bankruptcy Fund, to be divided among the creditors in proportion to their respective amounts payable to them. Such dividends and other moneys shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042."

With the amendment above proposed, section 66b is no longer needed. The bank­ruptcy of the United States, for the recommendation of its bankruptcy commit­tee, 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 the proposals, but not acted upon. The Judicial Conference at its meeting in September 1954 upon the recommendation of its bankruptcy committee carried over the amendments. (See Report of the Judicial Conference, September session, 1954, pp. 14 and 16.)

With great respect, I am Sincerely yours,

ELMORE WHITFIELD.


The letter accompanying Senate bill 1997 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.


HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

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 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 997 is as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.


HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

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 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.
amendments were approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its regular meeting in September 1953 (see report of September 11, 1953, of the Judicial Conference, pp. 13 and 14).

Under the present provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, at least two separate notices are required in full, one at the front of the court file and one for the filing of objections to the discharge.

Section 14b provides, however, that the obligation of the trustee to give the notices to the bankrupt shall not be entered until after the bankrupt has been examined. This makes it impossible to combine the two notices in the case of a simple case.

The amendment of section 14b would permit the 2 notices to be combined in approximately 76 percent of the ordinary bankruptcy cases and would effect an estimated saving of $40,000 a year in postage alone. In a two-page letter in type, the notices would be accomplished in the expenditures for clerical help, supplies and equipment. Such procedure would eliminate the cost of preparing and sending the first 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 discharge the bankrupt if no objections are filed. If objections are filed the filing of objections to the bankrupt’s discharge shall not be entered until after the bankrupt has been examined. 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 objections have been filed; otherwise, the court shall hear objections to the discharge, by the trustee, creditors, the United States attorney, or such other attorney as the Attorney General may designate. Notice of such hearing shall be given to the bankrupt and the objecting parties a reasonable opportunity to be fully heard."

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 (June 26, 1953, Senate Journal, p. 3376; Senate Executive Journal, p. 3376; August 3, 1954. No action was taken in the Senate. At the meeting of the Judicial Conference in September 1954 the Conference Committee of the Judicial Conference, in concurrence with the Conference Committee, reaffirmed its approval of this measure. (See report of September 1954 session, p. 14.)

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, advanced a sum which, in good faith, loaned 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 conduct 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 58d (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.

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 appropriate reference 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. 1968

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 of 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 under 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 58 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 (d) 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 section shall concern 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 Agriculture, and the Senate was informed that there shall 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-
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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 proposal, which would enable private citizens to recover, in the sum of $1,600 and providing for full payment of interest.

The Senate has adopted 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 of the sum of $110.22, representing accrued interest on certain deposits to November 10, 1954.

The report of the President indicates 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 am referring to S. 1346, a bill to amend the National Gas Act, introduced by Mr. Kilgore, which is pending before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The bill will be received and applied to. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and applied to. 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 the scarce commodity at less than the actual cost including a fair share of the transportation costs, and provide that applications to increase gas rates of domestic consumers may be denied where the increase would result in 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 225 years, at the present rate of consumption. Natural gas sales have increased some 500 percent since the Congress passed the Natural Gas Act in 1938, and we have the 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.

I am in the forefront of the effort to seek improved conditions in the industry. The new law which has been passed by Congress provides for the protection of the national interest with respect to this limited natural resource.

We will be delinquent in our duty if we do not now, at this early hour, with the aid of the bill before us, act to correct these many problems which require solution for the protection of the national interest.

CURRENT STRENGTH OF THE SOVIET AIR FORCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for many years some of us have been warning that the United States might, in the future, have to rely on those who would minimize the ability of the Soviet Communists to produce modern combat weapons. But even I am 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 convinced they are well ahead with the production of improved air weapons; namely, the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Why is this true? Is it because some of us believe this money is more important than any other money we have in the world? No, but it is because we have been warned that it is. 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, we must be sure we have enough arms 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 committees.

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. 109) 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 circulatiion reported to the position of the Soviet Air Force; and

Whereas administration representatives appearing before the defense committees have attempted to justify their planned further heavy reductions in the Air Force and the Marine Corps, on the ground 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 nations is peace, which can only be obtained through negotiations for disarmament, conducted from a position of strength and relative security; and

Whereas it is imperative that the people of the United States and their elected representatives be fully and truthfully informed of 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. KEPAUVER. 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. Fulbright, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Man, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Magnussen, Mr.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The motion (Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Murray, Mr. Neely, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith of Maine, and Mr. Shankweiler) to discharge the Senate is in order.

The motion (Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Murray, Mr. Neely, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith of Maine, and Mr. Shankweiler) to discharge the Senate is in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The motion (Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Murray, Mr. Neely, Mr. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith of Maine, and Mr. Shankweiler) to discharge the Senate is in order.

WHEREAS article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Resolved, That the following be, and hereby are, adopted as the Code of Fair Committee Procedure of the Senate of the United States, and the Senate may investigate and hear testimony concerning alleged violations of law or improper or unethical conduct;

1. Subcommittees, as required, shall be appointed by the chairman, subject to the approval of the majority of the committee, and shall ordinarily consist of not less than three members, a proportionate ratio of whom shall be members of the majority (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 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (80 Stat. 587), shall be called only upon a majority vote of the members in 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 or motion may be amended only upon majority vote of the committee in a meeting at which a majority of the committee is actually present.

(e) Any witness who shall consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation being conducted by the committee shall not be shown proof of 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 members for a reasonable period of time to review evidence contained therein.

(g) (i) No testimony given in executive session may be transcribed, except pursuant to majority vote of the committee, to obtain access to the official transcript of such hearing.

(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 committee, and shall apply to 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) Bullsing on motions or objections shall be made by the member presiding, subject to appeal to the majority and minority 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 any 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 a majority of the members of the committee are present.

(f) (i) Every witness shall have the right to be present during the taking of testimony to object thereto 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 therein, and a witness and his counsel shall have the right to inspect only the complete transcript of his own testimony in executive session.

RIGHTS OF PERSONS ADEQUATELY AFFECTED BY AND AFFECTED WITH Adverse Material
Sec. 4. (a) A person shall be considered to be 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 staff authorizing such release, the right of written notice to the person of the evidence or testimony in a public hearing, the rights conferred by subsection (c) hereof and all other pertinent rights given by the evidence or testimony of the adverse witness or material or as will be made public or the subject of a public hearing.

(iii) The right of 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 deems 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 copy to the appropriate committee chairman and the adverse material or the relevant evidence or testimony or material or any disclosure of or comment upon it by members of the committee or staff authorizing such release, and to such person as in the committee's judgment the person to whom the subpena shall be issued or remain in force if already issued shall be decided by majority vote.

COMMITTEE STAFF
Sec. 6. The chairman, at his discretion, and changes in, the professional and clerical staff of a committee shall be subject to the majority vote 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 communication devices, 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 findings and their suggestions, and (3) to present their findings to the Senate, with such recommendations for remedial and disciplinary action, as 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 Joint Committee of the Senate except the majority and minority policy committees and any subcommittees of the foregoing.

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 is 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 $2 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 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 $86.3 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 unexpended balances carried over from previous years 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 continue the Treasury to meet their obligations to the amount of the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Total after transfers</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Unexpended balances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balance</td>
<td>Current fiscal year 1955 Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to expend from public debt receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$77.6</td>
<td>$48.1</td>
<td>$33.5</td>
<td>$94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>116.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 is 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 $2 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 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 $86.3 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 unexpended balances carried over from previous years 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 continue the Treasury to meet their obligations to the amount of the so-called unexpended balances in their appropriations and other spending authority. As 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Total after transfers</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Unexpended balances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior year balance</td>
<td>Current fiscal year 1955 Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to expend from public debt receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$77.6</td>
<td>$48.1</td>
<td>$33.5</td>
<td>$94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>116.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of appropriations and other authorizations, expenditures, and unexpended balances, executive branch of the Federal Government,
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]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department or agency</th>
<th>Appropriations and authorizations</th>
<th>Expenditures (through Dec. 31, 1954)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior-year appropriations and authorizations</td>
<td>Current appropriations and authorizations, fiscal year 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,731</td>
<td>8,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds appropriated to the President (including foreign aid)</td>
<td>59,662</td>
<td>49,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent offices</td>
<td>12,577,751</td>
<td>2,473,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
<td>1,566,769</td>
<td>335,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Home Finance Agency</td>
<td>5,623,563</td>
<td>61,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>5,555,971</td>
<td>2,152,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td>760,192</td>
<td>711,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>83,470,662</td>
<td>30,118,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health, Education and Welfare</td>
<td>577,776</td>
<td>1,354,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>201,197</td>
<td>274,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>20,846</td>
<td>181,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>55,987</td>
<td>356,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>257,867</td>
<td>302,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td>56,062</td>
<td>130,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Treasury</td>
<td>4,716,884</td>
<td>7,346,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undistributed</td>
<td>98,419,630</td>
<td>50,961,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>$8,568,000</td>
<td>$56,945,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Excluding trust and deposit fund accounts.
2. Includes balances in 1953 and 1954 appropriation and other authorization accounts and balances in non-year and multi-year appropriation and other authorization accounts.
3. Includes all regular appropriations and authorizations, transfers, and unexpended balances as of Dec. 31, 1954.
4. Excludes principal of refunds of receipts resulting from variations in methods of reporting and reporting and reporting Northwest Territories.
5. Represents transfer of funds from one account to another within the same agency or among agencies, or from other accounts, and for disposition of earnings of business-type activities (principally wholly owned Government corporations).
6. Includes small amounts for which time for obligation has expired, and time for transfers may be scheduled.
7. 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).

**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 Lumbar, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice John Marshall Harlan, expired.**
- **Sentry R. Waterman, of Vermont, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice James Alger Fee, retired.**
- **Kenneth P. Grubis, 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 a written objection with the committee on or before Tuesday, May 24, 1955, any objections that may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with any statement that they intend 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 will be held 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 they may deem 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, expressing the desirability of having Foreign Service personnel who have served continuously for long periods overseas, return to spend some time in this country.

I seek that there also be printed my letter of the same date to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDY], who wrote me in regard to this important matter.
I am in complete agreement with your view that the Wriston program should be carried out and I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written to Secretary of State, 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, Mr. 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, China and Poland, yesterday in Vienna yesterday the long-delayed treaty which makes Austria again a sovereign and independent nation was signed. In its masterpiece form, the Austrian treaty has as its starting point the promise made in this city in 1945 of a free and independent Austria. The treaty 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 its basic liberties and rights, Austria is again to becoming masters in their own house in a matter of months. What is more, Austria has been given back with the recognition 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, this Austrian treaty, for example, return for Austrian neutrality, are merely part of a wider program being built up by the Soviets for the purpose of bringing the continent at top levels, to which they have agreed. That program takes into account the patent fact that the United States and Britain have been unable to prevent the implementation of the Paris pacts. The Soviets seek, therefore, to supplement their threats with more unambiguously gestures designed to persuade-and ill-the world into the belief that they have suddenly become a nation that can make a treaty, just as 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. Both these pacts are dependent on the prior achievement of some more immediate objectives, and it is to these that the Soviets now direct their efforts.

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 stated 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 top-ranking Soviet chiefs propose to visit soon to mend the quarrel that drove his country from the Cominform. Marshal Tito does expose another part of the Soviet 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 a new sense of confidence in limiting her armaments, endangering the refugees within her borders, and gratuitously charging her with giving up her military strength. It is probably the best experience at the cost of heavy economic burdens and at the price of severing the Western military front between Germany and Italy. Only as such as it is, it is a welcome first dividend of the Big Four policy, 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, the time has come when we need to clarify the facts. The treatment of Asia as a region in the mutual-security bill of this year is naturally interested in the new stress and the special emphasis laid on the Far Eastern area of the world. We are considering the special situation existing in relation to China, 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 world, it is important to have 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 the special situation existing in relation to China, 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.

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. The Simla Conference should have made it plain to us that there are differences, areas of mistrust and antagonisms, that a vision and ideals that will make it difficult, if not impossible, to deal with a geographical area as if it were unified in nature. Furthermore, it is not yet exist and the Conference made it clear that it is still some considerable way in spirit as it is in need. The unity does make it clearer than ever that the problems posed and the questions raised cannot be understood, but their reasoning is set forth, from the beginning, as mutuality.

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 understated but real, and it is not unsound to be self-defeating in the long run. It cannot be expected that the United States will lift all aid in the absence of need, and it should not be the illimitable source of American money for all nations that are in need. The whole concept of regional aid is not contrary, but 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 will become slowly lessened.

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 deprive us of 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 specialized 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 those 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 Foreign Service, and supported by several congressional committees, in the Far East, Near East, and Latin America. Not only will the reduction of the appropriation vitiate all plans for 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 business, and others—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, leadership, and supervision would be completely eliminated, and would be cut in half—from $350,00 to $128,250.

Recently, I received from Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of Kansas University, a letter urging favorable action on the part of the Senate on the proposal of the Department of State 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, Kans., April 26, 1955.

Mr. ANDREW SCHOPPEL,
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 reducing the appropriation from the full amount requested by the House Appropriations Committee dealing with this matter, either in original form or copy. I can only say that if this kind of short sighted disposition of the available funds is to continue, we, the American people, could not have hoped for greater good fortune.

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 months or 2 years. I have seen them come to these shores, cynical and questioning, and have seen them leave as enthused and enthusiastic about our country and our system. I can only say that if this kind of shortsighted disposition of the available funds is to continue in the future, the American people could not have hoped for greater good fortune.

It is not the business of the American people to help the Russians, but it is the business of the American people to educate the Russians. If we set a budget for ourselves in building our own home, it seems to me that it is up to us to look after it, and not allow the Russians to pick up the ball when our technical mistakes become overrun and we are unprepared to meet the greatest 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. And for this reason we, the American people, must be able to see that this is a program for the future and the future leaders of the United States and the United States States. I can only say that if this kind of shortsighted disposition of the available funds is to continue in the future, we the American people could not have hoped for greater good fortune.
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, California, 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 to 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 reports following discussion (vote tabulated April 21, 1955).

TREATIES

1. Are existing provisions of the Constitution adequate to prevent abuse of the treaty-making power? Yes, 563; 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, 1,058.

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, 616; no, 475.

4. Do you think the Constitution should have an express provision to the effect that no treaty granting 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, 498.

6. Do you believe that an executive agreement—
   (a) Has been abused in the past? Yes, 796; no, 324.
   (b) May be abused in the future? Yes, 608; no, 277.

7. (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? 708.

8. (a) Should approval by both Houses of Congress be required before the President as Commander-in-Chief may make an agreement binding him 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, 632; no, 301.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

9. (a) Should section 1 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 647; no, 487. (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, 517; no, 519. (Section 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.)

(c) Should the first sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 517; no, 519. (Section 3. A treaty may not confer on the President power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization.)

(d) Should the last sentence of section 3 of the Bricker amendment be adopted? Yes, 647; no, 518. (All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.)

3 OF THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

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-percenter parity. The people of my State are very proud of their Senators. If I 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 the copy of the paragraph at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have written to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENBERGER), 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 ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENBERGER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Rightfully or wrongly, the statement has gone out that the Senate is not going to consider H. R. 12, passed by the House on April 5, 1955, for 90-percenter parity.

While I realize that the bill passed the House by only a margin of five, nevertheless, I am stating to my constituents in North Dakota—and I believe in the Northwest—when I respectfully ask that under your leadership, 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—lies.

Thanking you for the many courtesies you have shown me, and hoping that you are well and happy, I am

Sincerely,
FRANKLIN D. MURPHY,
Chancellor.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Majority Leader of the Senate, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Rightfully or wrongly, 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-percenter parity.

While I realize that the bill only passed the House by a margin of 5, nevertheless, I am stating to 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. ELLENBERGER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, asking that the committee report out the bill for action by the Senate, because every time I have brought this bill to 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—lies.

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 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 ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENBERGER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

We have recently received your determination to fight for 90-percenter 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 General 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 previous statements; that March position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if the Senate does not enact this bill, parity can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before this—which was promised to the States—and the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate, this action can result in a great 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.


The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENBERGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We have recently received your determination to fight for 90-percenter 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 General 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 previous statements; that March position of today will be one for which you will later on be very proud. I firmly believe that if the Senate does not enact this bill, parity can prevail in the committee and in the Senate. If this action should not be completed before this—which was promised to the States—and the combination of an unfavorable wheat vote followed by an unfavorable action of the Senate, this action can result in a great 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,
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STATUTORY OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, I have been told that 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:


1. Applicants notified of documents required.
   - Italy: 62,744
   - Greece: 17,705
2. Applicants notified of documents received.
   - Italy: 1,281
   - Greece: 1,291
3. Visa refused.
   - Italy: 1,495
   - Greece: 674
   - Italy: 23
   - Greece: 78
5. Applicants still in process.
   - Italy: 42,790
   - Greece: 11,985
6. Assurances received by Administrators.
   - Italy: 5,705
   - Greece: 8,774
7. Assurances verified and sent to field.
   - Italy: 4,820
   - Greece: 7,974

Assurances received.
   - Italy: 2,366
   - Greece: 3,297
Assurances sent to field.
   - Italy: 1,039
   - Greece: 1,310
Assurances canceled returned.
   - Italy: 2
   - Greece: 4

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 refugee relief program, status of visa applications, May 6, 1955, presents an opportunity for the Girl Scouts to demonstrate the use of voting machines, to train girls in participating citizenship, to train girls in participating citizenship, to train girls in participating citizenship, to train girls in participating citizenship, to train girls in participating citizenship.

One may ask how in the world little girls can contribute to 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 informational 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,” etc., which 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. Even though the “My Government” badge as “Active Citizen,” “My Community,” “My Country,” “My Government,” etc., which 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. Even though the “My Government” badge as “Active Citizen,” “My Community,” “My Country,” “My Government,” etc., which for which more than 100,000 girls, 10 through 13 years old, qualify each year.

The United States, within its 48 States, has more than one million people who are 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 Norway 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.

These people were among the first to 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 the farms which provided food and fiber for a growing country.

They also turned to the waters in the exciting era in our history. It was the Norwegians who tilled the soil and built the farms which provided food and fiber for a growing country.

They used the lumber to build communities which still stand as testimonies to their courage and industry, and which 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
The contributions of Norwegians in both World War I and World War II were significant. At Fort Snelling, Minn., in World War II we had a Norwegian battalion trained as a part of the Ninth Infantry Regiment. They were trained in the rigid conditions necessary 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. Col. 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 struggle. Norway, since 1920, 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 NATO have been an inspiration to all member countries. From the famous fjord country, from the farms, from the cities, and from the universities of Norway, has flowed 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. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that these recommendations of the Hoover Commission, as printed in the New York Times of May 16, 1955, be printed in the Congressional Record.
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 by former President Herbert Hoover, were far from embraced in full by the Senate and the Congress. Of the 23 recommendations of the present Senate, the Commission made 22 proposals. It could not estimate what they would save in their entirety. Ten got no approval. The remaining, or part of the 22, got partial enactment.

"Far more important than the dollar savings are the beneficial results to our economy from the better administration of these enterprises," 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.

Exempt 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 production prices, frequently do not include their personnel on their payroll.

They also deprive the Government of taxes that might otherwise go 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 governmental function," the Commission said.

In addition, it added, probably a few hundred other government enterprises 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. Parley, of New York, the former Postmaster General, objected to the proposal calling for an end to all TVA chemical operations. Representative C. Earle Orrin, Democrat of California, in a general dissent, objected to the "summary, method of disposing of a governmental function in which the Commission's report would dispose" of Federal activities.

The majority of the Senate majority has dissented from Commission reports, said the majority had failed to consider that the curtailment of operations by the Administration would thereby 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 business-type enterprises are 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 changes if the transfer were possible, of all such work to private yards.

As many as possible of the 288 large industries in the United States which operate under World War industrial reserve should be sold to private companies. The Government investment in these enterprises, in the United States Steel Corporation, is about $9 billion and maintenance costs run about $200 million a year.

Deferring operations 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 post office departments. Blacksmiths, welders, and other Government enterprise which 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 not exceed the civilian level.

"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 of 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 alone because of a self-selling and dispose of the processing plants.

The Defense Department should be reminded for its recent efforts to get out of the business of producing "any substantial portion of the latter's needs," 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 of 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 alone because of a self-selling and dispose of the processing plants.

The Defense Department should be reminded for its recent efforts to get out of the business of producing "any substantial portion of the latter's needs," 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 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 other commercial services should be leased or closed down where feasible.

The Commission noted that it was keenly aware that its recommendations, if enacted, would mean that "many keen 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 employment.

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, Ore., Mr. Floyd Officer, has suggested the strange administration power partnership in a fine letter sent to the Pendleton East-Oregonian, and reprinted in the Pendletonian East-Oregonian and the North West Rural.

Mr. Officer suggests a lumber partnership with the Government on the same terms that the utility companies seek to take over powerplants at such 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 industries, the coal and oil companies, have enjoyed in their 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 powerplants should not be reversed, so that the utilities would get the mill 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 be more interested in the powerplants at which 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 Pendletonian East-Oregonian and the Northwest Rural.

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 is not to be extended to other fields of endeavor.

Now I have in mind an excellent plan which is 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 lumber, pay for the construction 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 the lumber must be brought. I will see to it that all the necessary machinery is taken over and the mill wops, I mean lumber, away from the mill. All this expense to me is to be financed by loans from the Government. I take this as no risk of my own.

The big thing about it is that this partnership is to last for only 60 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 owned by the Government. The lumber will be bought by the Government at $5 a ton, and the sawmill paid for by the Government through the usual procedure.

I wonder whether the partnership at good ole Doug today, and who knows, within a fortnight, I may be in business with the Government.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD OFFICER.

SENICA, ORE.

DEATH OF FORMER SUPREME COURT JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to refer to 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 dissent" of the High Court, had lived in Phillipsburg until 1952, when he moved there to civil affairs and an occasional appearance in court as an independent and "unpredictable" jurist who frequently cast the deciding vote in 5 to 4 decisions of the High Court.

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 Court.

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 was influential 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 bought by special interests, and he insisted upon making his decisions in accordance with the great tradition of the American judiciary.

When he retired from the bench 10 years ago, he did not retire from public life. He felt that he had an obligation to his country, an obligation which could be discharged only through service.

He has devoted the past 10 years to civic affairs, and his friends, his neighbors, and the whole country have been enriched by his activities.

His passing leaves an aching void in our national life. But to those of us who knew him and admired him, he will always be with us.

A man of such stature never really dies. His personality and his character are stamped upon the permanent life of our country. And this consolation can rejoice.

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 89 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 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 in the civic and development 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 programs 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, to the Senate, was agreed to by the Senate. The message related 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, 1966, and for other purposes, and that the House had recessed 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. 1908. An act for the relief of Frankett Lee; kind.

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 who would be on 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, was set to make recommendations, to write a report, and that 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, had the draft of the 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 of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Washington, D. C.:

Urges that your Commission release the task force report on public power and water resources. Reports are that recommendations contained therein are of sweeping vitality. Public has vital interest in the recommendations, since public owns these properties involved.

I have before me an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of last Sunday, May 14, 1955, 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 DISCARDING TVA TYPE OF PUBLIC UTILITY SYSTEMS

(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, which is being kept secret until its publication as an official document of the Hoover, Commission, will be a bitter report against the third at.

It will not advocate outright sale of TVA to private interests but the net effect of its recommendations is a strong recommendation that the government give up of TVA and the systems of public-power distribution which TVA represents.

While all members of the Hoover Commission are bound by secrecy against revealing the contents of the task force recommendations, the Post-Dispatch has learned from other sources that the task force will recommend that 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 keep the public utilities 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 men are all men of business. 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 down to publishing 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 who favored the motion were former Postmaster General James A. Farley, Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican Representative from Ohio, Senator L. MCCLANAHAN (Democrat), Arkansas, and HOLIFIELD.

Against the Holifield move were Hoover, Attorney General Herbert Brownlee, Jr., Ar­ chie C. Holton, special assistant to President Eisenhower (Republican), New Hampshire, Robert G. Storey, Sidney A. Mitchell, and Solomon C. Hollister.
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Sources close to the Commission say that shortly after the commission selected and began its business in July 1953, the forthcoming attack upon public power has been its main objective.

Hoover and Mitchell who handpicked the task force of anti-public-power members. Mitchell is a director of the American Electric Power and is a utility-career man. His father, Sidney Z. Mitchell, organized the electric plants of the Edison Company and was several of the board of the Electric Bond & Share Co.

Electric Bond & Share Co.'s wholly owned subsidiary, Electric Bond & Share Power Corporation, is 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 conservation. The task force has, since February 1954, has spent more than $5,000,000 on various studies and is expected to ask for more money from Congress Monday.

There have been frequent demands on Hoover to the report secret much longer. There will be discussion from Congress next week that it be released.

This task force has, since February 1954, spent more than $324,000 on various studies and is expected to ask for more money from Congress Monday.

The Hoover Commission is presently engaged in a project to determine the best interest of conservation. The Hoover Commission on the whole, since September 1953, has spent more than $400,000.

Report according to Hoover to the Post-Dispatch has learned from the AEC that the task-force report is a story that should be sold to private utilities. The task force has spent more than $400,000.

There have been frequent demands on Hoover to reveal the contents of the task force report secret much longer. There will be discussion from Congress next week that it be released.

Three 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. The school was one of the first to publish such a publication.

One of the outstanding activities of this kind which has come to my attention recently is the publication of a special issue of a monthly newspaper of a small-town elementary school. The school was one of the first to publish such a publication.

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 a conservation day a few weeks ago. 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.

The Hoover Commission has been critical of the AEC's handling of the task force report and has made the report secret.

Professional conservationists, educators, and scientists are amazed with the progress and contributions to conservation being made by the Hoover Commission. The best interest of conservation are in the classroom, the church, school, and works of the AEC for its supply of power.

All youth groups have come to realize that they must assume a leading part in the conservation of the country's resources.

Conservation is an integral part of the National FFA (Future Farmers of America) program. More than 250,000 boys and girls have received specific training in soil and water conservation.

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 boys and girls.

The Hoover Commission has been critical of the AEC's handling of the task force report and has made the report secret.

The Hoover Commission has been critical of the AEC's handling of the task force report and has made the report secret.

The Hoover Commission has been critical of the AEC's handling of the task force report and has made the report secret.

The Hoover Commission has been critical of the AEC's handling of the task force report and has made the report secret.
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. You are working on the articles, who made drawings 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 by the American Nature Association at Washington, D.C., has an article in the May issue, just off the press, pertaining to the special number for March on conservation.

The special number 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 at Milford Elementary School who worked on the articles, who made drawings to illustrate it, as well as those who participated 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 saw no objection, and the request was granted.

The article ordered to be printed in the Record appears below:

EMERGENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE—VOLUNTARY DISTRIBUTION SETUP DEFENDED BY MRS. HOFFY

(By John Van Camp)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—President Eisenhower this morning approved a voluntary plan for the distribution of Salk antipolio vaccine, and early in the afternoon Mrs. Matilda Salk, daughter of the late Dr. Jonas E. Salk, also made a statement on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record this article that appeared before a Senate committee to defend it.

The 11-point voluntary plan carries with it a $25 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 publication 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 authority for distribution of the antipolio vaccine.

With her jaw jutting and her back stiff as a ramrod, she challenged critics and made the point in her capacity as senator from Oregon, that her Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee to show her a federalized control system that would work as well or as fast as her proposal.

She was backed up by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who said the Government and 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 polo season—August and September.

SHELD 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 11- through 14-year-old "pioneers," those children who took dummy shots in the great experiment last year.

There are 9 million children in this group, and completing these 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 "re-appraised" and given a second approval. The withdrawal of the vaccine made by the Cutter Biologicals, of California, was the subject of 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-through 19 age group, including all non-immunized 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 rest of the country, the Service 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 according to the State's priority. The 5-9 to 15-19 group will be inoculated. Manufacturers will make reports to Mrs. Hobby on their shipments.

6. Race, religion, and creed are irrelevant. The availability for distribution within its borders and will decide what portion goes to public agencies and what portion to the private medical profession.

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 either Salk or Salk-K 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 shipper to physician and patient—be regulated. The transaction involving Salk vaccine is recorded and that the record includes the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the physician's or agency's name.

10. Action by Congress to appropriate $28 million for grants to the States for the purchase of the vaccine for indigent children.

RECORDING 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 Allocation will issue new recommendations.

These are the other age groups, in the descending order of priority as of today: 1 to 4; 5 to 9; 10 to 14; 15 to 19; 20 to 45.

At the base, as a representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the program rests "on the faith that the medical profession will give the vaccine to the 15-to 19 age group first."

POWERS 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.

Hobby answered that the Salk vaccine was "under a medical high command" by which she could have foreseen the public demand.

FUNDATION LAID PLANS

The Polio Foundation, however, in October of 1954 laid far larger foundations for 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 report to the President and the Senate committee, said the voluntary plan was based on these principles:

1. Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by medical advice, unaffected 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.

Mrs. Hobby said that a poll of 51 governors of States and Territories taken last week showed that 41 of them were in favor of Health, Education, and Welfare should stand
Mr. President, I wish to say that I am not at all impressed with the efforts of Mrs. Hobby to bullhead through and abet her horrid 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. Six 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 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. 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 any vaccine should have been tested by the Federal Government batch by batch before it was released by the drug companies. Nothing but bad faith or lunacy would make the public believe that after defective vaccine was discovered on the market the 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 requires a national control 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. Vre] 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 that makes no sense at all, a horrid 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. 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 vaccine was discovered on the market, and certainly it has been aware 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 abet her horrid 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. Six 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 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. 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 any vaccine should have been tested by the Federal Government batch by batch before it was released by the drug companies. Nothing but bad faith or lunacy would make the public believe that after defective vaccine was discovered on the market the 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 requires a national control 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. Vre] 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 that makes no sense at all, a horrid 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. 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 vaccine was discovered on the market, and certainly it has been aware that new laws could do nothing to speed up production of the vaccine.
to the Senator from Ohio. I suggest that he read it. The editorial was published in the Ohio State Journal on 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 vaccine was not 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 production falls behind demand, and until the present disgraceful ineffectiveness of the production of a medicine, particularly a new, long cherished and quickly distributed.

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.

In the face of this, the Government indifferently let matters rock along, unguided, unadvised, 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, free enterprise system, there are some weaknesses, among them being that sometimes production falls behind demand, and until the present disgraceful ineffectiveness of the production of a medicine, particularly a new, long cherished and quickly distributed.

The Government should have already provided. The temporary halting of the program was the only course possible after it was ordered to be printed in the Record of Congress.

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.

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.
laboratory, give satisfactory evidence of compliance with the standards to assure the safety and quality 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 vaccine, the manufacturing standards and the testing procedures used were developed jointly by Dr. Salk, the manufacturers, and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and experts of the Laboratory of Biologics Control. The laboratory collaborated with 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 biological characteristics of personnel in these manufacturers, their methods and standards of manufacturing, and the physical layout of their plants. The field trials conducted during 1954 provided the widest possible experience, unique in the history of testing new drug products on a large scale. Each lot of 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 biological product in history. These results were evaluated under the direction of Dr. Jonas Salk, Jr., chairman of the department of epidemiology at the University of Michigan School of Public Health. The studies announced on April 12, 1955, proved the vaccine prevented from 60 percent to 90 percent of paralytic poliomyelitis.

On April 28, a telegram was addressed to the governors of all States and Territories requesting their help in distributing the vaccine equitably.

In the first meeting of some 50 national organizations broadly representative of the public interest was held to provide them with that of probation 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 addressed a letter to the manufacturer of six lots of Salk vaccine to the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine had its first meeting under the chairmanship of Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to advise on testing procedures with respect to the vaccine. The Surgeon General issued a special study under the chairmanship of Dr. Chester S. Keefer, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to advise on the need for testing procedures with respect to the vaccine. The Surgeon General and three members of the advisory committee on testing procedures with respect to the vaccine. The Surgeon General and three members of the advisory committee on testing procedures with respect to the vaccine.

On May 3, the Surgeon General directed the development of a small scale and testing procedures with respect to the vaccine. The Surgeon General assigned an up-to-the-minute summary of the poliomyelitis vaccine situation at the Governors' Conference. On the same day an advisory committee on the vaccine 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 the vaccine. On May 7, the Surgeon General issued a bulletin recommending that States and counties acquire as many vaccine 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 previous 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.

A summary of technical and scientific problems in this connection is contained in appendix 1.

On May 11, the first field reporting of the Salk vaccine program began in California. On May 13, the Public Health Service announced the release of the Parke-Davis & Co. vaccine that had been reappraised.

SUPPLY

Throughout the history of the development of a new vaccine, there have been several steps in the process of product development, each requiring the production of a new batch of vaccine. These batches must be tested and approved before they can be used. The steps include the isolation of the virus, the establishment of a method for growing the virus in cell culture, the production of a concentrated vaccine, and the testing of the vaccine for safety and efficacy. This process is repeated for each new vaccine, and the same steps are required for each subsequent batch of vaccine.

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 biological product production.

1. Limited Number of Manufacturers

There are at present six licensed manufacturers of Salk vaccine, the product of which can be used. These are the companies that produce the vaccine. Only two of these manufacturers also contributed substantial risk capital for the development of the vaccine. Inasmuch as the outcome of the field trials, which began in 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 that in late December of 1954, a meeting was held between the manufacturers and the National Institutes of Health to advise on the need for testing procedures with respect to the vaccine. The Surgeon General issued a bulletin recommending that States and counties acquire as many vaccine programs until Public Health Service recommendations could be released on Sunday, May 8. On May 9, the list of states was released, and the following states are reported to be using the vaccine: California, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

An accurate estimate of the vaccine supply at any future time is impeded by the complexity of the biological and chemical processes on which manufacture is dependent, by the intermediate testing procedures 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 6 months, and the delay or failure of a particular lot may have a significant effect on the supply at any given time.

B. Supply estimates

1. Present estimates

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.

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 the qualifications which accompany any estimates made in this field. They might necessitate either upward or downward revisions. Biologics are subject to fluctuations due to a variety of factors, and it is not possible, therefore, to predict production schedules with any certainty. Failure of any batch, therefore, cuts production schedules. Further, the production of vaccine by the manufacturer, as of April 22, 1955, was based on the assumption that the stated quantity will be checked out and released for clinical use by the Laboratory of Biologics, as of January 1, 1956. It was not possible, therefore, to cut production schedules prior to the release of the vaccine. The estimated supply of vaccine as of January 1, 1956, was that no vaccine will be delivered to States as of January 1, 1956, other than to the States in the first 10." The estimates are subject to the following qualifications:

(b) NFIP contract fulfillment

The NFIP present purchase goal is for delivery of 27 million cubic centimeters of Salk vaccine during 1955. As of May 6, according to the 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 announcement on December 14, 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 5 million cubic centimeters, in individual dose containers, was distributed by three companies for general sale. This was the basis for reports of sale of vaccine to the general public, and administration by physicians to their private patients.

Four companies relabeled material they had previously distributed for distribution to the State health officers and provided it to NFIP when the need for additional vaccine became apparent. Each manufacturer has informed the Secretary 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 attitude of the companies and the cooperation between the Department and representatives of six firms. Each manufacturer individually has exhibited a 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 of the Advisory Committees, April 22 and 27, 1955

Immediately following the President's directive of April 14, 1955, the Secretary in consultation with elected representatives of the health professions, the pharmaceutical industry, and others to a technical and scientific meeting in Washington on April 22, 1955. The purpose of the scientific meeting was to present the findings of the April 22 technical and scientific meeting and to discuss the results of the surveys and expressions of views about allocation and equitable distribution of the vaccine. (Appended are summaries of discussions represented at the meeting on April 27.)

The essence of the discussions at the technical-scientific committee meeting on April 22 was to determine who would be willing to cooperate in a plan for distribution of the vaccine. The essence of the discussions at the technical-scientific committee meeting on April 27 was:

1. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.
2. No age-group priorities for vaccination should be set for the guidance of the general public, health officials, practicing physicians, and vaccine manufacturers.
3. The priority age-group schedule will be developed through consultation with a committee of the Department, and representation of citizens groups on April 27:

a. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

b. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

2. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

b. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

2. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

b. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

2. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

b. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

2. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

b. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.

2. There will be a continuing need for experimental mass production of the vaccine.
The committee discussed thoroughly the question of the available vaccine supply and reserve, and equitable distribution. The committee’s first recommendation was that the supplies of Salk vaccine be distributed "in accordance with an overall plan based on the anticipated need for the Salk vaccine, taking into account the total supply for the next 2 months (that is, until July 1) be limited to children aged 5 through 14 years, and that the available supplies be utilized to the largest extent possible."

On May 9 three members of the Governors’ Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis 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 division of the vaccine supply among the various States were discussed. The plans being developed by the Governors’ Committee were announced in this report were discussed; and the committee agreed to poll the governors of all the States at that meeting as to the plan they wished to follow. The present meeting is to be told of specific additional requirements as soon as they were formulated.

The plans for using the vaccine in New York City were discussed, and the committee was advised that the city was developing a priority 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. The committee was told that the supplies and the vaccine were being distributed among the States in accordance with the priorities established at a meeting of representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the governors of the States. The committee was advised that the supplies of vaccine were being distributed among the States in accordance with the following plan:

1. Responsibility in a single agency at the national level to direct the distribution of vaccine among the States, and the entire output of the manufacturer, and to rationalize the basis on which the total output of the vaccine is allocated.

2. Allocation of vaccine on the basis of age groups and other epidemiological factors.

3. Assurance that the vaccine made available to each State, under the plan recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

4. Assurance that the vaccine made available to each State, under the plan recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

5. Allocation of vaccine on the basis of age groups and other epidemiological factors.

6. Assurance that the vaccine made available to each State, under the plan recommended by the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

The distribution system, established by the NFIP, under which the vaccine is distributed, is designed to give effect to the foregoing six basic elements (except No. 4, which is inapplicable, since the vaccine did not flow through commercial channels). The required mechanics of the NFIP system are as follows:

1. Essentially the entire initial output of vaccine was made available to NFIP manufacturers which had been made between NFIP and the manufacturers. The NFIP program to vaccinate first- and second-grade children thereupon 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. Physicists and others who administered the inoculations with NFIP vaccine gave it only to first and second graders, in accordance with the NFIP priority system.

5. The cost of the vaccine and distribution costs were met with NFIP funds. Physical and other costs of administering the vaccine, in connection with administration of vaccinations, were met with public or privately raised funds.

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.

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. It is the intention of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the governors of the States and Territories on April 26, 1955, requesting each of them to name an individual or State agency to serve as primary planning and coordinating agency with the activities of 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.

Following the meeting with the governors, a conference of members of the medical profession was held in March, the purpose of which was to secure the very broad outlines of the plans for using the vaccine. The conference was attended by representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the governors of the States, and the medical profession.

The committee was advised that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now in a position to recommend the basic elements of a program designed to extend the vaccination of children to children in the first and second grades.

The committee was advised that 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. It is the intention of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the governors of the States and Territories on April 26, 1955, requesting each of them to name an individual or State agency to serve as primary planning and coordinating agency with the activities of 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.
which has been generally overlooked. It emphasizes the need to locate ade-
sirable 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 de-
volved solely to complete the NFIP contracts.
No effort has been made 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 3.

The National Advisory Committee has re-
commended 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 pay for the procurement and dis-
tribution of any allocation to their re-
pective 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 be expected to distribute vaccine 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
distributing vaccine to children.

4. Assurance of sales in authorized channels
and on prescription

The usual laws applicable to the distribu-
tion and sale of prescription drugs are ap-
plicable to the distribution and sale of the
Salk vaccine.

Under the terms of the Federal Food, Drug,
and Cosmetic Act, section 503 (k) (1), the
Salk vaccine may be lawfully sold only to a
licensed physician or on the prescription of
a licensed physician; the local health officer,
notwithstanding any Federal law or regula-
tion, may order 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 sanc-
tions which help to assure that in the distri-
bution and sale of vaccine at all levels—through
wholesalers and to the retail
drugstores—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 the provisions of this
section if it were found to be in the possession of a person
not regularly and lawfully entitled in the mainland, trans-
portation, storage, or wholesale distribution
of prescription drugs. Furthermore, the
person making a sale to such an unauthor-
ized person would be subject to similar sanc-
tions.

The following existing Federal laws provide
adequate sanctions against unauthorized sales
of such portions of the vaccine as may be distributed through normal commercial
channels. The 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 estab-
lishment 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 with a strong educational pro-
gram. The physicians of America can be coun-
ted 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 leg-
islatures and local public-health agencies
to carry out that responsibility. The time required
to do the same job. The time required
to carry out that responsibility, Mr. Presi-
dent, is measured in terms of the financial inabil-
ity of his parents, we recommend Federal funds for
emergency grants to State health agencies would pro-
vide 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 con-
vincing that the voluntary and established
distribution of the vaccine will be accom-
plished through the voluntary cooperation of all
agencies within the framework of an 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 the overall
plan of division among States developed by
the Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare and the priority system.

Second, the governors of the
States have been directed to make
the intra-State allocation of the vaccine.

Third, a well regulated and established
priority system exists, in which the vaccine not purchased for public
agencies may flow. All vaccine in commer-
ial channels is subject to a food and drug
agency permit, and there has been no
relating to prescription drugs.

Fourth, the problem of fair allocation are
magnified by the facts that (a) the priority
consumers of the vaccine at any given time
are not only identifiable but are all
and (b) within the priority consumer group,
there is no demand for more vaccine per
individual than that needed for the single
dose of vaccine.

Fifth, only a voluntary plan utilizing exist-
ing organizational machinery can be mobi-
lized quickly enough to be effective during a
brief period of shortage.

Sixth, all groups involved in the
distribution—employers, medical groups, the
profession—have pledged their full coopera-
tion 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 sale of the vaccine
must always be the first consideration. Dis-
tribution must be secondary to safety. The
safety of the vaccine released for use will
be the responsibility of the Public Health Service under the biologies
control provisions of the Public Health Ser-
vice Act, and is receiving the constant and
diligent attention of the Public Health Ser-
vice.

Recommendation No. 1. Resources of the
Public Health Service

That, with the cooperation of the legal
consideration, the Public Health Service must have
every facility, including necessary additional
funds and personnel, to insure maximum
precautions in continued testing of the vac-
cine for safety and potency.

Recommendation No. 2. National Founda-
tion for Infantile Paralysis free immuniza-
tion 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
grades.

Recommendation No. 3. Priorities

That the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on
Poliomyelitis Vaccine, the vaccine should be
administered for the time being only to children in
the most susceptible age group, 5-9, inclusive.

Further priorities should be announced from time to time as the
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
administration of the States of the entire out-
put of Salk vaccine, as pledged by the manu-
facturers.

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
give priority for children in each State to those
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
agency, develop a state plan to carry out the
direction of the State's share of the Salk vac-
cine within the State. The State plan must be
based on age group priorities, to become
effective as soon as the NFIP free distribution
program is completed.

Recommendation No. 7. Enforcement of
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 request-
ed for Food and Drug Administration of the
Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
fare. It is further recommended that State
officials and local officials give special emphasis to the enforcement of applicable State laws relat-
ing to prescription drugs.

Recommendation No. 8. Adherence to prior-
ities by physicians, public and
private

That, with the cooperation of the medical
profession pledged to insure the success of
a voluntary control plan, medical organiza-
tions take all appropriate steps to assured the
(a) physicians will administer vaccinations only to, and issue prescriptions only for, children who have had paralytic polio;
(b) physicians will, in accordance with the recommendations of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccines, and the National Institutes of Health, require parents to receive vaccination, site of vaccination (place on body of child), and the lot number of the vaccine used, and the lot number.

Recommendation No. 9. Record keeping by distributors

That manufacturers, pharmaceutical companies, and other drug organizations and States and other public agencies, whose cooperation to make a voluntary control plan work has also been pledged, taken necessary steps to assure that every dis-

tribution of vaccine keep a record of the name of the manufacturer, the lot number, and the customer receiving the vaccine.

Recommendation No. 10. Federal funds for grants to States

That legislation which has been prepared by this Department be submitted to the Con-
gress to make Federal funds available to the States for the purchase (or otherwise the provision of) vaccine (except of its own). 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, supple-

mented by existing law relating to drug dis-
tribution and Federal leadership and funds provides an immediately available system of distribution. Under this program, the vac-

cine will be distributed equitably and admin-
istered in accordance with scientifically es-
tablished age priorities. It will get the vac-
cine to the children who need it most with the speed, efficiency, and economy that are the end result.

We will continuously review the progress of the total national program for distribution of the vaccine thus far this year. The committee will be submitted to you or on or about July 1. In the event there should be any situation, either prior or at that time, threatening the successful operation of the distribution program, which would warrant requesting additional legislation, we shall promptly re-

spond necessary action.

Dr. Thomas F. Francis, professor of epidemi-
ology and chairman, Department of Epidem-
ology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

All of these doctors are experts in polio-

mial infections, and the accumulated scientific competence available to study and evaluate the problems associated with polio-

mial vaccination are recommended.

On May 5 and 6 this subcommittee met with scientific personnel of the National Institutes of Health. They were joined on May 5 by representatives of the industry. On Saturday, May 7, in view of the fact that a number of States was scheduled for vaccinations over the weekend and there was insufficient time to evaluate the committee's findings, the Sur-

geon General directed 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 con-

cerned over recent developments with respect to the nationwide poliomyelitis vaccination program."

"As Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, by my primary responsi-

bility is to assure that our Nation's health is protected and that we make continuing progress against disease, I reaffirm 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. W. McD. Hammon, head, Department of Epidemiology and Microbiology, University of Pittsburgh Graduate School of Public Health.

Dr. Edward Lenette, California State Health Department, director of the National Polio-

Rickettsial Disease Laboratory, California.

Dr. H. D. Hooper, medical advisor, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

Dr. John R. Paul, professor, preventive medicine, University Medical School.

Dr. Albert Sabin, fellow-in-charge, Infectious Disease Division, Children's Hospital Research Foundation, Department of Pediatrics, College of Medicine, University of Cincinnati.

Dr. Jonas 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 ex-

planations for the occurrence of paralytic poliomyelitis following administration of vaccine. Three possible explanations were sug-

gested, respectively:

(1) the provoking effect of an injection given while virus was in the blood stream as a result of natural infection; and

(2) virus in the injected vaccine. A number of studies was recommended in an attempts to determine which of these alternative ex-

planations is correct.

The committee expressed the belief that the continuation 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. Shaugnessy, chairman; deputy director, Division of Public Health, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. John Enders, associate professor of bacteriology and immunology, Department of Bacteriology, Harvard University Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Robert Hood, research professor of bacteriology and director, virus research labora-

tory, University of Pittsburgh, Pitts-

burgh, Pa.

Dr. Frederick 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.
ties, I directed the withdrawal of all lots of the vaccine that had been distributed by that company pending a careful examination of their manufacturing processes.

The president of the American Drug Manufacturers Association, Dr. John E. Phelps, recently spoke at the White House.

The Public Health Service immediately initiated a thorough check at the Cutter plant itself. We started extensive laboratory tests to determine the potency of the vaccine there. We also organized a nationwide network of scientists, epidemiologists, and laboratories to collect and synthesize data on every case of paralytic polio among these children and others of both the vaccinated and the unvaccinated groups. We proceeded with continued and quick intelligence on all cases of poliomyelitis reported to the Service.

The association between administration of the Cutter vaccine and the few cases of poliomyelitis that have developed is an open question, and it will be determined. The association is so definite, however, that until the precise cause is found, the Cutter 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 and thus, one is not expected to be harmful to man. In this respect, this vaccine is similar to other vaccines prepared in a similar way."

"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 record of quality control, from 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 the country is now moving forward in this 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 of paralytic poliomyelitis reported to those of the Public Health Service, that early this year indicated their desire to have this additional information and assistance.

"The division on use of the paralytic virus vaccine is based on a series of calculations. We justify a given dose of vaccine, however small, in certain exceptional cases, in the belief that the benefits outweigh the possible hazards."

Public health physicians are specialists in the practice of public health. They must exercise broad responsibility for the health of their profession, and for the responsibilities of physicians in private practice. Public health physicians, by and large, are the guardians of the health of the individual patient. 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 past experience and we must, in the light of present changes and improvements and improvements and improvements, will have to be followed.

"The Public Health Service is discharging its duties under this concept, is acting on the conclusions emerging from our study which, in our judgment, will guide and influence progressive improvements in epidemiological and public health service."

"The committee's work has been undertaken inoday 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. The steps taken are in the interest of safety and that the American people have made the American children safe from poliomyelitis and the vaccine is safe and effective."

"A few important medical techniques are every day being developed by the scientific factor gives an injection of penicillin, perform an en- ecstasy, or vaccinates for 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 pos- other important medical techniques are making use of science to improve the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine."

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 F. Seabrook, treasurer; 96 members.

American Academy of Pediatrics: Dr. John H. Fitzgerald Dunning, president; Dr. Karl Bambach, associate director; Dr. Albert W. Snook, executive secretary.

American Drug Manufacturers Association: Dr. J. H. Fitzgerald Dunning, president; Dr. Karl Bambach, executive secretary.
APPENDIX 3

ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON SALK POLIOVACCINE DISTRIBUTION: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 27, 1955

Advertising Council.
American Academy of Obstetrics and Gynecology.
American Academy of School Administrators.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of University Women.
American Council on Education.
American Economic Association.
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.
Cooper Union.
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 Education.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Conference, Inc.
National Community Health Council.
National Conference of Catholic Women.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Farmers Union.
National Grange.
National Jewish Welfare Board.
National School Board Association.
National Tuberculosis Association, Inc.
National Urban League.
Railway Labor Executives Association.
Save the Children, 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 POLIOVACCINE

The following recommendations were made at the first meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine.

(a) That the supply 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 of the population, 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 epidemic season.
(iv) It is a group easy to reach.
(v) If age priorities were set up on a State-by-State basis here might be a confusion between neighboring States.)
(b) That every physician keep a record of the 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 number of children needing poliomyelitis 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.
(e) That the manufacturers report their supplies of vaccine to the Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department within 2 weeks so that the National Advisory Committee can recommend to the manufacturers equitable geographic 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 Secretary of Defense Committee on Polio Vaccine distribution.
(g) That vaccine 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 informed of the current status of the Salk vaccine, and that the committee be given 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, in accordance with the group priority in effect in the United States.

(h) That the vaccine 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 informed of the current status of the Salk vaccine, and that the committee be given

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 Appropriation bill. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be made a part of the record.

The conference report was ordered to be printed.
report may be in order immediately follow­
ing the Senator's statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. Without objection, it is so or­
dered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has unanimous con­
sent been granted that the conference
report on the agricultural appropriation
bill may be taken up at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. Unanimous consent has been granted
that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I sub­
mit a report of the committee of confer­
ce on the disagreeing votes of the two
Houses on the amendments of the Sen­
ate to the bill (H. R. 5298) making ap­
propriations for the Department of Agri­
culture and Farm Credit Administration
for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956,
and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. The report will be read for the in­
formation of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.
(For conference report, see House pro­
cedings 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 conferes were
present when the conference report was
agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all
conferes on the part of the Senate who
attended the conference. The minority
was represented by the distinguished
Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBER],
the chairman of the Committee on Agri­
culture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. 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 tem­
pore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the dis­
tinguished Presiding Officer was inquir­
ing whether there was any objection to
the consideration of the conference re­
port.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. The Senator is correct. The Pre­
siding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presid­
ing 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 tem­
pore. The Chair will withhold an­
nouncement of the admission of the con­
ference 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 Subcom­
mittee of the Senate Appro­priations Committee, who was chairman
of the conference committee which con­
cidered 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 of entry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Sena­
tor has referred to the fact that the
conference increased by this sum, and
I would like to ask two things.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the conference agree­
ted to increase the amount by this sum?

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.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand
correctly that all the conferes were
present when the conference report was
agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all
conferes on the part of the Senate who
attended the conference. The minority
was represented by the distinguished
Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBER],
the chairman of the Committee on Agri­
culture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. 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 tem­
pore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the dis­
tinguished Presiding Officer was inquir­
ing whether there was any objection to
the consideration of the conference re­
port.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. The Senator is correct. The Pre­
siding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presid­
ing 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 tem­
pore. The Chair will withhold an­
nouncement of the admission of the con­
ference 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 Subcom­
mittee of the Senate Appro­priations Committee, who was chairman
of the conference committee which con­
cidered 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 of entry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Sena­
tor has referred to the fact that the
conference increased by this sum, and
I would like to ask two things.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the conference agree­
ted to increase the amount by this sum?

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.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand
correctly that all the conferes were
present when the conference report was
agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all
conferes on the part of the Senate who
attended the conference. The minority
was represented by the distinguished
Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBER],
the chairman of the Committee on Agri­
culture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. 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 tem­
pore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the dis­
tinguished Presiding Officer was inquir­
ing whether there was any objection to
the consideration of the conference re­
port.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. The Senator is correct. The Pre­
siding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presid­
ing 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 tem­
pore. The Chair will withhold an­
nouncement of the admission of the con­
ference 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 Subcom­
mittee of the Senate Appro­priations Committee, who was chairman
of the conference committee which con­
cidered 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 of entry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Sena­
tor has referred to the fact that the
conference increased by this sum, and
I would like to ask two things.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the conference agree­
ted to increase the amount by this sum?

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.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand
correctly that all the conferes were
present when the conference report was
agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was signed by all
conferes on the part of the Senate who
attended the conference. The minority
was represented by the distinguished
Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBER],
the chairman of the Committee on Agri­
culture and Forestry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. 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 tem­
pore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the dis­
tinguished Presiding Officer was inquir­
ing whether there was any objection to
the consideration of the conference re­
port.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem­
pore. The Senator is correct. The Pre­
siding Officer heard no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore the Presid­
ing 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 tem­
pore. The Chair will withhold an­
nouncement of the admission of the con­
ference 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 Subcom­
mittee of the Senate Appro­priations Committee, who was chairman
of the conference committee which con­
cidered 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 of entry.
Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have those kind words from such a stout fighter for the farmers of the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT. The time is not temporary. 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 amendments of the Senate to House bill 5239, which was read as follows:

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.

I understand that the committee of conference will be available for consideration by the Senate on Thursday. I desire to place the Senate on notice as to that possibility.

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 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 minority 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 Tuesday noon and presumably will go to the Public Printer. 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 Senate subcommittee, I have suggested that it might be more satisfactory for them to have the weekend in which to study the minority views and to prepare for a weekend discussion. I am also aware of 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 minority leader, Mr. KNOWLAND. 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 do not want to 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 which it was 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 96 Senators to consider the majority report and the minority views, and any individual reports which may be available, study them, read them, and perhaps on 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 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 my amendment 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. I expected 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 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 my amendment Friday, for the purpose of having general discussion.

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 on Public Works, 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 that we have a full week to explain what they had voted on a day 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 distinguished majority leader has been prepared to offer a recommendation, on which
in the committee there have been weeks and weeks of hearings, and then weeks of voting; and in connection with this 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 bill on 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 I think we ought to try this week 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 Texas might say that 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 floor of the House? There was a request for unlimited time within which to file minority views. After discussion we finally arranged for a certain period. If we do not wish to trust the record, as soon as it is available, we 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, I am sure I would do if I were in his capacity as a distinguished Senator and as the majority leader. I also have some systems, to say that he wishes to take an opinion on the 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 an understanding on these matters, and I intend to continue to try to do so. If we do not wish to file the views of some Senators on our side of the aisle who are not members of the committee interested in the bill, and the governors of their States are interested in the bill, 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 mainly 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. In the course of the debate, 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, as in this case, when the majority leader has indicated that he will take the same position with the Senator indicates that the matter of filing the minority views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think 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 from Utah and Nevada and other States who will consume several hours discussing the action taken by the committee. I think Friday can be profitably used for that purpose.

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. The Senator from Texas has 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 then go on the agenda of the House, and there may be no bill passed at all. I think the proposal before the Senate is a reasonable one. In view of the assurance given by the distinguished Senator from Texas, I think it should be passed on Friday, or on Monday, whichever is selected. However, if we do not get started on it, there may be no bill passed at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want 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 said it was unusual, and I think the record will show.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But this year, as shown by the Congressional Record of March 2, after considerable collocy, during which the President 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 it would not be efficient in which to prepare and present the minority views; and finally we agreed upon 10 days for the filing of the minority views. Now, 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 that 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 to see how the amendment was prepared or to prepare separate views.

Although later it was determined that the amendment of H. R. 1573 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 proponent 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 equally divided by the majority leader or some Senator designated by him: Provided further, That no amendment that 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. I want 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 either to move to adjourn or the report, where there are some Senators who have said they
wish to change somewhat the wording of the amendment. So I prefer to leave to wise to change it. I assure the distin-
if such a request is made, and if it seems wise to change it. I assure the distin-
quent crops, to read as follows:

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 Ad-
justment Act of 1938, as amended, is amend-
ed, so as to provide for such payment for such year under this title shall not be eligible for any pay-
ment for such year under the Soil Conserva-
tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

For the purposes of this section, no person shall be deemed to have harvested any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been de-
termined by the Secretary to be in excess of the commodities which producers have rejected marketing quotas, and peanuts

Sincerely yours,
E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. President, I yield myself 2 min-
Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I be-
lieve 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 shall not pass the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Although production controls at best are not too effective in bringing and keeping supply in line with demand, it is im-
oposible that the basic problem which this bill is designed to solve shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conserva-
tion and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Senator HOLLAND, Senator AIKEN, AN-
derson, and myself.

H. R. 1573 would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended in 1954. Section 348

Any person who knowingly harvests any basic agricultural commodity on his farm which has been determined by the Secretary to be in excess of such crops with respect to which producers have rejected marketing quotas, and peanuts

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 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 Government to provide a clear, black and white rule which would per-

DEAR Senator...
From "The American farmer..."

Sincerely

DEAR Senator...
From "The American farmer..."

Sincerely
In this connection, it is interesting to note that the commercial fertilizer pro-
ducers are well aware of this fact, as the following newsletter dated May 3, 1955,
by the executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc.,
indicates:

ACP AUTHORIZATION FOR 1956

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.


To Persons Interested in the Agricultural
Conservation Program:

A week ago today the Senate, in the most

unusual action taken since I have been as-

sociated with the agricultural-conservation
program overwhelmingly approved continu-
ing the ACP for 1956 at the $590 million
level. The administration originally re-

quested $173 million from the House and
then, after it was passed by the House at $550
million, moved to reduce the amount to $173 million. When the Senate
Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee
reported the bill at $550 million, Senator Williams, of Dela-
ware, made an attempt on the Senate floor to reduce the
amount to $330 million. In spite of the fact that his effort was to leave
the program at $330 million higher than that requested, the amendment of Agricultur-
ian, the Senate by a rollcall vote of 70 to 5
approved the $250 million.

Strong bipartisian support was given to the program by the Senate Minority
Leader, Senator Sargent and the Senate Speaker, Senator Vandenberg.

HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Furthermore, the repeal of the Holland
amendment which had been expected mo-
demorally has run into a serious snag. Here
at the congressional level men fail to appre-
ciate the significant effect which the so-
called "Holland Amendment" has had on the admin-
istration of the ACP and the participa-
tion of farmers in this important program.

Even though the Holland Amendment has
unanimously to the Senate floor, we need
grassroots support to assure passage. When Senator Hollands objected to passage of this bill
on the floor of the Senate, it was pointed out
by Senator Johnson, majority leader, that the ACP would not be
in jeopardy. I hope the Senate will pass this bill
this week, I strongly urge the Members of the Senate to pass the
ACP legislation immediately after the USDA appropriation
bill Tuesday. We will need your support on this bill.

The Holland Amendment was designed to correct a
problem which is more correctly stated as a weakness of the
ACP, but has been made the scapegoat of the ACP and the ACP
Administration.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Members of the Senate will not yield to
the pressure to defeat the Holland Amendment. We do not
depend on the House for this legislation. The Senate has the final
authority on this bill. The Senate can, and should, pass the
ACP legislation.

I am writing to you to urge your support on the Holland Amendment. It
is urgent that we pass this legislation without delay.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. Koch

Director of Senate Staff

P. S.—Both USDA Assistant Secretaries
McConnell and Peterson testified for repeal of
H. R. 1573.
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organic materials—limestone, phosphate
and potash. Another 14 percent was used
for livestock feed and 17 percent for
creosote.

In this connection, it is interesting to
note that the commercial fertilizer pro-
ducers are well aware of this fact, as the
following newsletter dated May 3, 1955,
by the executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone
Institute, Inc., indicates:

ACP AUTHORIZATION FOR 1956

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL
LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.


To Persons Interested in the Agricultural
Conservation Program:

A week ago today the Senate, in the most

unusual action taken since I have been as-

sociated with the agricultural-conservation
program overwhelmingly approved continu-
ing the ACP for 1956 at the $590 million
level. The administration originally re-

quested $173 million from the House and
then, after it was passed by the House at $550
million, moved to reduce the amount to $173 million. When the Senate
Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee
reported the bill at $550 million, Senator Williams, of Dela-
ware, made an attempt on the Senate floor to reduce the
amount to $330 million. In spite of the fact that his effort was to leave
the program at $330 million higher than that requested, the amendment of Agricultur-
ian, the Senate by a rollcall vote of 70 to 5
approved the $250 million.

Strong bipartisian support was given to the program by the Senate Minority
Leader, Senator Sargent and the Senate Speaker, Senator Vandenberg.

HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Furthermore, the repeal of the Holland
amendment which had been expected mo-
demorally has run into a serious snag. Here
at the congressional level men fail to appre-
ciate the significant effect which the so-
called "Holland Amendment" has had on the admin-
istration of the ACP and the participa-
tion of farmers in this important program.

Even though the Holland Amendment has
unanimously to the Senate floor, we need
grassroots support to assure passage. When Senator Hollands objected to passage of this bill
on the floor of the Senate, it was pointed out
by Senator Johnson, majority leader, that the ACP would not be
in jeopardy. I hope the Senate will pass this bill
this week, I strongly urge the Members of the Senate to pass the
ACP legislation immediately after the USDA appropriation
bill Tuesday. We will need your support on this bill.

The Holland Amendment was designed to correct a
problem which is more correctly stated as a weakness of the
ACP, but has been made the scapegoat of the ACP and the ACP
Administration.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Members of the Senate will not yield to
the pressure to defeat the Holland Amendment. We do not
depend on the House for this legislation. The Senate has the final
authority on this bill. The Senate can, and should, pass the
ACP legislation.

I am writing to you to urge your support on the Holland Amendment. It
is urgent that we pass this legislation without delay.

Sincerely yours,

Robert M. Koch

Director of Senate Staff

P. S.—Both USDA Assistant Secretaries
McConnell and Peterson testified for repeal of
H. R. 1573.
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organic materials—limestone, phosphate
and potash. Another 14 percent was used
for livestock feed and 17 percent for
creosote.
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 from South Dakota. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. WATKINS. There is considerable merit to the arguments of the Senator from Florida. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas. However, the present law requires acreage control instead of marketing quotas.

Mr. WATKINS. That is likely to happen under the program we have today.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota?

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, the Senator from South Dakota?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WATKINS. The legislation from Utah that marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.

Mr. CASE. That may be so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said 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 so. However, what intrigued me was the Senator from Utah said marketing quotas would be more severe than acreage allotments. I was not sure that I wanted to accept that statement.
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 conference 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 amendment would put the corn grower in 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 more than the allotment of wheat, which definitely an effort to assist small farmers who might be expected not to understand the law too well.

The amendment would make the phrase of section 348 "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 which event the House should pass S. 46 which has been before the Senate for over a month. 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. If it is not passed, I would say, Mr. President, that the Holland amendment will not 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 with impunity. 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 those 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 amendments to the same are rejected, it can only result in encouraging wide spread 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 appreciable degree, the Middle States of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin? They are the States which would be hardest hit by the amendment. The amendment would make North Dakota or the other major wheat-growing States.

Mr. AIKEN. I must say that there is pretty good complacency 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. My way of saying 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 over-plant, the 1954 act provides that they would correct the situation. 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: "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 the Senate for over a month. 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. It shall be rejected, I would say, Mr. President, that the Holland amendment 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 with impunity. The penalty provided by section 348.

Whatever the vote on the amendment, Mr. President, we shall be able to ascertain, whether those who in the past have said, "Give us those high supports and we will control our crops" mean what they said, because if the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and other amendments to the same are rejected, it can only result in encouraging wide spread 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 appreciable degree, the Middle States of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin? They are the States which would be hardest hit by the amendment. The amendment would make North Dakota or the other major wheat-growing States.

Mr. AIKEN. I must say that there is pretty good complacency 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.
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 amendments. The amendment, I think, 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 figures of noncompliance last year. There were 9,787 wheat farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment exempts the farmer who produces only a few acres of wheat. So far as those farmers who have spoken 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, the amendment would have little effect on North Dakota.

The State hardest hit would be Illinois. 32,352 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. 150,536 corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

The amendment, I think, would have little effect on its 695 wheat farmers and 114,434 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment 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 last year. It would have little effect on 12,345 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment 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.

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 think, in addition to 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 and 114,434 corn farmers were out of compliance last year. Most of them would be in compliance under the modified amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My 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.

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 amendments. The amendment, I think, 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 figures of noncompliance last year. There were 9,787 wheat farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment exempts the farmer who produces only a few acres of wheat. So far as those farmers who have spoken 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, the amendment would have little effect on North Dakota.

The State hardest hit would be Illinois. 32,352 wheat farmers were out of compliance last year. 150,536 corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

The amendment, I think, would have little effect on its 695 wheat farmers and 114,434 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment 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 last year. It would have little effect on 12,345 corn farmers who were out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

The amendment 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.

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 think, in addition to 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 and 114,434 corn farmers were out of compliance last year. Most of them would be in compliance under the modified amendment.

Twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty corn farmers were out of compliance last year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Twenty-nine thousand seven hundred and forty corn farmers is a pretty sizable proportion. I think that number is probably more than the 60 percent I suggested.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The very fact that a farmer is denied soil-conservation payments takes away the inducement for him to comply with the corn allotments or the wheat quotas. A corn farmer can raise additional corn and make far more money than he can by receiving a small soil-conservation payment, which does much in a State like Massachusetts to help bring about better soil conservation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It does not bring a corn grower into compliance; it merely induces him not to do anything with respect to soil conservation in a cooperative plan.

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

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Does the Senator from North Dakota have the figures as to noncompliance on the part of wheat and corn farmers in Kansas?

Mr. YOUNG. In Kansas, 9,787 wheat farmers would be out of compliance on the basis of last year's figures. But, again, most of them, under the modified amendment, would be in compliance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Kansas would have 18,397 corn farmers out of compliance.

Mr. CARLSON. I think that is a rather interesting figure. I am in accord with the Senator's view that the wheat farmers would largely be in compliance under the Holland amendment. I have a grave question about the 18,397 corn farmers out of compliance last year. They will probably have as many this year.

Mr. Aiken. They would not lose their feed they needed for their feeding operations. The only reason the amendment before the Senate was made is that the corn allotments would be denied the right to carry out what was advocated as a sound soil 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 spotfully 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 has supported this amendment, so I am in opposition to an organization with which I have worked for years. But I say there are times when we walk into difficulties, 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 an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Minnesota 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
Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks a chart 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>3,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 11,197

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

### Average 1953 ACP payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average ACP Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>107.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>151.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>307.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>151.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>79.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 6,665

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 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.

We should like to use an analogy. What is 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 doing 85 miles an hour on the turnpike, if there are 100 people in the car, and if he is driving under a certain law and you have 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 and is in the hands of a judge, 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 is not efficient. 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 take 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. Well, we are going to try 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 for taking away from soil conservation rights if he violates production limitations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, let me say that section 348 says "farmers who knowingly."" 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 it means. 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.

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. The other is supposed to operate as a penalty-as a further club or disciplinary weapon.

My distinguished colleague, the Senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Tarrv), pointed out very aptly what happens. If there is a price-support program, 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 payments, but even though he would never sell 1 ear of corn in the market, 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 another provision. It is straightforward enforcement.

Soil conservation payments are to be used by farmers in a cooperative relationship with their Government. As a matter of fact, the 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 result that I can see from breaking a farmer, from making an overproducer. By canceling the program intended by the law by making an overproducer, by canceling the program intended by the law. I do not understand 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 a farmer to make overproduction. Mr. President, shall the Senate from Florida speak on the amendment in his own time?

At this time I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to help the Senator from Kentucky.
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 Congress has denied the farmers who may have an acreage allotment or production in the Department of Agriculture 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 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 temporary 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?
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Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to give the Senator from Minnesota a brief description of a situation I have in mind, so as to see whether I correctly understand this matter. I am informed that if a farmer who deserts his own terraces and because such practices have to be tackled, is because such practices are expensive, and because when the farmer helps to build a small dam or to the building of terraces, and because such practices do not pay immediately, with the result that temporary 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. HUMPHREY. The Senator from South Dakota is correct and I thank him.

The other specific argument which has been raised is support of a political view on which there is a division of opinion. Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. ARNOLD) that some of the farmers may have an acreage allotment or production in the Department of Agriculture 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 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 temporary 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.
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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 under existing 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. Most 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 house; 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 just a fine.

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 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, also.

Mr. Humphrey. Its design and purpose was long-range, from decade to decade and from generation to generation. The Government has provided these payments to encourage farmers to engage in the early practice of soil conservation, to help them to help themselves. We have done this all along in HUMPHREY. 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 drained away. And if it was not for the fact that we were able to continue as we might, as our population increased and as our soil fertility decreased, we would be down in the situation in which many of our farmers are now, 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 say, in effect, any effective relationship to price supports and production controls. In other words, does it operate to control production? I believe that that is what 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 the members of this Committee are from. 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 support programs. We do not mix it. 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 President pro tempore. 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 North Dakota [Mr. Young] 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 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 out of one million cotton farmers in the Nation.

In other words, about 1 percent were out of compliance in their practice. 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 President pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota designates the time.

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 in cotton that the cotton industry is a complying industry.

Listening to the arguments of the opposing party, one would think that it is almost a crime to comply with the acreage limitation. But that is not true. There is no 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 if 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.

In other words, there is no danger 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 other industries, if it is given a chance to operate. It has not been given a chance to operate. We have 11,000 farmers who were out of compliance in their planting.

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.

The Senator from North Dakota 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 farm program is one which allows the wheat producer to 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, and equitably, 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 uncertainty at any 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 general scheme, 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 the 15-acre provision. The pronounced effect would be on the corn farmer.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fact is that it would affect 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 acres not only under the act, but 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 on one hand and fight with the other. That is not the practical way to do things. The farmers who have the advantage of the 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 not only against the acreage provision, but against the general scheme. He brought the fact into consideration 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 grows barley, oats, rye, and other 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 was the case.

Mr. THYE. Any time I take comes my wheat will be in compliance.
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we do not. I think agriculture must realize that if it continues to follow this irresponsible course of 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 it will be an effort 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. 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 is the kind of judgment 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 statement that we received from Mr. E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and to ask the able Senator from Florida if Hassel Schenck does not think that the amendment of Mr. Schenck's telegram reads:

Senator Schenck has amendment to H. R. 1273 striking section 348 of 1954 act which denies ACP payment to anyone knowingly harvesting more than allotment. Holls 2 is proposing amendment to retain section 348 but modify it to permit harvesting (1) wheat up to 15 acres, (2) corn for silage, (3) peanuts for seed for hoggins-off—

Evidently Mr. Schenck means "feed for hoggins-off."

Mr. HOLLAND. No; "seed for hoggins-off."

Mr. CAPEHART. I continue:

(4) above allotted acres on basis if quotas voted down. Also applicants need not certify if have not exceeded allotments in area where allotments not applicable. Would appreciate your support Holls amendment.

HASSIE 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 purpose and objectives of the bill.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Schenck is president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not happen to know the gentleman. As I understand, the amendment is designed to aid the small-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 farmers.

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 we have a system such as this, a farmer who is not entitled to any sympathy, much less to be accorded aid in his evasion by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. 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 or more corn growers last year; 11,000 among the cotton growers, and more than 30,000 among the tobacco growers. But if the violators were the wheat, rice, and peanut growers, who would it be a million and a half violators among the 3 million commercial producers in this country?

If 60 percent of the corn growers were violators is a fact that those violators came under the rigid 90 percent support program, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly is.

With the tobacco growers, because I do not consider that should be brought into the picture, the larger part of their noncompliance was in the burley field. That situation has been frankly admitted, by those who represent the States where that kind of tobacco is produced.

Last year Congress was asked to "up" the penalty to 90 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 refuted.

Mr. Aiken. Of course, those farmers would have no quotas to comply with.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHEY. 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 morning. The Department of Agriculture and its Secretary is Ezra T. Benson. They are authentic figures.

Furthermore, I cannot understand the amendment 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 violators, 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 Hollander amendment. I think the farmers all over America would disagree entirely with the viewpoint expressed today by the five 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. HUMPHEY. 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 our troubles in this respect, stands 44th among the States. We have, as 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. I saw the farmers cutting hay and going ahead, doing the best they could. I saw whole fields of barley which were damaged.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is 11 o'clock 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 logical basis for such a requirement. As these farmers are striving to fulfill their contracts with Almighty the Lord. We are charged with the responsibility of determining how we shall use land which the Lord has given to us to work. We are doing the best that we can with what Congress has authorized us to do.

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 turned to his neighbor and up to him, said, "John, that is nothing but a ground hog. You don't eat ground hog, 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.

We shall 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 parts of the country but does not help those in other parts. It only helps those in about 25 counties in my State simply because they follow exactly the same principle which is carried out in the contingent penalty program.

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 the 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 continue to have an incentive to overplant.

It also is argued that the farmers who overplant their ACP payments have lost ACP payments because of their overplanting. They have lost ACP payments because of their overplanting, but the result is not any different than it is in the case of the farmers who harvested on the adjoining farm, if he is outside the commercial belt, can plant a thousand acres of corn and get his ACP payment.

As for the situation that is carried out in the contingent penalty program. Situations of this sort would exist all over the State if the Holland amendment would be made 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 is for home consumption, but we need and we need this to be seen in the following figures by North Carolina ASC officials.

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 26 percent of the farmers in the commercial corn area of North Carolina had made application to participate in the soil conservation program. The Holland amendment proposes to make it illegal for a farmer to make application to the ASC for participation in the soil conservation program. This means that a farmer must pay 16 cents per pound penalty on that tobacco he produces over his allotment. If there is no penalty for overplanting 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 rate on all cotton they produce over their allotment. This means that a farmer must pay 16 cents per pound penalty or 40 cents per pound penalty on that tobacco he produces over his allotment. When the average market price of tobacco is between 55 and 60 cents a pound— as it was recently—it would mean that he would have to pay 40 cents a pound penalty on that tobacco he produces over his allotment. If there is no penalty for producing above his allotment then such a penalty as this is the way to do it.
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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, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERG] therein refers to the Senator from New York [Mr. MORSE]. 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 the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERG] has indicated, 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 programs that this is the most important point as a part of my remarks, because I believe 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 programs.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE


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 that are being considered by the Senate.

The Department agrees with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERG] who has made it known to us that a high percentage of these 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 be eligible to receive 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. ELLENBERG] and is dated March 11, 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, which was added March 19, 1955, and is signed by Earl L. Butz, Acting Secretary. 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 to have the entire letter of March 10, 1955, addressed to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENBERG] and is 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


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 amendment to section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which was 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 contract acreage allotment would remain in effect. It is the view of this Department that ACP's eligibility should not be conditioned on compliance with its contract acreage allotments. The principal effect of such restrictions is to discourage the carrying out of needed conservation work. This Department recommends that the entire eligibility requirement imposed by section 348 rather than elimination of the requirement for only a part of the crops with acreage allotments. More details of our recommendation are contained in our report to you with respect to S. 494, S. 517, and S. 832.

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 farmers who over­plants any basic crop allotment may adjust the planted acreage to the farm acreage allotment. Section 136 of the 1954 amendment to section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was added by section 139 which would repeal the provision, the last sentence of section 374 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. This amendment, if S. 139 is enacted, would be void except that it applied only to cotton.

Since the passage of Public Law 690, farmers have been experimentally 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 1650 crop, would lead to much dissatisfaction, misunderstanding, and administrative difficulty in connection with acreage payment.
as are the farmers, I believe, in almost all the 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 letters from farmers and from social clubs, all opposed to the Holland amendment. More particularly, I have received 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, and 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. Landon], the Senator from New York [Mr. Lehman], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Scott], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Trammell], and other Senators who have expressed their views in the desire to leave none out. I think they have stated the case clearly.

One claim the Holland amendment proposal advocates take unto themselves and I think the Senator from Florida [Mr. Knowland] makes a particularly strong one is that, if adopted, the proposal would provide a stick or club or punitive measure to force the farmer to comply, and therefore the temptation or the necessity for going beyond the acreage allotment is not present.

We have been accused of following an irresponsible course of action. Farmers are not willing to do the job on their own, and the proposal advocates take unto themselves the responsibility of seeing that all farmers comply with the acreage allotments, and marketing quotas, 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 have the penalty provision to keep farmers in line.

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 we were not to have them we would not have had the price support program. They led the way and pointed the way. They not only have increased their acreages, but marketing quotas.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.
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) which amends Sec. 5 of the bill. The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. WATKINS).

On this question, the ayes 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. KERAVEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MURRAY), and 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. HOLAND), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. JENNER), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 1873) 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
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Federal debt without acknowledging it, the Senate might get the impression that something of a sort that should be put down as a must?

It is costing vast sums of money, and it is a question whether the situation may not be all that is desired, but it is true that new highways and streets would give America the greatest road system in the history of the world. It would be a tremendous prime for the Nation's highway network. It would be a potent factor in raising the gross national product from around $360 billion to the goal of $530 billion for 1956.

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, and it is a question whether the Senate will be made to regret meeting with Democrats challenging several facets of the plan and promising a fight.

Senator Byrd, of Virginia, who has his own highway bill before Congress, objected to the financing setup, as did Senator Brann, pro-Eisenhower Democrat. Their criticism was mainly aimed at Ike's scheme for putting the Federal share of the huge road-building program on the highways of the States.

The Gore bill would keep the present federal-State-federal system that is now in effect. The President is responsible for it, but it has been receiving a hot breath of political opportunism in a vast area. This is the fiscal side and the financing setup, as did Senator Brann, pro-Eisenhower Democrat. The problem is bound to be told how it can get them economically, and they will be told that the Federal Government would provide about 31 of the Federal contribution from $875 million to $1,600,000,000,000 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 Federal aid.

Although both parties have executed pledges to bar politics from the road program, Senator Byrd observe that the hot breath of political opportunism in a vast program involving billions on billions of tax dollars.

Senator Brann, 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 Brann estimates that in 30 years every dollar borrowed through bonds would cost the taxpayers $1.52 because of interest payments.

One related question also has arisen to the bond proposal. Why is the administration unwilling to issue highway bonds, which are the common practice among foreign countries, schools, and the like? It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an almost unlimited scale. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senators Byrd, of Virginia, and others, pronounce it "just pure pork barrel" and say it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator Byrd's judgment to accept his verdict as conforming 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 commitment. The Nation's highway network is steadily expanding. This expansion, 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 for roads, lakes, and schools and the like. It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an almost unlimited scale. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senators Byrd, of Virginia, and others, pronounce it "just pure pork barrel" and say it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator Byrd's judgment to accept his verdict as conforming our own suspicions.
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Either of its own volition or as a result of high pressure the administration is calling for programs that mean heavier and heavier Federal commitment. The Nation's highway network is steadily expanding. This expansion, 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 for roads, lakes, and schools and the like. It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an almost unlimited scale. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senators Byrd, of Virginia, and others, pronounce it "just pure pork barrel" and say it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator Byrd's judgment to accept his verdict as conforming 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 commitment. The Nation's highway network is steadily expanding. This expansion, 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 for roads, lakes, and schools and the like. It all holds out prospect of "pork barrel" expenditures on an almost unlimited scale. It calls for financing of a sort that is frowned upon in many quarters as unsound and deceptive. Senators Byrd, of Virginia, and others, pronounce it "just pure pork barrel" and say it would be inflationary. We have enough confidence in Senator Byrd's judgment to accept his verdict as conforming our own suspicions.
The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick. They say that money spent on civilian defense, and what-have-you. Then you cannot know what the budget meant and what the true state of the national debt was the true state of the national debt. They are falling below every day. Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways are all-out highways program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized Nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

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 him. He is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all. The plan sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. A lot of people who support the powerful Harry Byrd, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to 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.

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 him. He is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all. The plan sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. A lot of people who support the powerful Harry Byrd, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to 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.

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 him. He is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all. The plan sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. A lot of people who support the powerful Harry Byrd, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to 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.

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 him. He is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all. The plan sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. A lot of people who support the powerful Harry Byrd, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to 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.

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 him. He is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all. The plan sent to Congress this week calls for paying $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 bill would be the Federal authority. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. A lot of people who support the powerful Harry Byrd, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to 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.
The Federal Roads Program

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, is at present trying to estimate how much the Federal Government should spend on the Interstate highway system. The Committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 60,000 road miles, or about 100,000 miles per State. The Committee would finance this project by borrowing $50 billion at 3 percent interest to be paid in installments 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 the total surface highways. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, Byrd observed, 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 then be able to get their 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—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.

The highway program as presented to Congress is one of the most far-reaching Federal State aid programs. The President is seeking to have the Federal Government finance the cost of the interstate highway system. This means that the States would be given the opportunity to build their highways, and the Federal Government would contribute the cost of construction. The States would be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the highways.

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. The President believes that the Federal Government should provide 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 tax the flames of inflation. Though there would be no compulsion on the part of motorists or of others to increase their expenditures to the amounts suggested by the Clay Commission, unquestionably they would be under pressure for large-scale increase in gasoline and oil consumption. This would mean evitably a large-scale increase in taxes in one form or another.

Eisenhower's objection is one that has been raised by Senator Byrd. It is the objection to the manner in which the proposed Federal aid program would be financed. The President, and the Clay Commission, have suggested that the expanded highway system would of itself increase traffic and, therefore, the money available for financing it. This would 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.

Across the Nation are virtually 30 years of highways the expenditure of about $11.5 billion in interest. And certainly there is no assurance that the bonds would be paid off at maturity. We would have to retire a bond by means of additional debt, or additional taxes, which is the same thing. It means more inflation, with its attendant difficulties, to cope with it.

It seems to us that the President is using the highway building program as a more stable basis of revenue and at the same time keeping the debt in a more conspicuous position where it can be less easily ignored. It would be an increased invasion of private property, if a state or local government is able to levy taxes on gasoline and oil and to make the public pay for better roads—If and when they are built.

The President a reaction to higher taxes being levied is that the President is so high that the extra tax involved in an accelerated highway building program is going to have to be financed with increased Federal expenditures.

That can come from either of two sources: (1) Special bonds as suggested by the President, and (2) an increased debt to cover the increased deficits caused by larger highway appropriations.

As long as Congress and the public go into it with their eyes open and acknowledge the fact that the money is being borrowed, we are not saying that there can be more mean a cost, not of $25 billion, but of $38 billion for this Federal project.

This plan would plunge the Federal Government deeper into a function which, essentially, belongs to the States. The proposed Federal aid program for education it would be an additional invasion of State functions. All such projects call for additional Federal aid means adding to the Federal debt, or additional taxes, which is the same thing. It means more inflation, with its attendant difficulties, to cope with it.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is not the President's program, but his suggestion. It is the American Automobile Association that says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should look to the motorist, he says, and the $75 billion that would be allocated by the Federal Government on road projects is not enough to cope with the problem. He says the motorist should be convinced that the country cannot afford to do without a road system capable of handling traffic efficiently now and in the future.

What does it cost not to have adequate roads? 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 "reasonable estimates" put the cost of traffic accidents at $4,300 million per year.

Then there is the increased cost of operating vehicles when a highway system is inadequate. And the President pointed out that in 1955 there were 180 million vehicles in the United States, that these motor vehicles cost the country $4,300,000,000 each year. He said that the $75 billion that would be spent for the national program is not enough to cope with the problem. He says the motorist should be convinced that the country cannot afford to do without a road system capable of handling traffic efficiently now and in the future.
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object and which many Republicans do not find to their liking.

He did not back down. He simply said that some of the proposed program, some of the States are already worrying about how they are going to dig up their roads. And the White House program. Some have been building roads on a pay-as-you-go basis, but the White House program would be financed by setting up a Federal corporation. 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 are paid for by the cities, counties, and States with but the smallest participation of the Federal Government.

At the end of World War II 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 $20 million.

Today our highway system covers 3,300,000 miles and represents an investment of nearly $3 billion a year and steadily rising. And all this without benefit of any grandiose Federal program and, indeed, with very little money from the Federal Treasury. In 1952 Federal aid amounted to only $45 million out of $1.8 billion spent on roads.

Certainly the building of our future highways will be a stupendous job and there is an almost impossible need to provide help—one thing would be to take less from eager taxpayers than 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 traditional democratic 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 the agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas. Would the Senator from Washington agree 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", 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."

For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the plan.

The committee, headed by Sen. Curtis D. Clay, D., Ky., would completely determine the budget and the Federal debt limitations: "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit, that is the way things are," he was inclined to favor the committee's recommendation. The committee's report Congress should by now fully understand that the financing which the President is inclined to favor is a big once-and-for-all departure from the country's past fiscal policy.

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 the budget and the Federal debt limitations:

"It's not much good to have the best roads in the world if they are kept up. We have to look at the bookkeeping."
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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?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 a fixed percent of funds going to any State in the Union for purposes of REA loans. The present act provides that 50 percent of the annual sums made available 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 to the several States so far as the number of unelectrified farms is concerned, but only to meet the needs in the non-farm population in the several States." This means that the 50 percent of the funds 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.

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 for purposes of discussion. But, my Sen- ders, I do not feel that there would be any quarrel with that point of view, though it seems to me that in the past, the rigid formula which was established by the act for the allocation of funds for the purposes of the act, have today what appears to be a rather substantial amendment, which was read, but which I have not been able to find anywhere in the proposed legislation, and I would like to ask whether this amendment is going to be considered in the Senate.
Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Ty}e}, 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 acting as a block to the administration of the REA, and I did not believe the proposed restrictive measure which in the past has proved to be necessary.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Sennis], 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 pulled up on him 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. We did not interfere with the funds impounded in certain States which were available for REA associations. 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.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

I do not believe the proposed 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.

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 amount appropriated in any one State? That is the purpose of the amendment now before the Senate.

The other 25 percent would be subject 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 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 to 12 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.

I 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 of 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 administering 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 restrictive measure which had been avoided.

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

Mr. STENNIS. 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 ordered that next Thursday, as I understand, we could determine whether or not there is 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 the job. That is to say, the Senator's amendment is perfectly all right. The Department may say it is not what it hoped for, or what it thought should be done. I would like to have a report from it. The Department may say it is not what it hoped for, or what it thought should be done. I would like to have a report from it.
Mr. THYE. I know the Senator is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

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 this 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 of the act, as I see it, of retaining the formula.
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Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?
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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 of the act, as I see it, of retaining the formula.
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 want 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 $176 million a year would suffice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to underscore and emphasize what the amendment provides, so the Rescom will be interested in 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 participate, 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 could find it necessary to have 25 percent discretionary authority, complete control, over the entire appropriation.

The purpose of the formula—which, I wish to say, 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 this matter is important.

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 to make sure to control 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 the authority for the REA Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. This has been reported, as the Senator has said it is 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 general fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the 75 percent may 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 total formula has not used all its funds, possibly $150 million or $176 million, which are entitled to a little of the 75 percent, they could use the funds, possibly $150 million or $176 million, and go over to a subsequent year or years.

Mr. BARKLEY. The original bill sounded a little simpler.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think 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 the Senator 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 caution 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 heard?

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 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 views on the amendment, 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 them to the Floor.
18 or 20 years. It is my opinion that it is in the interest 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 Congress. It is especially important 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 assumed the most prominent feature 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 the task of detailed legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Those are reassuring words. There is no more staunch advocate or friend of the REA in the Congress than the Senator from Georgia.

As the Senator knows, I respected his judgment in this matter, and sought his counsel and advice, as I did that of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEWART]. I feel that it was the end of Thursday, if we have an opportunity to look over 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 during the 24 hours following the Thursday. 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 this additional problem. I want to be certain that the conference report on the reciprocal trade extension bill will 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 Senators to remain in the Senate 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 it requires a 60-hour extension to cover some other private or 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. JOHNSON of Texas. 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 delaying action, I feel compelled to serve notice that I oppose the bill as reported by the conference 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 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 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 administration of the Compact on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

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 Thursday morning for Managua 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 DONERO, 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 NOBLE, 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. CARY HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to accompany the delegation.

Our group left Miami by air on the morning of May 6. en route to Managua, Nicaragua, the plane stopped at Havana, 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 Braggioti, 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. Elloquent statements were made by the distinguished representatives 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 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, formerly 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 is very greatly in our national interest that the Inter-American Highway be completed as quickly as possible.

On May 8, some of us drove by automobile from Liberia to San Jose, Costa Rica, a ¾-hour drive, completing the 300 miles or more of highway travel begun at Managua. The trip proved to be the most scenic and afforded 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 Inter-American Highway 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 8 o'clock that evening, the United States delegation was received by His Excellency, H.E. Col. Carlos Alfaro, Armistice, 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, May 11.

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, who accompanied the delegation in the Inter-American Highway, and Mrs. Mann, for the very cordial entertainment extended by them to the delegation at the respective Embassies. Our warm appreciation is also extended 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 United States 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 friendship between our friendly neighbors in Central America and ourselves.

As a result of this trip and the opportu­nity I had to inspect portions of the Inter-American Highway in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Guatemala, I am more strongly convinced than ever that it is very greatly in our national interest that the Inter-American Highway be completed as quickly as possible.

Mr. DOUGLASS. Mr. President, this is an opportunity for me to express the utmost appreciation of this Committee to the trip here for the Members of the Senate, to hear what the Senator has just presented and to get an opportunity to see Central America first hand. It is a trip that I think is in the highest interests of the Senate, of the White House, and of the country at large. I think the President would like to have an opportunity to make a trip here and I think the Congress would like to have an opportunity to make a trip here.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President. I do not think, Mr. President, that this is an occasion to introduce this motion, and I do not think it is an occasion to have the Senate adjourn. It is an opportunity for me to express the appreciation to the Senate at large for the privilege of having an opportunity to visit this country and see it first hand. I think the trip was well worth while.
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 of hearing from his lips and, on the other hand, of hearing from his lips and, on the other hand, of reiterating before him the repeated, constant wish of our government to recognize. Nature, which never really wanted to separate us, has been conquered by the vigor and enterprise of our great American system, in guaranteeing by means of law the security and political independence of the nations of the hemisphere, is gradually converting the earth into a single entity, and the ills which illusory boundaries. Let us hope that this border only a few steps from us here, will be next crossed with the same facility as the student of geography who progress can destroy all barriers. Central America is described as the mainland of the American highway 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 it Washington in 1855. In the heart of Costa Ricans. Men of America, here you have the highway, Welcome to this land. (TRANSLATOR'S NOTE—Applause, with shouted 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 will be connected with the achievement of Pan Americanism, whose bases are found in the Pan American Highway, which was officially opened to the public in 1936. That highway, which links all or most of the nations represented at the conference would contribute, we hope, to the furthering of the moral relations and material interests of their nationalities.

That concept was then reaffirmed at the Second Inter-American Conference held at Montevideo in 1929. At the Sixth Inter-American Conference at Buenos Aires in 1928, 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 1930, it signed a Pan American Convention in whose preamble are made some timely remarks concerning the belief that direct and material contact between the American peoples would work to the benefit and indefinite 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 American movement, which 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 Tegucigalpa in Honduras. The establishment of Central American communications in which nine of the signatory states obligated themselves to work for the establishment of communication with that of other adjacent countries, either directly by means of railroads and the navigable lakes and rivers, for which purpose new routes would be constructed or the existing ones would be extended.

In regard to the Nicaraguan sector of the Inter-American Highway, it is well known that there has been in service between our two northern and southern borders for some years.

In view of the antecedents to which reference has been made, I wish to express on behalf of the Government of Nicaragua, and the faith which I have in their glorious destiny."
to make public the gratitude of Nicaragua toward the noble people of the United States of America and their illustrious Government. I hereby express this appreciation in the name of this Government, guided by his excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower, for the friendly cooperation which in this year 1955 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 13 o'clock next Thursday.

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

To be brigadier generals

To be major

To be first lieutenant

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.
The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braekamp, 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 holy, and moral lives.

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 despair, 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 realized.

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 the following:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 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 amendments of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, 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 "$18,638,700"; 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 "$1,050,000"; 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 "$1,050,000"; 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 "$50,300,000"; 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 "$22,600,000"; 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 "$20,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,000,000"; 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 "$6,000,000"; 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 numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; 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 "$11,060,000"; 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: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; 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 "$400,000"; 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 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, 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 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 "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000"; 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 "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$388,000"; 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 "$8,744,500"; and the Senate agree 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 paragraph struck by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That $1,000,000 of this authority shall be available only to expand and strengthen the activities 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.

JAMES D. O'REILLY, 34th District.

Managers on the Part of the House.


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: Appropriations $37,800,000 instead of $37,500,000 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 foreign production. In view of the urgent need for research on basic problems, the conference committee insists that research programs be expanded, such as orchids of Guatemala, Flora of Dominica, and differences in clothing of farm and urban people, population dynamics, rural sociology, methodology, and child-rearing practices.
end projects undertaken primarily for the benefit of employees doing graduate work, be discontinued in favor of more important work. The Senate feels that discontinuance of nonessential and nonproductive research projects, such as those listed above, will enable it to postpone the day of the inevitable need for further economies 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 conditions in the cotton, $80,000 additional for the National Arboretum. The conferees are in full agreement that the research and agricultural estimates: Appropriates $23,000,000 instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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 $1,000,000 instead of $1,440,000 as proposed by the House and $1,617,000 as proposed by the Senate.

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

Amendment No. 20—Commodity Credit Corporation: Appropriates $2,100,000, instead of $2,079,000 as proposed by the House and $2,164,000 as proposed by the Senate, to provide, instead of section 302 expenses, instead of $4,520,000 as proposed by the House and $4,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 9 and 10: Eliminate language in section 208 relating to 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 Senate.

Amendment Nos. 11 and 12—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Authorizes $11,046,000, instead of $10,581,000 as proposed by the House and $11,086,000 as proposed by the Senate, for research and experimentation, instead of $16,146,000 for the agricultural research program, for a total of $24,694,000, rather than the amount of $24,250,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—Marketing services: Authorizes transfer of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,010,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 21—Commodity Credit Corporation: Appropriates $4,550,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,576,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 22—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 conference does not approve of any forecast of apple prices by the Department during the coming fiscal year unless contrary legislative action is taken by the Senate. Instead of $65,273,881 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23—Reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for transfer of wheat to Pakistan: Appropriates $9,545,830 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $9,476,628 as proposed by the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. In general I would like to ask further, the amount of money that was transferred by the Department of Agriculture, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in 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, in general, the conference report was unanimously adopted—we made it quite clear at least how the conferees felt about this matter.

MRS. GRIFFITHS. Then I would 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 conferees have done it, 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 transferred by the Department of Agriculture, as contemplated by the amendment adopted in the Senate, for the nutrition field, would be continued; is that not so?

Mr. WHITTEN. We did not try to transfer, we allow for a decrease of 10 percent or so. We did say, and the Senate amendment provided, that not less than $40,000 be retransferred. In the opinion of the House committee, in the view of new, local 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 that amount is sufficient to carry out 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 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 thus transferred were returned 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 mind of any one. 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 work is retained. They are merely share of the money to the home economics work.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 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 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 California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

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 5 years more than a year 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. But as Austria now gets the lion's share of the credit in the minds of the Americans 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 programmed 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 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:

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:

"There is 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, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate protection of life in connection with 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 make deposits in existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such approipa-
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 farm, ranch, residence, or hunting camp, and its associated 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. 2990) 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 passage 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 container 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 Post Office Department is charged with the best interests of the Government he may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, purchase, out of appropriations or other funds provided for the Post Office Department, such, blanket position, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds as he may determine, and mail clerks of the Armed Forces and other 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 of 4 years, 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 postmasters, officers, employees, contractors, and mail clerks and their sureties from any liability otherwise imposed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 1, line 9, strike out "categories of all."
2. Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "contractors with the Post Office Department."
3. Page 3, lines 1, 2, and 3, strike out "the" and insert "premiums on any such."
4. Page 2, line 6, after "four years," and insert "the bonds."
5. Page 3, 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, 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 parliamentary 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 to the conference 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 the other body 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 may be, 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 are making a mistake if the Congress did not exert its influence and its viewpoint on that gathering.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, that is what we have been saying about the Interparliamentary organization. We 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 have expressed al,erlay by our diplomats?

Often times we hear the criticism that our delegations to international conferences speak only for the executive department and not for the American people. We do not have any representation in the NATO meeting. 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 to the conference in July to the conference to be held this year in France.

Mr. GROSS. You already have the Interparliamentary Union that takes a trip once a year to some European country. I suspect that all counties 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 field, not the specific field; 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 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 engrossed and read H. R. 469.

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 land or any part thereof, in the counties of Travis, Hidalgo, and Cameron, for the military purposes of the United States the tract of land described as follows:

Beginning at the southwest corner of the fifty-acre tract hereinbefore conveyed to J. W. 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 tract conveyed by deed of Travis County, Tex., to W. C. Phillips, on the northerly line of the Charles Thiele tract, from which an angle is made with the northerly line of the Charles Thiele tract; 10 varas more or less to a point, said point being south thirty degrees west one hundred eighty and sixty-two varas to a point, the southeast corner of the said tract conveyed by J. W. Gasser, insofar as said tract is to be conveyed by the Secretary of the Army under the authorization and direction of the President of the United States, as authorized and directed in this act, and the same is more particularly described as follows:

Thence north thirty degrees west one hundred eighty and sixty-two varas to a point, the southwest corner of the 38.55-acre tract conveyed by J. W. Gasser to the city of Austin, Travis County, Tex., being the southwest corner of the 38.55-acre tract conveyed by J. W. Gasser to the city of Austin, Travis County, Tex., for the duration of the state of war or other national emergency designated by the President of the United States, to which the transfer of a portion of said property is to revert to the United States by reason of 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 connected with or used by the United States or its successors or assigns in connection with the property described in subsection (a), and said lands 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 tract for a period of one hundred years from the date of said conveyance and excluded from the transfer.

(c) Such conveyance shall contain a provision that such 189.11 acres shall be used by the United States Armed Forces, the Air National Guard and Air National Guard for and Air Force and 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) The conveyance shall contain a provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency and the President declares a state of emergency to exist, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property so conveyed is necessary for national defense, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right 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, 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.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.
and forty-seven varas to the northwest corner of same;

Thence south thirty degrees west with the west half of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, and forty-one varas to the place of beginning.

Containing in all one hundred eighty-nine and one and seven-tenths acres of land more or less together with all improvements thereon, said land being the remaining portion thereof,

Thence south and forty-nine degrees forty-nine minutes east a distance of one hundred and forty-six and eight-tenths feet along the house line of the United States Air Force parcel and the five-acre Organized Reserve Corps armory parcel above described, to a point.

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

Similar bill House H. R. 489 was laid on the table.
Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the
"SEc. 2." and substitute the following:

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

The conveyance authorized by this act
shall be upon condition that such prop-
erty 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 revert to the
United States.

In addition, all improvements made by
the State of Iowa during its occupancy shall
remain the property of the State of
Iowa, together with all appurtenances and
utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

"Sec. 3. The conveyance authorized by
this act shall be upon condition that
whenever the Congress of the United
States declares a state of war or other
national emergency, the President by
determination by the Secretary of Defense
that the property conveyed under this act
is useful or necessary for military, air,
naval, or other national defense, the United
States shall have the right, without obligation
to make improve any kind, to reenter upon the
property and use the same or any part there-
of, including any and all improvements made
thereon by the State of Iowa, for the dura-
tion of such state of war or of such
national 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.

By virtue of the power so
conveyed hereby, the United States, by
authority hereunder, shall make
improvements and improvements thereon
which are owned by the
Iowa, in addition to all improvements made by
the State of Iowa during its occupancy.

With the following committee amend-
ment:

"Sec. 4. The conveyance of the
property authorized by this act shall be upon
the determination by the Congress of the
United States that a state of war
or other national emergency, or the Presi-
dent declares a state of emergency, and upon

the determination by the Secretary of De-
fense that the property conveyed under
this act is useful or necessary for military, air,
naval, or other national defense, the United
States shall have the right, without obligation
to make improve any kind, to reenter upon the
property and use the same or any part there-
of, including any and all improvements made
thereon by the State of Iowa, for the dura-
tion of such state of war or of such
national 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.

By virtue of the power so
conveyed hereby, the United States, by
authority hereunder, shall make
improvements and improvements thereon
which are owned by the
Iowa, in addition to all improvements made by
the State of Iowa during its occupancy.

With the following committee amend-
ment:

"Sec. 5. In consideration for the convey-
ance 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
portion thereof during the occupancy of the
State of Iowa and such improvements made by
the State of Iowa further agrees that
the State of Iowa shall agree to use
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
portion thereof during the occupancy of the
State of Iowa and such improvements made by
the State of Iowa further agrees that
it will, prior to delivery \[\text{of the conveyance authorized herein, file with the Office of the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Farm Credit Building, 1920 39th Street, Omaha, Neb., a description and inventory of the State-owned property as defined herein and the conveyance to be made without payment or compensation therefor.}\]

\[\text{The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.}\]

\[\text{CONVEYANCE FOR NATIONAL GUARD PURPOSES OF JACKSON BARRACKS, LA., TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA}\]

\[\text{The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5170) to the bar and read the title therefor.}\]

\[\text{Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 148 be considered in lieu of the bill H. R. 755.}\]

\[\text{The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?}\]

\[\text{There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:}\]

\[\text{SEC. 2. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Iowa.}\]

\[\text{The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.}\]

\[\text{Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 653) for the bill H. R. 5170.}\]

\[\text{The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?}\]

\[\text{There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:}\]

\[\text{Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Louisiana all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the real property comprising Jackson Barracks, La., as is held by the State of Louisiana under lease No. W-766-QM-6117 and a license issued by the Secretary of the Army on July 26, 1953, being in the aggregate one hundred four and six thousand, two hundred sixty-six acres, more or less, in Orleans and Saint Bernard Parishes, La., together with improvements thereon, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, the property so conveyed to be used for National Guard purposes in connection with Camp Dodge and Polk County Target Range as of the date of enactment of this act: Provided, That the improvements on such lands shall include specific provisions covering the reservations, restrictions, and conditions as the Secretary of Defense determines to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States.}\]
in the event of need therefor during a national emergency; and the condition and limitation that if the property shall fall or come into the possession or control of the National Guard of Louisiana or for other military purposes, the title to the property so conveyed shall revert to and vest 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. 5179) 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 1726 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

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, it is hereby authorized and empowered to abolish the stamp fee on passports, and to transfer the funds to be thereby saved into the United States Land Treasury for the benefit of the land grants and improvements made for the benefit of commerce and industry in the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota.

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. 116) 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, in 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 LOS EBAÑOS, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5984) 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, it is hereby authorized and empowered to authorize E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, 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 therein, and subject further to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and the right to the said Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, 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.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed 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 22, 1906, as amended (33 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 main­
tenance of roads, the establishment and main­
tenance of schools, and the care and support of
benevolent persons in the district of Alaska, and

"The Secretary of the Interior, or such offi­
cer, or officers, as may be designated by him,
shall have the power, and it shall be his duty to
lay out, construct, and maintain high­
ways, roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to
and through any town, mining or other indus­
trial camp or settlement, or between and through
any such town, camps, or settle­
m ent which is wholly transitory or of no substantial
value or importance for mining, trade, agri­
cultural, or manufacturing purposes: Pro­
vided, That only such highways, roads, trails,
and bridges shall be constructed to and
through any such town, camps, or settle­
ment which relates to the grant of additional
lands by the Territory and the approval of such
lands by the Secretary of the Interior as part of
the through highway system of the Territory of
Alaska; but no such highways, roads,
trails, or bridges shall be constructed to and
through any town, camp, or settlement which
shall then be regularly published."

With the following committee amend­
ment:
"Strike all after the enacting clause and
insert in lieu thereof the following: "That
section 2 of the act of January 27, 1965
(38 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952
d., 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 have the power, and it shall be his duty to
lay out, construct, and maintain high­
ways, roads, trails, and bridges from any point on the navigable waters of Alaska to
and through any town, mining or other indus­
trial camp or settlement, or between and through
any such town, camps, or settlement which
shall then be regularly published."

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

SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN ALASKA

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

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

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

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

CLARK COUNTY, MO., TOLL BRIDGE CHARGES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and
read a third time, was read the third
time, and passed, and a motion to recon­
sider was laid on the table.
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 while foreign states and other high officials of foreign governments and other distinguished visitors to the United States, as well as for the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the other distinguished representatives of foreign governments visit the United States at the invitation of the President, the other distinguished visitors to the United States, as well as with the general public. The 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 visit falls upon the 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 proceeds from one police department to another, the Department security officer is the person responsible for his constant protection. This officer is forced to assume a tremendous responsibility totally unshared, as a part of the Department's responsibility for security officers of the Department to carry firearms.

Prior to 1953 certain security officers of the State Department were permitted to carry firearms. However, when the question was raised as to whether or not there was authority for such practice, the legal advisor of the State Department said that there was not. Ward E. Cameron, assistant legal advisor, 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 Department of State, and, as designated by the Department of State, and granting 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.

Wade M. Cameron, Assistant Legal Advisor.

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

Certainly any 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 firearums abroad.

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 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 to protect 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 the Federal Government granting obligation 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 case of other Federal officials, the Department, is specifically authorized to carry firearms for the purpose of protecting the President of the United States and members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President, as authorized by Federal legislation granting protection to the President of the United States and members of his immediate family. 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 or the table.
AUTHORIZED RETROCESSON OF JURISDICTION OVER HIGHWAYS AT FORT DEVENS, MASS.

The Clerk read 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 of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass., as number MED-PA-638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northwestern portion of said original reservation and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound in the boundary of said reservation marking a curve of a point on the southerly location line of the right-of-way of the Fitchburg and Leominster Siredal Railway and extending north 9.50 feet by a curve to the right of 1,025.00 feet radius 222.45 feet to a point; thence leaving said boundary line north 32 minutes 58 seconds east 949.51 feet to a point on the dividing line between the towns of Harvard and Leominster, said point being located by the Nashua River; thence following said dividing line north 55 degrees 52 minutes 20.20 feet to a point on the said boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line south 71 degrees 6 minutes 68.92 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 17,000 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 MED-PA-638, dated May 1946, said parcel being located in the northwesterly corner of said tract and being bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a stone bound in the boundary of said reservation marking a curve of a point on the southerly location line of the right-of-way of the Fitchburg and Leominster Siredal Railway and extending north 9.50 feet by a curve to the right of 1,025.00 feet radius 222.45 feet to a point; thence leaving said boundary line north 32 minutes 58 seconds east 949.51 feet to a point on the dividing line between the towns of Harvard and Leominster, said point being located by the Nashua River; thence following said dividing line north 55 degrees 52 minutes 20.20 feet to a point on the said boundary line; thence returning by said boundary line south 71 degrees 6 minutes 68.92 feet to the point of beginning; containing about 17,000 square feet.

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 a point numbered 39 thereof, bearing a point of curvature in the southerly line of the aforesaid reservation marking a curve of a point on the right-of-way of the Commonwealth Railroad (Worcester to Ayer); said right-of-way location line also marking the easterly boundary of said parcel, being part of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, and said point bearing 37 degrees 1 minute 55 seconds east 55.34 feet; thence south 3 degrees 1 minute 55 seconds east 90.00 feet; thence south 3 degrees 1 minute 55 seconds east 50.12 feet; thence south 15 degrees 29 minutes 11 seconds east 533.03 feet; thence south 9 degrees 30 minutes 51 seconds east 496.40 feet; thence north 6 degrees 30 minutes 41 seconds east 5,656.00 feet; thence by a curve to the left of 2,400.29 feet radius 534.96 feet to a point on the northerly location line of the right-of-way of the Commonwealth Railroad (Worcester to Ayer); said northerly location line also marking the westerly boundary of said parcel, being part of the Fort Devens Military Reservation, and said point bearing 151.40 degrees 11 minutes 26 seconds east 423.91 feet; thence south 79 degrees 15 minutes 16 seconds west 597.87 feet; thence leaving said railroad location line and returning westerly by a curve to the right of 2,800.29 feet radius 433.91 feet; thence north 70 degrees 15 minutes 16 seconds east 5,654.00 feet; thence easterly to the point of beginning, containing about 3,800.20 square feet (the above-described parcel is the same as described by P. R. Rittfeld, chief engineer, in and to that certain Commonwealth 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 in the United States of America. Scale: 100 feet to the inch."

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 read 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. 1222) 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, and the Secretary is hereby authorized to make further regulations as to the making of such assignments or allotments, and to prescribe the method of doing so."

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

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

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 4359) to an amendment to an act of September 29, 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 property herein shall include all right and title of the Secretary of Commerce in and to that certain personal property 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 5,000 feet of 10-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 personal property, or any part thereof, by deed, lease, permit or otherwise, and grant as well a perpetual easement, any other privilege, or any interest therein, only subject to the condition of maintaining the said right-of-way in good condition and repair and upholstery, and in all respects in conformity with the laws of the State of California."
Army, Navy, or Air Force of the same length.

SEC. 3. (a) The second proviso of section 2b of the act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 704, 28 U.S. C. 654a (b)) as amended is further amended by inserting a period after the word "engineer" and deleting the words "in the District of Columbia" which appear at the end of the proviso.

(b) Section 3 of the act of January 18, 1933 (36 Stat. 6), as amended (33 U. S. C. 657), is further amended to read as follows:

"The Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey may 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 two 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 an officer who may be retired while serving as Director or Assistant Director, or who has or shall have served 4 years or more at the time of his appointment, and he shall be entitled to retirement with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or position of which he would have occupied had he not been so appointed in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)." 613 44 u. s. c. 247). Sec.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299; 33 U. S. C. 663a) is amended by deleting the words "junior grade," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "junior grade." 613 25 U. S. C. 4650)." Sec.

"(a) Section 6 (a) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 2, 1946 (63 Stat. 296; 33 U. S. C. 656c) 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." Sec.

"(b) Section 17 (of the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 299; 33 U. S. C. 663a (a)) is amended by deleting the words "junior grade," and in their stead inserting the words "junior grade." Sec.

"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.

"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, 1938 (48 Stat. 1092), is hereby 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


"(a) 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.

"Sec. 522. Punishment for violations

Any person who shall violate any regulation prescribed under the terms and conditions of this act, shall be provisionally 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.

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

The bill was 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 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 REFUGEE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

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.
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 be acquired for the uses and purposes in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 27, 1920, as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 646), 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 to the Senate in commendation to recom-
ELIMINATION OF LIMITATIONS ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOAN FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5978) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed 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.

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.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES' CLAIMS ACT OF 1955

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 5650, be recommitteed 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. 5778) 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 $35,000 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 rights, title, or interest. Nothing in this act shall affect 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:

S 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 disposes of stamps 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 any purpose of increasing the emoluments, or compensation of the postmaster or any employee of a post office or any branch thereof, or reduces 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 as "Lighthouse Keepers" 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 subparagraph 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:

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

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and enlistees entitled to such regulations, in the Coast Guard, an enlisted person, at any time within 3 months before the expiration of his term of enlistment or extended enlistment, may be discharged, upon his own request, by the Secretary, for 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 to preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits."

A motion to consider 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. 5785) to incorporate the 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; INCORPORATES; NAME

Section 1. The following persons, to wit: James G. Walsh, Distinguished Service Cross, 50 Patten Street, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Benjamin F. Tyler, Distinguished Service Cross, 3858 First Avenue South, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Deming Bronson, Congressional Medal of Honor, Route 2, Box 323, Roseburg, Ore.; Arthur F. Gates, Distinguished Service Cross, Lutherville, Md.; Leo L. Zin­gage, Distinguished Service Cross, 3612 East 15th Street, St. Paul, Minn.; John A. Davis, Congressional Medal of Honor, 800 North Shore Drive, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Glen O. McLean, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 737, Spokane 3, Wash.; Ben Prager, Distinguished Service Cross, 316 Court House, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Earl N. Norton, Distinguished Service Cross, 29 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Ray Eastman, Navy Cross, 300 LaSalle Avenue, Buffalo 15, N. Y.; Ben Neff, Distinguished Service Cross, 208 Ewell Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Warren L. Granger, Navy Cross, 703 16th Street, Alexander, Ark.; William Oliver Smith, Distinguished Service Cross, 907 Holt Drive, Raleigh, N. C.; Robert M. Gaynor, Distinguished Service Cross, 211 South, Taylor Street, Arlington, Va.; Leon M. Hanno, Distinguished Service Cross, Box 217, McHenry, III.; Bruno G. Forsterer, Congressional Medal of Honor, Walker Street, Oakland, Calif.; Elmer H. Hargartner, Distinguished Service Cross, 2103 Lynn Avenue, Altoona, W. Va.; William F. Orsborne, Distinguished Service Cross, 1236 A. Dombrowski, Distinguished Service Cross, 137 Highland Drive, Williamsville, N. Y.; William C. Hardie, Distinguished Service Cross, Post Office Box 1306, Billings, Mont.; E. Lee Henderson, Navy Cross, 1098 Fruitland Drive, North Hollywood, Calif.; Other J. Gross, Distinguished Service Cross, 416 Medical Arts Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Leslie Hardy, Distinguished Service Cross, Fairmont, W. Va.; William R. Allen, Distinguished Service Cross, 853 Dixwell Avenue, New Haven, Conn.; Den­nis C. O'Callahan, Distinguished Service Cross, 1008 Missouri Avenue, Houston, Tex.; Co­Jumbus Whipple, Distinguished Service Cross, 316 E. White Street, Sheridan, Wyo.; and such other persons as shall be Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., 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 the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America.

ORGANIZATION OF CORPORATION; DELEGATES

Section 2. The persons named in section 1 of this act and such other persons as may be selected by the Board of Directors 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 chapter or corporation, or any person 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

Section 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 cherish and perpetuate the spirit of comradeship which was the greatest single factor in the success of the armed services; and to obtain funds for the support of 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.,

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 title 8 of the United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President, be amended, as hereby amended, as follows:

Sec. 5. Threats against President, President-elect, and Vice President.

Provided, That such person shall have an honorable discharge or separation from such service or continue 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 33, 1947, Public Law 216, 80th Congress, (61 Stat. 407; 36 U. S. C. 284) as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

" "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 is not terminated by discharge or release from active duty by honorable discharge or separation. No person who is a member of any organization violating the principles of, any organization believing in, or working for, the overthrow of the United States Government, or who refuses to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, shall be privileged to become 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:

"1. 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 any other letter, paper, writing, print, missive, or document 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, 1938, 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 and expenses for travel as fixed by the conference, in the light of the recommendations of the deliberations of the districts and the judges of the 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.

The following committee amendment:

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 "s.

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.

AUTHORIZED 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 empowers, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, in the absence of the President, by the contrary, to obtain from the Federal Unemployment Fund, established pursuant to the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1936 (Public Law 577, 79th Cong., approved August 5, 1944), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the President may authorize, for the purpose of maintaining the President, President-elect, and Vice President, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

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 ‘Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1936’ (Public Law 577, 79th Cong., approved August 5, 1944), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the President may authorize, for the purpose of maintaining the President, President-elect, and Vice President.

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 increase salaries for part-time referees.

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 following amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL:

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 sale 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 members of the committee or the floor upon the present consideration of this bill, and I would point out 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 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. 5643) to amend section 6(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1938, 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 6(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1938, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1129) 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. Compulsory examinations shall be held annually among these candidates as candidates to the Academy by Senators and Representatives. The number of vacancies allowed as candidates to the Academy shall be proportioned to the representation in Congress from that State. Appointments from each State shall be made at the direction of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(2) In connection with such instruction and preparation as aforesaid, the United States maintains for and purposes only, in shipyards, plants, and private agencies, and in cooperation with other governmental and private agencies, on other vessels, and, for instructional purposes only, in shipyards, plants, and other vessels and plants, under the direction of the United States, the Merchant Marine Academy may be maintained at such places as the Secretary of Commerce may authorize, and expenditures incidental to such training shall be hereby authorized.

(4) As permitted by the United States and the United States merchant marine academy may be maintained at the United States Merchant Marine Academy of 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 be the last bill eligible for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

DR. CRISTOFO CRISTOFET 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. Cristof Cristof, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristof, and their children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristof, with a Senate amendment thereon, 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 FINALLY

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 Finally, with a Senate amendment thereon, 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 "Antonio Alkier."
Page 2, line 1, strike out "Wladyslaw Barczykowski."
Page 2, line 7, strike out "Stefan Glundzewich."
Page 2, line 12, after "Jankowski," insert "Roberts Gustav Javalda."
Page 2, line 13, after "Kaminski," insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sem Karlich)."
Page 2, line 18, strike out "Piotr Kowalscy."
Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Zbigniew Pietrowski."
Page 3, line 20, after "Saplinski," insert "Jan Brodulicki."
Page 3, line 21, after "Stubynski," insert "Silvio Svangaro."

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.

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 thereon, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "Yvonne Manticas."
Line 11, strike out "live" 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 desk 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 thereon, 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 Alkier."
Page 2, line 2, strike out "Wladyslaw Barczykowski."
Page 2, line 7, strike out "Stefan Glundzewich."
Page 2, line 12, after "Jankowski," insert "Roberts Gustav Javalda."
Page 2, line 13, after "Kaminski," insert "Sime Ivan Karlick (Sem Karlich)."
Page 2, line 18, strike out "Piotr Kowalscy."
Page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "Zbigniew Pietrowski."
Page 3, line 20, after "Saplinski," insert "Jan Brodulicki."
Page 3, line 21, after "Stubynski," insert "Silvio Svangaro."

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. LeCOMPTIE. 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 carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, and 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 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 in any special order heretofore entered.

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. 959) 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. 9715) 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 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 debate or the adjournment of the House, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the House shall then proceed to report the bill to the Senate, 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 KYIYOTA SZEKERES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Aalso Kiyota Szerkes, 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. Bocci). 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 perma-
nant residence in the case of each alien here-
inafter named, in which case the Attorney
General determined that such alien is quali-

fied under the provisions section 4 of the
Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended
U.S. C. 1932). Kown Woman
- A-7125821, Bened, Peter Milhaly or Peter
Michael Berend.
0300-370649, Koon, Lim Jew.
- A-786663, Brize, Roberta Martins.
- A-786664, Brize, Mildra Hermine.
- A-586299, Brize, Tien Hsien.
0300-43060, Chen, Chin Ah.
- A-586266, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.
0300-37469, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng
Shuan.
- A-7969040, Chit, Ho Fung.
- A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoi or Ting Hsien
Chow or Chow Ting-Hsien or Hsien
Chung.
A-851519, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang
Bau, Chow.
- A-707870, Chow, Tseng Kam.
- A-9536500, Dong, Ng Eng.
- A-6052568, Dong, Ng Eng.
- A-6851319, Dong, Ng Eng.
- A-9651830, Hau, Chiu Hwai or Hwai Hau.
- A-9651731, Janovits, Benjamin (a.k.a. Seri
A-6961380, Janovits, Elia (nee Siplíman).
- A-6961197, Kramar, Branko.
- A-910399, Kramar, Maria.
- A-8956759, Kulp, Karel.
- A-8583678, Lin, Der Shiang.
0300-38727, Vudkhot.
- A-7972277, Loo, Sam Teer.
- A-7782581, Maksimovs, Eiriks or Maximovs.
- A-9170685, Maksimovs, Michiels or Micles
Maksimovs.
- A-670578, Pang, Yoo.
- A-655890, Pulasaks, Matas.
- A-7909727, Shok, To or Doo Sat.
- A-7049238, Sipes, Marianne Margaret
Kartesz.
- A-9696193, Toong, Kuo Ching or Toong
Chung Shing.
- A-6930774, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or
Tong Shing or Chung Chuan.
- A-835868, Too, Fung or Too Fung.
- A-8620914, Tsing, Lo Chao.
- A-9659409, Tien, Chen Yen or Chen Shi or
Yi Shi Chen.
- A-6949540, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.
- A-8409705, Kramar, Maria.
- A-9170659, Kramar, Maches.
- A-6919511, Kramar, Minja.
- A-6594198, Lee, Mary Min Chen.
0300-30416, Lek, Yee Kow.
- A-7249060, Liew, Janis.
- A-9682636, Man, Sedl.
0300-134839, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.
- A-6536864, Mei, Chiu Chow Ah.
- A-7633445, Prietai, Mioste Hana.
- A-9667721, Pitkell, Miralda (nee Piit).
- A-7254063, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).
- A-1959296, Yip, Frederick Albert.
- A-9850325, Shang, Sung Chan.
- A-9603579, Tashkovich, Gilgore Tahko.
- A-9846576, Ting, Lu.
- A-7249580, Vlan, Mikelt.
- A-7825165, Vlan, Alexiell.
- A-9882368, Yick, Tong.
- A-659765, Yin, Huo-Bing.
0300-26506, Ying, Chen.
- A-5842543, Yu, Lung Tao or Lum Tow Kee.
0300-82836, Yuen, Chian Kam or Chan Hong
Kong.
- A-6073490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-
Shun.
0300-397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.
- A-7254063, Chow, Chung Shan.
- A-276803, Fong, Koo Chee.
0300-390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.
- A-8082869, Kwan, Wu Sing.
- A-9671757, Soasaar, Hela (nee Feder).
- A-610014, Lotiek, Major.
0300-28959, Chan, Ah Hoe.
- A-804083, Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan
Yuk Cheung.
- A-9692737, Chan, Tim.
- A-7070295, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu
Bou Cheung.
174,736, Cheung, Mong.
- A-9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chian.
A-8039173, Fok, Lam.
A-653188. Ha, Tsong Tung or Tsong Tong Hu.
A-6971585, Hileselou, Endel.
A-7238483, Haueh-Yung, Shu or Evan
Hauheh-Yung-Hu.
A-6666988, Hu, Teel Suun.
A-7238198, Inventarr, Izak.
A-1100-29666, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-
Chen Kao.
A-6983073, Kao, Yen-Tat.
A-7092303, Keng, Pei-Ling.
A-7268177, Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.
A-6969357, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.
A-6969919, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim
Hing.
A-7058692, Loh, Taue Yuch or Thomas Y. Lowe.
V-305339, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.
A-9727272, Ming, Tung.
A-7840198, Moon, Andrew.
A-9780268, Okeeff, Kwn Min.
A-7269324, Sivasar, Elmar Johannes.
A-7269387, Sivasar, Armind Koka.
A-7269377, Sivasar, Avindka.
A-9780480, Sepich, John.
A-9770463, Shi, Chang or Shu Kun-
Tseung.
A-9820170, Podsustalny, Ivan.
A-7840186, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang
Szuberk.
A-7840189, Pe-Kuang, Sofia.
A-7840192, Radulich, Mate.
A-7840200, Radulich, Mate.
A-7840202, Radulich, Mate.
A-9780480, Sepich, John.
A-9770463, Shi, Chang or Shu Kun-
Tseung.
A-7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A-7840200, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7840201, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7840202, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7395272, Sang, Tung Kow or Sang Tung
Kow.
A-6538009, Shih, Shih Nia or Shi Nia Shih.
A-9651377, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.
A-6439014, Tan, Ying Ching.
A-9639017, Tjana, Vanaja.
A-9629002, Yean or Yen.
A-7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A-7840200, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7840201, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7840202, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7395272, Sang, Tung Kow or Sang Tung
Kow.
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 purchase the land described herein, 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 23, 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. 5145) 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 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. DeMoscovonby
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1034) for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoscovonby.

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. DeMoscovonby 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.

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. 928) 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-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.

Eugenio Maidai
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of Eugenio Maidai.

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 Maidai 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 for the period during which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.
The committee amendments were agreed to.

There being no objection, 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 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 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 RII REICH

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

EVANGELOS B. TZARIMAS

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 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 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.

There being no objection, the Speaker asked unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1705, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The Speaker asked unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1705, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

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

SISTER ANTONINA ZATTOLO AND SISTER ANTONINA CALI

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 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.

There being no objection, 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.

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, 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 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.

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

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 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.

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, 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.

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.

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 be 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.

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 Calli 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 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.

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 Calli 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 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.

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 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.

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 be 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.

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 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. 1406) for the relief of Caterina Ruello.

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

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

Page 2, line 9, after the words "in this act", insert "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.

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:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "241 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.

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.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "have" and insert "had." The committee amendment 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.

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 provisions of section 123 (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 said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "241 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.

GIUSEPPA CURTO TATTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1935) for the relief of Giuseppa Curto Tatti.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Curto Tatti may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "have" and insert "had." The committee amendment 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 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, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Athena Kitsopoulou 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 with 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) 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 legal or equitable claim, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legal or equity 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.

MRS. HILDEGARD HERRMANN COSTA
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1964) for the relief of Mrs. Hildergard Herrmann Costa.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the bill (H. R. 5630) entitled "A bill for the relief of Frederick 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 legal or equitable claim, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legal or equitable 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.

MRS. HILDEGARD HERRMANN COSTA
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1964) for the relief of Mrs. Hildergard 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) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Hildergard 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 with which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to 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.

EMIL ARENS
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5446) 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 with 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.

GALEN H. CLARK PACKING CO.
The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 230) for sending the bill H. R. 5630, 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.," 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 legal or equitable claim, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legal or equitable 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 Employee's 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 United States Court of Claims, 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.

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 P. FULMER
The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 229) 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 legal or equitable claim, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legal or equitable 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 R. REDMOND
The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1415) for the relief of Frederick R. Redmond.

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 Frederick R. Redmond, of San Antonio, Tex., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary emphysema alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of his duty as chief clerk at the United States Court of Claims, 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 he 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.

The amendment was agreed to.
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 $6,162.60 in full, in excess of $1,000, appropriated, to Joseph J. Porter, against the United States for the damages occasioned by the transmission of a North American Van Lines truck, which 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 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.

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 damages occasioned by the transmission of a North American Van Lines truck, which 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 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 is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Law, Jr., of Commercial, Tex., the sum of $7,747.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages occasioned by the transmission of a North American Van Lines truck, which 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 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.

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, Richmond, Va., the sum of $297.21, as payment of hospital and medical expenses incurred from July 14, 1953, to and including September 8, 1953. The payment of such 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 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. JOSEETE L. ST. MARIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of Mrs. Joseette 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 in line of duty October 19, 1943, at Camp Shelby, Miss., on March 9, 1943, shall be held and considered to have died in line of duty.

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.

TENNESSEE C. BATTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2760) for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in consideration of all laws relating to benefits payable on account of death in the United States Army, the late Tennessee C. Batts, Waco, Tex., is hereby relieved of all
liability to refund to the United States the sum of $4,706.66. Such unappropriated compensation was paid to the said Margaret Mary Hammond, a homemaker of Columbus, Ohio, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, William Corbett Hammond, allegedly due to an injury suffered on April 26, 1938, while in the performance of his duties as a laborer for the United States, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this act, notwithstanding any representation made to him by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943, as amended, 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.
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, any claim filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act by Howard L. Gray, of Fayetteville, Ark., for compensation for the relief of Howard L. Gray, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the compensation paid to him, because of service rendered by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army at Fort Lewis, Wash., for compensation for services rendered by him as a civilian employee of the Department of Labor, pursuant to section 212 of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended, and insert the following: 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.

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 Howard L. Gray, of Fayetteville, Ark., and his claim 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 (3) 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 said 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 (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 on account of the overpayments described 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, and any part of the compensation paid to him, because of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

The bill read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: Page 2, line 8, strike out "Howrd" and insert "Howard.

Paragraph 1, line 8, strike out "Fayetteville" 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 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, Army of the United States, retired, any repayments made by him to the United States on account of the overpayments described 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, and any part of the compensation paid to him, because of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The bill read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: Page 2, line 8, strike out "Howrd" and insert "Howard.

Paragraph 1, line 8, strike out "Fayetteville" 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.

ALFRED J. STAHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5339) 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 the said Alfred J. Stahl, of 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 Compensation claims Nos. 417 and 445) 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 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 debts owed by them for accounts in good faith and without fraud, collusion, or negligence on their part:

Ivan N. Burlingame, general housing manager, Badger, Wis., $10.

John Marin, general housing manager, Tulalahoma, Tenn., $29.84.

Thomas C. McDougal, management aide, Carver Court housing project, Coatesville, Pa., $25.

Kate 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 the said John L. Boyer, Jr., $454 Mary Lane Drive, San Diego, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by him as a result of management and destruction of his personal property in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer and Storage Co., 2301 Mille Street, El Paso, Tex., on June 3, 1964: Provided, That nothing in this act does or shall affect the right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the Green Mountain National Forest 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 inscription, or negligence on the part thereof:

John N. Burlingame and others.
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 Industry, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, at Amarillo, Tex., are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $466.57, $523.57, and $695.50, respectively, which they received as excess compensation as a result of their promotions approved on November 20, 1945, by the United States Department of the Interior, and for any 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.

DR. WOLODYMYR PEDYNIAK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5635) for the relief of Dr. Wолодими́р Педя́ніа́к 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 (63 Stat. 706), prohibiting the payment of compensation from appropriations contained in that or any other act to officers or employees of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursements of disbursing officers of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture: Dr. Wолодими́р Педя́ніа́к, Dr. Володимир Педя́ніа́к, and Bohdan Tkaczyk, to certify officers of liability for such payments for services rendered by the following former employees of the United States Department of Agriculture: Dr. Dr. Wолодими́р Педя́ніа́к, Dr. Володимир Педя́ніа́к, and Bohdan Tkaczyk.

SEC. 2. Where credit is allowed in disbursement officers' accounts or where certifying officers are relieved of liability in accordance with section 1 of this act, the former employee or employees 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 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., the sum of $7,582.57. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILOPIMIN MICALACOPOULOS (MIHALAKOPOULOS)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 163) for the relief of Philopimín Micalacopoulos (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, Philopimín Micalacopoulos (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: 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.

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: 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.

SANDRA LEA MACMULLEN

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.

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 BRENNA

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 alien children of 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: 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.

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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.

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 granting of status of permanent residence to certain aliens

The Clerk called the House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of 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-9541167, Bacchina, Ermanno.
1-2786645, Bain, Hong Yuan.
A-9622692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.
A-9626591, Barlow, Earl Antonio.
A-7186556, Basch, Marton.
A-6207921, Bistrell, Stanu Salvo.
A-9547998, Black, Robert.
A-7358887, Chang, Yi-An Rossita.
0300/41999, Ching, Ab.
A-8052335, Chuang, Cheng.
C-9600020, Chuang, Shiu or Shiou Ching.
E-094561, Ding, Sing Yok.
A-6608996, Fablan, George Stephen.
A-9786255, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.
170/484, Foo, Yee King.
A-8935956, Fook, Look.
A-7361380, Gruenberg, Dora.
A-9749485, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.
A-9887736, Hop, Leung.
A-7775909, Hung, Chung Shiu or Francis C. S. Hung.
A-6971747, Huva, Leili.
A-6911971, Kaminak, Kazmer or Kazmierczak.
A-7955018, Kancans, Edgar Arnold.
A-8915639, Kasper, Peter Voldemar or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.
A-6967238, Kao, Evelina Tse-Yen.
A-9583199, King, Chin or Chin Kim.
0300/36066, Lee, Koo.
A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.
A-4709378, Lee, Ying-Chy (nee Ling).
A-6067887, Lee, Ching-Young or Lee Young.
A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.
A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Weiel Kang or Wei Kang Liang.
A-00308568, Ling, Ah Fook.
A-6849488, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.
A-6784996, Lo, Yu-Cheng.
A-7034946, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.
A-6962964, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.
A-6014700, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.
A-7046729, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton or M. T. Marton.
A-7200789, Mascieti, Tereza (nee Tohlik).
A-9721869, Ming, Chan Chey.
A-7673931, Mint, Samson or Seymons Mind.
A-9825235, Morin, Silvestro.
0300-18266, Nee, Kai-Sung.
A-9636706, Ofstorp, Sven or Tan Geen Ning or Oftorp, Sven or Tan Geen Ning.
A-9776855, Olman, Karl.
A-7371653, Pappas, Marja.
A-7265173, Pien, Pa Chih.
0300-19744, Hu, Yu Ming.
A-8031504, Ping, Lal or Lal Pree.
A-8294067, Poon, Tai King.
A-6759976, Potos, Judith.
0300-30435, Racynski, Wladaw.
A-6534475, Rajeczy, Sulm Dawid.
A-8964180, Sal, Leong Kc.
A-5699937, Sang, Tsang.
A-8897993, Seltick, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcl.
A-9061316, Sen, Tek or Pu Thel Shin.
A-8001335, Sheng, Yee Sheng.
A-6100966, Sung, Lin Shi.
A-9092711, Soon, Jong.
A-7844932, Steinbergs, Juris.
A-7844937, Steinbergs, Marjia (nee Labonovsky).
A-9774013, Straks, Marie.
A-7888261, Straks, Karel Alex.
A-7061816, Sumunu, Alfred Saleh.
A-7996745, Szwajciarek, Monika P.
A-7991592, Szma, Eva Agnes (nee Vicenty).
A-7991593, Szma, Thomas, Jr.
A-7991594, Szma, Adam.
A-6561464, Sz, Chen Teng.
A-705950, Szeony, Giselle.
A-9791178, Tischler, Albert.
A-9921783, Tischler, Vilma.
A-9401228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Jr., Lee.
A-9354036, Tran, Foo Shing.
A-9888260, Vilde, Nikiela, Niklava.
A-8010517, Virkebav, Uno or Wirkebav.
A-8080268, Wai, Lee.
E-094562, Wuon, Choy or Won Sang or Woon Sang.
A-8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.
A-9677850, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.
A-9677849, Yap, Lee Ah.
A-6957373, Yuen, Yee Sin.
A-9657341, Liu, Chiu Po.
A-965767, Liu, Dah Wen.
A-6951949, Korcevic, 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. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST TOMASSICH and YOKO MATUSO TOMASSICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1869) 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 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 quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

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.

EUFEMIA BENCICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1209) 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.

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.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE
fee. Upon the granting of permanent resi-
dence 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 amend-
ment:

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 recon-
consider 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
rem

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from
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 the established dual position
statutes and permit Generals Partridge
and Howard to accept positions as
Assistant Commissioners of the Immigra-
tion and Naturalization Service of the
Department of Justice which is already
headed by General Swing. If these bills
were enacted, retired generals would oc-
cupy 3 of the top 5 operating positions
of the Immigration and Naturalization
Service.

In testimony before the Legal and
Monetary Subcommittee of the Commit-
tee on Government Operations, in justi-
fying 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 situa-
tion is immediately complicated by Gen-
eral Swing's background which has been
exclusively military. As a retired gen-

eral, 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 Pa-
cific.

And again referring to the two posi-
tions proposed to be filled by retired gen-
rals, he stated:

There was no one present in the Depar-
tment who could satisfactorily fill them.

I feel compelled to observe that these
statements of the general are completely
credible. The Immigration and Natu-
ralization Service as a whole is a polished
agency that has over 7,000 employees.
Yet, General Swing could find no qual-
ified persons in the agency. In fact, it
appears he could find no qualified civil-
ian officers or employees of its opera-
tions.

I am sure that no one of us is ready to
abide 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 im-
pressively acquit themselves in these po-
sitions.

General Swing has claimed that at no
time prior to his administration has the
webback problem on the Mexican border
ever been brought under control. If
the General, with the history of his own
agency, would he know that as recently as 1951–52 this border
was effectively controlled when Congress,
through a supplemental appropriation,
appropriated additional funds for a special
Border Patrol operation which carried wetbacks
in the interior of Mexico. However, in the suc-
ceeding regular appropriation these
funds were reduced to inadequate strength. It was
not an inexplicable error in 1953 that
General Swing himself was unable to do
the job—nor even by the grace of General
Partridge.

The Service is charged with admin-
istering the immigration laws and has
embraced within its function under the
Alien Registration 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 fascism. I
firmly believe that all of these laws can be
more effectively and humanely admin-
istered by civilian than by those whose
total experience has been in military ac-
tivities—I say this, recognizing as I al-
ways have, and without in any way dis-
paraging the significant contributions
our military personnel have made in the
recent military conflicts.

I suggest that those whose total ex-
perience has been in the Army are rarely
fit by experience, training, or ability to
administer the functions of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We are familiar with the hackneyed
criticisms of so-called government by
crony. Today such criticism may prop-
entially be changed to government by gen-
erals 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 ex-
periences of these generals that warrants
the passage of special legislation to pro-
vide 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
Major General 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 Company.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Pacific North-
ern 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 Secre-
tary of the Interior is hereby authorized
and directed to convey to the said Pacific
Northern Timber Co., the following des-
bred land situated in Alaska: That strip of tideland
in Shoemaker Bay approximately 6 miles
south of Wrangell, Territory of Alaska,
consisting of approximately 40 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 sur-
vey, and more particularly described as
follows:

Beginning at meander corner No. 1 of lot
14 of United States survey 3000 and extend-
ing along a line south 89 degrees 30 minutes
west approximately 8 chains to the mean
low water line in a southerly direction follow-
ing the mean low water line in a southerly
direction to a point where it inter-
sects with a line extending north 72 degrees
10 minutes west from meander corner No.
FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. POACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration the bill (S. 491) on the Consent Calendar, 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 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: 

"Provided, That the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, in making the total purchase which the land banks are authorized to make in each case, may be paid such lump sum purchase price as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior through survey of the lands to be purchased, plus the cost of survey and preparation of a plat of survey, after taking into consideration the market value of the land which is to be purchased, and the Secretary is authorized to fix the amount of the purchase price of the lands to be purchased, which amount may be in excess of the sum which is fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, but shall not exceed the sum which would otherwise be payable in respect of such lands, if the Secretary of the Interior were to sell such lands, by reason of the necessity of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation for the purpose 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 objected to the consideration of this bill, and explained that the bank allowed the Federal land banks to pick up what remains of the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, that the 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 carrying much labor, and can do 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 the gentleman from Texas having talked to 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.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 491) on the Consent Calendar, 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 Clerk read the roll of 351 Members who 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?

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.

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. 104-109), 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 H. R. 1092 will be agreed to and the House bill laid upon the table.

There was no objection.
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 chair to explain the bill; to explain the bill as it really is; to explain it without any修饰 or any amendments that have been added or made changes in the bill, and I should say there were 127, I think there were 127 amendments, and I want the committee to give 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, churches, fraternities, 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 or legislation was drafted 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.

"...the United States, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, Department of the Army; the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force; the Office of Defense, the Secretary of Defense; the Selective Service for the service that they rendered to the individual citizen and the civilian economy. Flexibility is a primary characteristic of the plan. We must and we do pay our committee members a tribute 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 further from the mind of the committee that wrote the bill than to write 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 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 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."

The United States Army consists of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.
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port by 460,000 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. Only May Day of this year brought to Red Square to be reviewed by the Premier a parade of 2 million men. It is estimated that they can field 400 divisions within 30 days of mobilization.

Within the week it has been announced that 365 miles mas-sket an additional 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 Arm is improving a 4-engined turboprop bomber able to fly 7,650 miles nonstop. The Red Chinese 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, mother ship, judged equal in capability to our F-100 Supersabre; and a 4-engined turboprop bomber able to fly 7,650 miles in 3 days.

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 660,000 men. There are 17,000 miles of defense belts, both land and sea, that we must take care of if we wish 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 so that 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 present a bill today. I hope the trained men who had served our country in a prior war and we, your Congress, 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 Korea so that we will have to rely on 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 using 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 Reserve for more than 7% of the Regular Army as a counterpart of our atomic cannon. If you were to try to give the Air Force, the Navy, and the Army, a single regiment of each service by the year 1962, we would have to have the equivalent of 300,000 Standby Reservists. The bill provides for the creation of about 1 million Standby Reservists in the next 4 years, or 7% of the Regular Army.

Within the week it has been announced that Russia has built several thousand MIG-17 supersonic jet fighter planes. That is merely a little bit of data I have for you to understand why I think we need a better trained and more-equipped Reserve to properly protect the freedom of the people of the United States of America, their safety and their very survival.

The man who volunteers for 4 years cannot be through his active obligation and then he would be called to duty in Korea so that we will not have him. That would give him 7% 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 7% years in the Reserve training at home. This portion in red represents the 6 months' active training in the field that he would set. Then he would be passed into the Reserve unit back home, and he would be given 7%% years' training during that time. During that 7% years, what would he do? He would attend weekly drills. Under the law as we have provided in this bill, he would be called to duty for periods of the year, 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 2 years he would have the name, addresses, and communications, with those who are needed in that great emergency when it came.

New coming to the bill itself, as I said, this bill provides no method other than a voluntary enlistment in the armed services. I point out this chart to you. Each 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 bill.

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 would be within the 5-year term of enlistment; the Reserve would be given 2 years of active duty and 6 years in the Reserve.

In this column we would show you how voluntary enlistment in the armed services may go out 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. If 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 years of the 6 years, 7% 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.

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. If 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 years of the 6 years, 7% 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.

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 Reserve where he will do duty as an Inactive Reserve 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 a ROTC man having 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, he would be called upon for no active training in the field and 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 7 1/2 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 have 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 get sent to the Standby Reserve or some other Reserve, whereas every ROTC man who graduates satisfactorily from the college and the ROTC program would be given a Reserve commission. If he is married he would have 6 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 Reserve, taking part in that Reserve under the 11 months’ training period, 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. We may have to call up those men who are trained 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 those who are trained and get them away from this family, his business, his obligations and his ties to fight another war such as we had in Korea.

In Korea we had to call upon those men who had been trained in our 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 go back to school seven months to teach his friends in some other place 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 those who are trained and get them 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 those who are trained and get them 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 those who are trained and get them away from this family, his business, his obligations and his ties to fight another war such as we had in Korea.

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. Does that answer the question?

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 as far 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 from Louisiana mentioned that there was no compulsion in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman tell us why he believes it 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 charging me with the responsibility of making some change in the bill. I can say that the bill is so drawn that it is not compulsory to enter the Reserves. We do have the draft, which, I suppose, the last time we sat was not.

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 Reserve. If you 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 the State services, 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 way?

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 our governor. 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 into the regular 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 National Guard 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 that is 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 8,600 per month the first year. But, of course, is based on the 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, I must say 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 Office to try to see them 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 the law for the moment to fill any 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, they can then in 2 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 commission, and we have 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 returns to the 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. FORD. 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 Government to carry this. I must say, if I understood it correctly, 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, 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 that the Reserve program is more efficiently 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 2 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 traffic officer, a man who had been practicing dentistry for 5 years. We called into service for Korea men who had been doing something else, who had had training in the field of screening. We had no way of keeping up with the reserves. This bill provides that we shall screen these reserves from the beginning. 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 before someone who had served 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, for instance, if they need a dozen engineers, for instance, would they 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.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 at the program. As I understand it, this proposed legislation is a big step forward to produce the necessary manpower.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, a step forward. We have now a legal bill on the Ready Reserve now of 1 1/2 million men, but we actually have in the Ready Reserve 2 1/2 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 inducted, 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 are trying to get 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 with full credit. 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 that was made 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 Reserve 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 chairman 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 out in the event of an emergency. Mr. HALLECK. It does not change his status of graduate ROTC, does it?

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 within the 2 years in the ROTC course. Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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 within the 2 years in the ROTC course.

Mr. MORANO. Is there 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 draftee, and then sometime in the first 2 years you will be called to active duty for only a 2-year active period.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I think that there was a misstatement here that the law provided that a man could still volunteer for 2 years of active duty in the Army.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is the way I wish to explain it. I think it is legal to accept 2-year volunteers.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman made some reference indicating that this bill will 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 within the 2 years in the ROTC course.

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 to the gentleman from Indiana.

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. 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 from Louisiana, I mean 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...
We all know the objections we had to that. Many men were called to active providing these forces. To, you who can people who have hardship cases, because if, find an easy way out, my hat is off to you. In that way we will take away many one we had at the beginning of the Ready Reserve obligation—that is, 1 or properly and faithfully perform the Reserve obligations— that is, 1 or 2 years, is going to provide an Active Reserve that is able to go into action immediately in 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 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 in 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 that if. However, they will be 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 will 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 elected a 2-year period of active duty compare with the 1-year Reserve obligation? Regardless of 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 Reserves?

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 fact 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 the country until the time I 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 which 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 the bill.

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 add 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 simultaneous war 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 strong 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, which I think is the greatest military genius of our time.

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.

I read testimony before our committee that this Nation is presently producing 22,000 scientific and engineering personnel a year as against $4,000 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. 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 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 plans to contribute to our national defense, to our scientific and engineering personnel. Boys must be able to plan their future, must be able to get their training, because modern technology is so rapidly changing, and so rapidly advancing. We are woefully behind in our technical training in the world that they need those 4-year enlistees, and there is every reason to be drafting the young men living next door to him to go into the Army for 2 years.

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 service, nor do they want any part of the 6-month 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 voted against the bill, because I do not feel that the 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 have volunteered for 6 months with a 7½-year Reserve obligation? If it does not work, what is the Army going to do? The next thing for this gentleman to do is 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. What a record of stealing young people from 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 almost a year I learned that 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 command of the situation of American youth in their training, because modern technology is so rapidly changing, and so rapidly advancing. We are woefully behind in our technical training in the world that they need those 4-year enlistees, and there is every reason to be drafting the young men living next door to him to go into the Army for 2 years.

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. Well, I would say to my distinguished chairman, the illustrious gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINSHAW] who is under the age of 19 years.

Mr. VISION. 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 will say to my distinguished chairman, the illustrious gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINSHAW] who is under the age of 19 years.

Mr. VISION. 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 gratified 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, if the Senate fails to do what they have been mandated to 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 the Senate to do it.

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 who is drafting 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 to people:

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. 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. B. S. 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 do not have the expertise 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 the 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 political and constitutional philosophy important to all Americans, vitally related to our very form of government and directly affecting the lives, plans, and freedom of our constituents.

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 to be my fundamental obligation as an elected Representative under our constitutional system.

I feel very strongly that the legislative branch of the Federal Government is responsible for the national security of the United States. I believe that I have a responsibility as a Member of Congress to help the Congress meet that responsibility.

Let me preface my statement of views on this proposed legislation with 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—first, the voluntary method; second, the compulsory method; and, third, the threat-of-compulsion method.

The voluntary method of recruitment has become 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 the Ready Reserves. It 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 voluntary and compulsory. It is neither white nor black but gray.

With the extension of the draft law and the draft threat there exists a considerable zone of compulsion which defines the 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 enlist or reenlist for military service-Active or Reserve-after having fulfilled their draft duty requirements. 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 the threat-of-compulsion, cannot actually be identified as true volunteers. These are the young men who would have chosen to enter the service even if there were no draft threat and who, in fact, may have entered the service even if there were no draft threat. They are bona fide but unrecognizable 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 threat of military service breathes down their necks.

Both historically and in the present operation of our military 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.

That is why the initial basic policy decision, 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 House.

H. R. 5261.

Today we are being asked to make a fundamental, far-reaching, precedent-breaking and precedent-setting shift of emphasis and of authority to the compulsion and threat-of-compulsion methods in the military, in the National Guard manpower for the National Guard and the Ready Reserve.

It is a decision that is being made in an easy stage, painless, noiseless, something under the belt, rubber-caster basis. 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 bluntly said that this is only a beginning.

Let me refer to just two such fundamental changes involved in this bill. And in the interpretation of these proposed changes in the military manpower procurement system in this threat-of-compulsion method of military manpower procurement I have described.

The first major provision of this bill would give 100,000 to 250,000 predraft age young men an opportunity to become military manpower by enlisting in the National Guard or Ready Reserve under new 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 weekly drill periods a year and 2 weeks in annual training camp, or, in lieu thereof, a regular training camp. Failure to maintain training would make the enlistee liable to induction for 2 years of active duty. If, 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 6 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 compulsory 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 in the event of 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.

Mr. Chairman, 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 Army. This, of course, is the main concern.

I do not question the desirability and need for an Army Reserve Force, provided such demand is realistic and provided it is not a universal military training program in disguise.

I am not prepared to dispute the value of the Ready Reserves and particularly so for the need for an Army Ready Reserve, provided it is not a realistic limit and provided it is not an Army Ready Reserve.

I have been amazed and shocked by the charges made by responsible and knowledgeable Members of this House. The Army has not really tried to build up its Ready Reserve and has not really tried to make methods of military manpower procurement, other than compulsory or threat of compulsory methods, really succeed.

In saying this I have in mind the discussion 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 at the top 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 48. Heretofore they have been denied drills. Our committee assumed that a quirk in the law was at fault, but found that there simply had been a misunderstanding 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. Curran) and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Winkler) during their debate 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'll be better," in the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg.

I have in mind, finally, the question as to whether he [the Assistant Secretary of Defense] was telling the truth. I have in mind General Maas' testimony that 'in the areas where there are adequate facilities, proper leadership and real training programs, you have something going for the Reserves."

I have particularly in mind that in answer to a specific question by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Jenson) 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. Sisow) and Colonel Philpott's reply:

"Mr. Sisow. If an honest, eager, sincere, determined effort had been made to implement the Reserve laws or even administer it and the Reserve forces had passed them, would it 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 and witness was being made at this time of the Department of Defense for strengthening the Reserve? Mrs. Rosenberg replied:

"We will come up in no later than 6 months with a plan on an improved Reserve. We are aware that that every time we have asked for something we have always given a thought to the so-called improved Reserve, but we never set a deadline on which we would submit this."

Army plans and promises to do something really effective with or for the Reserve, 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 Reserve it will acquire, or have the power to acquire, under this bill if it is enacted?

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 the Reserve force be made up of 2- to 4-year enlistment service and 2- to 4-year enlistment service, who began their service on or after July 27, 1953, must remain in the Reserve 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 48 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, and I know it is alleged that there already exists in this bill 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, passionate, 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 want to state that I advise you not to try to tell the returning veteran, subject to this added compulsion, that it is not something new.

The strongest 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.

In 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 called back to active duty for as much as 3 years after completion of his active duty service.

Consider also, what this provision does to the success of the Army Reserve, particularly the Navy and Air Force, which have developed active and successful volunteer Reserve programs and which have sold returning veterans on world industrial plans by their 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 difference that would make.

I revert to the premise with which I began these remarks.

We are dealing here today with a legislative proposition in a milieu of war, in which, 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 damage the vigor and the initiative of American men, 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 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 need of maximum manpower carefully exploited 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 in the United States, Mr. Chairman, in the form of compulsion and threat of compulsion. But I also believe that we are far from exhausting the voluntary methods of military manpower recruitment—that, that we have some methods that are 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 righting the wrong, so that all are realizing that they are accepting and urging it on only on this basis.

And I believe that the methods of compulsion are a deceptively simple and lazy way of dealing with a statutory obligation 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. SHOFT. 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 an objection to a statement 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 Reserve Force would become a well organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that this highly trained and equipped 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 who are in charge of the Army because they have been doing to make it work, we 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 submit therefore that we are not going to produce the change in the Ready Reserve. This is not the United States Army Reserve Act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. The basic question I raised back in 1955 to 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.

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 the bill is not the way it should be, but I would like to point this other distinction, too, which occurs to me as I listen to the gentleman from Missouri. 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 Reserve Force would become a well-organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that this highly trained and equipped 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 who are in charge of the Army because they have been doing to make it work, we 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 submit therefore that we are not going to produce the change in the Ready Reserve. This is not the United States Army Reserve Act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. The basic question I raised back in 1955 to 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.

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 the bill is not the way it should be, but I would like to point this other distinction, too, which occurs to me as I listen to the gentleman from Missouri. 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 Reserve Force would become a well-organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that this highly trained and equipped 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 who are in charge of the Army because they have been doing to make it work, we 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 submit therefore that we are not going to produce the change in the Ready Reserve. This is not the United States Army Reserve Act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. The basic question I raised back in 1955 to 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.

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 the bill is not the way it should be, but I would like to point this other distinction, too, which occurs to me as I listen to the gentleman from Missouri. 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 Reserve Force would become a well-organized and highly trained force within the statutory ceiling of 1,500,000. It was believed that this highly trained and equipped 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 who are in charge of the Army because they have been doing to make it work, we 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 submit therefore that we are not going to produce the change in the Ready Reserve. This is not the United States Army Reserve Act of 1952 from which the gentleman has just quoted. The basic question I raised back in 1955 to 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.
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 90 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 in the 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 since combat skills were what the military needed his self about other than to make certain that these skills exist in sufficient quantity in the civilian society so that they will have 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 General Hershey'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. Many of the recommendations from exhaustive studies being made on the subject are just beginning to make these studies and the Military Establishment has done little about these lines when they are actually made, 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 a new bill and I estimate as high as 141/2 billion dollars setting up a complete duplicative vocational educational system within the military departments. Instead they should avail themselves of the present very fine vocational education system with the manpower pool presently available. The cost of training a 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 in unison that if this form 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 basic 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's statement and one in 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 Congress against this bill. I have traced the administration bill that was supported by the Defense Department as originally submitted. We had under consideration in committee the original Senate bill in the years 1900, 1901, and 1902. 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 have served in the country faithfully for 2 years or 4 years, but who did not actively participate to the satisfaction of the military in the Reserve organization. The 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 2,500 pages of testimony that we had and I have 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 F. R. 4846 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, I think I would support it today. I would greatly do what my bill offered to do. Therefore, I am supporting this bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. In the full committee I offered a motion to cut out the 45-day compulsory, against prior servicemen, but that motion was defeated. But let me tell you about compulsion in this bill, it is nothing more like a 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 and I, especially my friend from Mississippi, was that we should take out the compulsion, and not compel any man to serve who we started with a paper Reserve, 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 point of view. I have 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, and I think we have as workable a bill as we could have got, that they have done all they could in order to build a Reserve. But that is not the question. Where do we stand today? We started 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. It is essentially a bill that is convoluted to strengthen the Reserve.

Now, what does this bill do? It imposes nothing more exacting than is already the situation in our Reserves. And I have endorsed the Legion plan, which is a UMT bill, than you would put compulsion in the bill as came from the Pentagon.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield 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 a Reserve. If you take the bonus 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 com-
ing 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
year; and I followed this point all the way
That is not good, but as the law now
stands and under present conditions
every young man faces the draft for 2
years. I think if we are going to have
approximately a million men

Mr. WINSTEAD. I offered an amend-
ment 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 pro-
visions of this bill of course we allow
them screening and a certain flexibility
of the Ready Reserves, but they have ob-
ligation on them; 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
may say to the gentleman. Mr. DEVEREUX.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The Defense De-
partment 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 men-
tioning the groups that intend to use
the bill, the gentleman overlooked the Coast
Guard.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes; the Coast
Guard.

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 pro-
visions for enlistment into the Reserves
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 con-
tinue 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
are trying to do, and even if we pass 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
strong Ready Reserve force, established
under present conditions.

I contend that a little
commonsense from military leaders with
the legislation we now have, and even
if we 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 the 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.

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
the gentleman think that although
the penalty in the present bill is some-
what lesser that it is equally obnoxious?
The gentleman has studied the Reserve program for 12 years, and he well knows the reason we did not have any Reserve; First, 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 see in this gentleman. I have been 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 hearing of 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 Reserve while requiring neither service nor training of the other 3."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. 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. DAY. 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? They will be able to provide the men. Where are they going to get the men? Mr. DAY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. 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 this bill. I am active in its work, and I am certain we can get a better bill than this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DAY] has expired.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. 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 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. Everyone 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 argue the question for the sake of 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, and 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, and in case the National Guard is called into active duty, which is really not expected. The Commandant of the 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. The Army says they cannot use it.

If any 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 they are physically fit. I am doing this with the National Guard. I think if the National Guard were exposed entirely to the Pentagons without the help of the people running the 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 if there is anybody who has greater admiration for our military service than I. But there is no reason why they wanted a Reserve. They said, "Well, we will work out a program for the veteran who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years of service 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 men from the Reserve were recalled to active duty to fight that war. And a half million men, who had reached military age after V-J 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, and the man who has already served 2, 3, or 4 years of service 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 would 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."

Mr. DAY. If he does not go, what then?" He will be 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, 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 draft, the veteran of 2, 3, or 4 years.

Mr. DEVEREUX of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAY. 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. DAY. Just one moment; the gentleman misunderstands me. I was not saying that at all. The man who takes the 6 months' training and then says, "Well, this is not what I signed for," the obligation certainly should be forced to be fulfilled in this case. I am talking about the man who is drafted before this bill was passed.
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 when they have tried to get people to carry out their obligations, they have given 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 for this man of 2, 3, or 4 years' service who are interested and want to make cause discontent among the new enlistees 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 Reserves would be so 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 anything you had in the 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. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recognize the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BRAY. General Walsh, who talks for the National Guard, or any member of the Guard, is he not 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 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 in basic training, is not a good man and you are making it far more difficult for him to get into a Reserve unit. He must take 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 Ohio.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that in the National Guard if a man does not participate he is subjected to compulsory service 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 Indiana.

Mr. DEVEREUX. 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 Reserves would be so 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 anything you had in the 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. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I recognize the gentleman from Mississippi.

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 it exists today, to which he is going to do, he is forced to do this. Perhaps that is true. But I am trying to say that the National Guard or the Reserves is trained as good as it can be. I do not quite 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.

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 it exists today, to which he is going to do, he is forced to do this. Perhaps that is what I want to say. But I am trying to say that the National Guard or the Reserves is trained as good as it can be. I do not quite 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.
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 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 trained men entering the Reserve are from those who have already served 2, 3, or 4 years. This is unfair and against the general desire of the people, and especially due hardship upon these ex-service men, 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 battalions, bombers, tanks and rifles. The greatest strength in America is in the Americanization of a free people, and their great spirit of liberty and economic strength, and anything that tends to destroy the freedom and dignity of man and replaces it with regimentation, despotism, regimentation is treason to the American idea. 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 House we have had a far too frequent Republican whip this morning, in paragraph 3, he says:

Universal military training is intended to mean what it says—universal; that is, to take any American man 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 that 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, that this bill is not some what 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. There is 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? The question 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 I and Korea, about 4½ million 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 have trained manpower, 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 900,000, who were 4-F, or 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 recalls, 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, apprentices, and just plain men earning a living. They were recalled to 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 1,000 were inducted. In September 200,000, in the months following September, the rate leveled off to about 50,000 but these men could not be used for at least months after their induction. This was the beginning of the Selective Service System. They could have drafted many more but the untrained men must be trained before they can fight. In August they 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 my remarks at this point.

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 of training and in the event they receive a drill call they are ready.

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 50 percent are veterans, but too few of them being officers and noncommissioned officers. Therefore, the active enlisted Reserves are almost totally nonveterans and trained only briefly.

Even 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 enemies under the command except in the National Guard. In the National Guard, what enlisted men there were, were largely untrained so that the men who were faced with the dismal routine of giving basic training over and over to the enlisted recruits, there was little real incentive for veterans to join the Reserve facing endless duties 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 in war service have actually tried to find out, they have too often been content with discovering, or have been interested in, 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 disregarded their time to other matters or have been ineffective spokesmen for the reservists. I believe that it can be proven that the Regular services have often and only 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 has not been accepted. They have gone to the Secretary of Defense they have no real independence. Too often their views have been filtered of all 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 the Reserve was in a sorry state.

One of the greatest rays of hope I have received along these lines has been the interest shown in the Reserve affairs by the Secretary of Defense and their 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 possible that we may have a Secretary of Defense who will still be forgotten even now, we would have no bill before this Congress today, and the Department of Defense would have never had initiatives in the Reserve affairs. 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 the ability 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 men for the Reserve. That is the core and the heart of this bill.

My only misgivings about it are that this 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. That we should not be able to recruit the men for the Reserve. That is the core and the heart of this bill.
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when all our World War II veterans were called back in for the Korean war. The proponents 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 government uses one measure first and then equity can be forgotten.

No one can deny that the Nation's security comes first. But I 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, then equity can be forgotten.

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 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 what I have said 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 security, is a waste of money.

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 I saw and heard yesterday at our Nike radar site, located at a Nike defense. To me, the real thrill so far as the launching area is concerned cannot help but be the efficiency of the men manning the equipment while the highly trained crew goes through the preengagement routine, cannot help but be impressed, not only with the complex nature of the Nike battery, but with the efficiency of the men manning the equipment.

Another phase of the construction which impressed me was the underground radar. The underground shelters, filled with deadly Nike missiles, are completely out of sight. By storing the missiles underground, the area required to cover only 150 acres to about 50 acres. Here the missile sites are located 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 a dangerous site; that the shelters are comfortable, and economical. I can well understand why some communities have, 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 through out the country, I can assure you and your constituents that the Nike batteries will be a credit to any community.

A third highlight of the day was the Nike equipment. Anyone who has stood in the control area of a Nike battery will realize the highly associated equipment while the highly trained crew goes through the preengagement routine, cannot help but be impressed, not only with the complex nature of the Nike battery, but with the 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 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.

I have heard of the years of work put into 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 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 radar and the gun, I was conscious of the defense of the country. He is the best friend that the Department of Defense has because he will support any worthwhile legislation.
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 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 increased the already high status of the soldier. 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 do, however, wish to call your attention to the many and wholesome recommendations of the people in respect to this bill.

I can see no 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 posterior let me assure you that all of us, even one of you, and I 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 address the fundamental issue 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 importance of his mission, confidence in his weapons, and resolution to do his part to defend his country.
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Gentlemen, in posterior let me assure you that all of us, even one of you, and I 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 address the fundamental issue of our past actions. We, as well as the Army, should be proud of the Nike.
Correspondence courses. But the military, shudder, does not believe in correspondence courses. They not only recommend these military schools which offer more than 450 courses, where a man can take for his boating, 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 too good 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 further gave the following foolish and meaningless reply:

It has not been possible to provide meaningful figures in some reports concerning obligations when a proper cost accounting system is not 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, in effect, is calculated as representing the total cost of operating the schools since they do not include amounts required to furnish standard supplies and equipment issued, 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 this. He is 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 the 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 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 educational regulations to the most expensive and haphazard way.

I would like for the gentleman or anyone else to challenge that statement. Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, 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 recognize mine. You recognized yours. And I have faith and confidence in the youth of this land to say that the generations to follow 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 all their 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 speaking 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 scientists 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 the scientific men, the chemists, the physicists, the electrical men, the well-trained men, those who can think, invent, and under stand those gadgets. They can do it.

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 had 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 that 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 and the House will carry 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 law in America guaranteeing an education if we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities. If we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities that we have, we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities. If we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities that we have, we 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 to double the number of school buildings in America and treble the number of school teachers if you are going to stand there at the door of the classroom and drive these children away 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 who are going to listen to this will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities. If we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities that we have, we will do a little something toward helping the boys realize the opportunities.

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 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 common sense 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. Mr. Chairman, 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 manpower. 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. We can do so by what has happened in the past.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

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 their high schools, 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 of the colleges.
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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, they are a threat to the schools. 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate 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 18th 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 simply simulate the gentleman’s position?
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.

The next war we have—and God forbid we ever have one, but if such should happen, it is 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 our automobiles that is true anymore. 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 our automobiles that is true anymore.

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.

There is one person I must live with forever, which is most fortunate for them; and certainly they will not always be with me to grant their wise counsel and fearless guidance, 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 Snod.

A great man once said:

"To act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright.

And when he nailed the 95 theses to 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 for a person who knows himself, his own background, his own experience, and talking to my 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 a draft. Sometimes it was drafted.

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, I think that I have 2 answers.

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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman.

This present bill is not UMT, granted. It is limited and temporary in its achievement in this date. Oh, yes, it terminates on July 1, 1959, if not extended—if not extended.
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It is not UMT, and campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. 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 campaign was taken out, and wisely so, by the distinguished chairman. 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 expel this. It is not where you begin, but where you end that counts; not where you start, but where you stop.
The rapid change 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, matériel, and money because ground troops with a rifle, machinegun, tank, or a field gun 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 of 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 word of the gentleman from Missouri in explaining to my people why he is going to vote 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, 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 defense contracts, which incorporate the principle of pick and choose. I want to defend the hard way, not the easy way, but do not have enough guts to vote to conscript for 6 months. Who is going to select these boys? This might be an elite guard of 250,000 young men? Oh, what a chance to play favoritism and politics. This bill is full of headaches and heartbreaks.
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militarily the most powerful Nation in the world.

Our citizens have more of the good things than does any other people who at any time anywhere lived on this earth.

Freedom, opportunity, prosperity, security for the individual have been ours. The 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 unyielding character of our 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 in 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 existence, the right of Congress to declare war, the ability of our people to avoid wars in which they have no vital interest.

Lack of love for 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 service in numbers sufficient to meet 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 blacklisting 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—while peace, our way of life.

Assuming their patriotism, there remains the sad, sorrowful fact that, as a result of their thinking, today the real world is falling 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 last rays of a sun sinking beyond the horizon, in every land and on every sea. Here in the homeland, there is a square mile in the country, a town of a few thousand people, who have become victims of the last rays of a sun sinking beyond the horizon, in every land and on every sea.

The answer that we cannot avoid war; that, unless we travel half way around the world to fight, to carry on a war, we will be brought to our shames is answered by the fact that in preceding world wars neither Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Norway, 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 of its own strength as to impose upon the present and future generations less than that they are every mental 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, where 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, are now 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, rather, and if the trends persist, 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: We must 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 forces to defend the United States is that we desire to contain communism.

It can no more be successfully either contained or suppressed by force than by 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—Russia.

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 B-29's, our B-36's, 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 United States.

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.

I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in contrast with a greatly improved service program, the Government is taking another important step to reinforce our immediate and long-range security, as the dollars, the sacrifices of the efforts and the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

Mr. CHAPMAN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Wickersham].
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.

Both in the wake of a more 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 testing, and Army and Air Force reviews have 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 literally trained more 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.

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 sound program 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 the Reserve forces without adverse effect on the Active forces.

Third. Assure supply of trained personnel to the National Guard by assignment of qualified eligible reservists who fail to perform duties under other than honorable conditions other than honorable.

Fourth. Secure compliance with Reserve training participation requirements.

Fifth. Permit organization in peace-time 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 a voluntary basis 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. The program will match the massive manpower of the Communist bloc 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 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 this earth, a constantly increasing technological superiority— including the area of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons—and the proven fighting qualities of the American servicemen.

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 primarily 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 a. 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 times 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. Then came the 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 an army training. He said he supposed he would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to think in the terms of that little boy because we impose the duty of writing the kind of legislation 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. The second is that 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-equipped military Reserve program. It does not even go into the qualifications that the President is going to set up for 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 into it 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 go 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 women all 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 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 wits together and avoid what I would call 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 simply to pay the cost and the military will 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 need of this 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. Now, if you happen to paint a bill which you draw, there will be flaws in it. I do not care how wise you are or how skilful you are, whatever bill you draw will be a compromise of conflicting views.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I get up and I do not mean to say 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. It does not provide and I think you will admit this.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to tomorrow to point them out by 1 by 1.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. 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 come in college and work out their own opportunities along the line which the committee would like to 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.

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, the Secretary of Defense, after he finishes his 6-month period will be screened then into the Standby Reserve. He will have no Ready Reserve, and we have an obligation there to 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 which will be something that they can work out with educational 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 take up this work? This would have 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, as I think he knows, I do not like the idea of 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. DEVEREUX. Mr. Mr. Chairman, 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 which it may be the rare bird that you draft into the service. All and anyone needs to do to confirm that is to look at the history of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. 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. If 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 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. This afternoon I am 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 do it in such a way. 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 that 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 through the age of 26. I do not think that every commanding officer in the Reserve is competent or well 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 can be depended upon to interpret 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
Finally, it is argued that a large military machine may lead us into the role of an creditor 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. However, we have a good record. We have led the way to independence for 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 gentlewoman 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 effective and properly used military power may 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 to use it in a deterrent form as a sort of spiritual weapon. The onus of an aggressor and we may be tempted to use it for selfish purposes as other nations have done.

I do not think I can write a better bill, on the basis of my own limited experience, than this one. I have been able to avoid wars, such as Korea and the many other wars, too numerous to mention. But I do not think I can write a better bill, on the basis of my own limited experience, than this one. I have been able to avoid wars, such as Korea and other wars, too numerous to mention. But I think we must lead the way to international disputes.

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 effective and properly used military power may 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 to use it in a deterrent form as a sort of spiritual weapon. The onus of an aggressor and we may be tempted to use it for selfish purposes as other nations have done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very interesting statement. Is it not true that military power and strength of itself will not prevent war, but that the best use that can be made of it is to use it in a deterrent form as a sort of spiritual weapon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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 effective and properly used military power may 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 to use it in a deterrent form as a sort of spiritual weapon. The onus of an aggressor and we may be tempted to use it for selfish purposes as other nations have done.
city are alive with traffic which re-sembles 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. I am con-
tinued the opportunity to the pas-senger
to catch a panoramic view of Man-
hattan Island, its skyscrapers, its
avenues, its wharves and piers. The
human eye records this never-to-be-for-
gotten scene that will remain in the re-
cesses of memory and the entire picture
recalled vividly with the mere thought
of America.

Liberty.

whelmed with the scenes below of great
chemical plants, various other heavy in-
dustries which confront the free world
in every military capacity.

New York Harbor past the
Statue

Many tugboats are shifting barges and
cargo and passenger vessels into load-
ing and unloading piers—everything is
alive—it is a new dawn, a new day, a
new era, America proceeds to its great-
derby, America lives.

Mr. Martin. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to address the House
for 1 minute and to revise and extend
my remarks on the subject of raising addi-
tional necessary funds for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, con-

Mr. Van Zandt. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to address the House
for 1 minute to revise and extend my
remarks on the subject of raising ad-
ditional funds for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from
Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

World War II saw the
emerge as the greatest single power on
earth next to the United States.

But what 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.

So little cooperation with the Soviet
forces stand the armed millions of Com-

Union . remained

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 to-
day than ever before.

The philosophy of our Government
within this framework of alliances is to
confront the world at all times with a
willfulness to deal in good faith, but to
destroy from the beginning to the
end of the Communist threat.

The best hope this Nation has for
peace, along with its allies, is to main-
tain such a position of strength from
which it can work to reduce world ten-
sion to a minimum.

For this we require a stable and pre-
dictable military-defense program free
of the feast-and-famine expediency of
other years, and providing a solid founda-
tion for balance in all our service
branches.

The alternative is to court fatal weak-
nesses which might some day mean an-
other, and far worse, Pearl Harbor right at our own front doors.

With all the confusion in 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 being called.

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 this 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 the needed 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 is that today, in my mind, the Reserve program is the end of fiscal year 1959.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 constitutes the reserve base for initial mobilization, and it was determined to be 2.9 million men.

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 reservists, and the substitution of a required training period in its place.

But the problem centers around the requirement for a supply of initially trained young men to the Reserves or the National Guard.

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 train 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.

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 mobilized, 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 provide adequately the proclaimed emergencies as well.

The national Reserve plan would see the Ready Reserve become an organized force of trained units and individuals.

On the basis of current planned strengths of 2.88 million for the active forces, Ready Reserve requirements have been met and the individual meets these.

The goal for meeting these requirements is the end of fiscal year 1959.

The first problem in need of correction lies in the area of the reserve structure.

As conceived, the Ready Reserve, with a ceiling of 1.5 million, 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.

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 pronounces.

Any larger number will require congressional action.

The Standby Reserve will be called on a selective basis only in an emergency declared by the President.

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: 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 and are believed 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 not 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 reservists, 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 train rather than ignore that obligation entirely.

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. 3297 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, and that this 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 are called on to train them with basic training.
A high percentage of National Guard enlisted personnel have not had the benefits of basic training. Enlisted personnel have not had the benefit of basic training. The drilling green recruits becomes even more pressing when one considers that National Guard strength is assured supply of trained men.

This leads to the fourth major problem in the National Guard. It is the fact that the National Guard does not presently have an assured supply of trained men. The bill departs somewhat from previous practice in another 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 an adequate supply of trained personnel to the guard either by transfer of obligated reservists or by voluntary participation under the 6-month program.

If we are to move forward, 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 7 1/2-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 an adequate supply, the nation can meet strength levels, men leaving the active services may be transferred to guard units for the remainder of their Ready Reserve obligation.

Equally, these kinds of problems are in the broad 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 the condition and at the numbers prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and as provided by the laws of the State.

There is no congressional requirement that National Guard strength 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 an adequate supply of trained personnel to the guard either by transfer of obligated reservists or by voluntary participation under the 6-month program.

If we are to move forward, 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 7 1/2-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 an adequate supply, the nation can meet strength levels, men leaving the active services may be transferred to guard units for the remainder of their Ready Reserve obligation.

Equally, these kinds of problems are in the broad 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.

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 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 development of such generating stations, 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 the 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 dis-

tribution, both public and private, as well

as industrial companies have, with the

encouragement of the Atomic Energy

Commission, formed study groups to ex-

plore the commercial feasibility of pro-

ducing electric energy with atomic power

as an alternative energy source. Some of

these enterprises have now been broken

up. As was intended by the framers of the

Public Utility Power Act of 1935, the various

holding companies and agencies-such com-

panies and agencies as have facilities for

the transmission of electric energy in in-

terstate commerce are subject to the broad

jurisdiction of the Federal Power Com-

mission. I have touched briefly on the objec-

tives of the Holding Company Act and have

indicated that its principal objectives have

been to prevent the concentration of

activity 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

acquisition of atomic energy is subject to a

special license in order to obtain the

special nuclear material and for a license

to construct facilities for its use in the

generation of electric energy would be

achieved by an agency or instrumentality of

the public interest involved, and that noth-

ing contained in the bill is to be con-

strued as relieving any company from any

obligations imposed by the Securi-

ties Act of 1933 or the Securities Ex-

change Act of 1934.

Mr. Speaker, according to Atomic

Energy Commission officials, atomic

powerplants in order to be made com-

mercially competitive with large central

steam-generating stations using con-

ventional fuels, must be brought down

to a boiler cost of from $40 to $70 per

kilowatt — the cost of conventional boil-

ers. The Atomic Energy Commission esti-

mates 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 6,000 kilowatts of electric capability —

over $600 per kilowatt. Public and pri-

vate agencies should be given every en-

couragement to proceed to develop atomic

energy as a necessary step in bringing those
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 investment. The

provision under the Holding Company Act

will assist the development of nuclear

reactors through a subsidiary, also to

become holding companies. To clarify the

concept of public utility companies

holding companies under the Atomic

Energy Act of 1954, remain at all times

subject to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,

applied to the Atomic Energy Commis-

sion for licenses for the construction and

operation of dual-purpose nuclear re-

actors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,

be subject to regulations. As a result of

the Holding Company Act, electric utility

is, in general, defined as any com-

pany which owns facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

current, or gas utility. The Commission

to operate the grid, but it is known in the

utilities industry that many such com-

panies are very large, and in the nature

of things cannot submit to regulation by

one or more regulatory agencies. As I

have introduced today does not

merely have facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

utility, company is defined as any company

which has no connection with the

Atomic Energy Commission, formed study

groups to explore the commercial feasibility

of nuclear power.

The Atomic Energy Act provides,

however, that public and private commis-

sion for licenses for the construction

and operation of dual-purpose nuclear

reactors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,

be subject to regulations. As a result of

the Holding Company Act, electric utility

is, in general, defined as any com-

pany which owns facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

current, or gas utility. The Commission

to operate the grid, but it is known in the

utilities industry that many such com-

panies are very large, and in the nature

of things cannot submit to regulation by

one or more regulatory agencies. As I

have introduced today does not

merely have facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

utility, company is defined as any company

which has no connection with the

Atomic Energy Commission, formed study

groups to explore the commercial feasibility

of nuclear power.

The Atomic Energy Act provides,

however, that public and private commis-

sion for licenses for the construction

and operation of dual-purpose nuclear

reactors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,

be subject to regulations. As a result of

the Holding Company Act, electric utility

is, in general, defined as any com-

pany which owns facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

current, or gas utility. The Commission

to operate the grid, but it is known in the

utilities industry that many such com-

panies are very large, and in the nature

of things cannot submit to regulation by

one or more regulatory agencies. As I

have introduced today does not

merely have facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

utility, company is defined as any company

which has no connection with the

Atomic Energy Commission, formed study

groups to explore the commercial feasibility

of nuclear power.

The Atomic Energy Act provides,

however, that public and private commis-

sion for licenses for the construction

and operation of dual-purpose nuclear

reactors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,

be subject to regulations. As a result of

the Holding Company Act, electric utility

is, in general, defined as any com-

pany which owns facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

current, or gas utility. The Commission

of any other provision of the Holding

Company Act is to be affected and that

nothing contained in the bill is to be con-

strued as relieving any company from any

obligations imposed by the Securi-

ties Act of 1933 or the Securities Ex-

change Act of 1934.

Mr. Speaker, according to Atomic

Energy Commission officials, atomic

powerplants in order to be made com-

mercially competitive with large central

steam-generating stations using con-

ventional fuels, must be brought down

to a boiler cost of from $40 to $70 per

kilowatt — the cost of conventional boil-

ers. The Atomic Energy Commission esti-

mates 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 6,000 kilowatts of electric capability —

over $600 per kilowatt. Public and pri-

vate agencies should be given every en-

couragement to proceed to develop atomic

energy as a necessary step in bringing those
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 investment. The

provision under the Holding Company Act

will assist the development of nuclear

reactors through a subsidiary, also to

become holding companies. To clarify the

concept of public utility companies

holding companies under the Atomic

Energy Act of 1954, remain at all times

subject to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954,

applied to the Atomic Energy Commissi-

on for licenses for the construction and

operation of dual-purpose nuclear re-

actors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,

be subject to regulations. As a result of

the Holding Company Act, electric utility

is, in general, defined as any com-

pany which owns facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

current, or gas utility. The Commission

to operate the grid, but it is known in the

utilities industry that many such com-

panies are very large, and in the nature

of things cannot submit to regulation by

one or more regulatory agencies. As I

have introduced today does not

merely have facilities for the gen-

eration, transmission, or sale of electric

utility, company is defined as any company

which has no connection with the

Atomic Energy Commission, formed study

groups to explore the commercial feasibility

of nuclear power.

The Atomic Energy Act provides,

however, that public and private commis-

sion for licenses for the construction

and operation of dual-purpose nuclear

reactors. As this House also knows, all

nuclear powerplants will, under the AEC,
modification or clarification of the Hold- ing Company Act because I am convinced that insofar as that act is concerned it was never intended when it was drafted and I am convinced today at no cost to overburdened taxpayers. I ask the support of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I have called my bill the Electric Development Act of 1955. While it is designed primarily to meet the situa- tion in the United States, it was brought forward to the need for the pooling of the resources of several companies, through subsidi- taries, to speedily develop electric energy from atomic power there are other situa- tions which will it apply. On December 15, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced an upward revision of its electric power expansion goal, in suspen- sion since December 3, 1953.

The revised goal is for a total domestic capacity capable of producing 150 mil- lion kilowatts of electric energy by the end of 1958. This is an increase of about 46 million kilowatts over the one announced several years ago 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 15, 1955, the end 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 means of Federal Government capacity was commenced through tax conces- sion under President Roosevelt, continued under President Truman, and is going forward under President Eisen- hower. Thus the dependence of an ex- panding economy upon an adequate sup- ply of electric energy can properly be said to be nonpartisan and one which the members of all parties can work toward public whereby, My bill would not be sent to the Federal Government—in fact there would be savings to the Government and to the rate payers—encourage further development of the country's atomic en- ergy 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.

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 1,2 and 2 million kilowatts. Russia boasts that it already has a nuclear power sta- tion in operation. Many other foreign countries in operation 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.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 18, 1956, 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 $8,784,735 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and or- dered to be printed.

808. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment for the fiscal year 1956 for the Presid- ent's Adv. Comm. on Government Org. (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 rec- ommended 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 22, 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 for the improvement of the Canal Zone Water Work" by the addition of provisions relative to the regis- tration and the regulation of the practice of engineers 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 a report on Bard River, Wis., for flood control with particular reference to Mellen and Ondaham and vicinities. This in- vestigation 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 pre- liminary 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 the 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 re- newals of leases of the Annette Island Air- port to the United States"; to the Commit- tee 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 the provisions relating to the public use of the Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reserva- tion"; to the Committee on Interior and In- sular Affairs.
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for enrollment, with reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6715, 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 thereafter, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6580. A bill to extend the times for 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 directing the President to participate in the Olympic Committee to hold the Winter Olympic Games in the United States in 1960, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GREEN: 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. 2073. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Mason 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, infected with vesicular exanthema; without amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: H. R. 2257. A bill to provide grants to 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.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: H. R. 6288. A bill to authorize the conveyance 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 Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H. R. 6290. A bill to recognize and facilitate the admission to new multiple use permits 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.

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. 6307 under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6294. A bill to provide an increased per diem travel allowance and travel expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FJALLE:
H. R. 6295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a maximum per diem allowance and travel expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALE:
H. R. 6297. A bill to allow certain members of the Army Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:
H. R. 6298. A bill to amend section 601 (g) of the 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 so as to apply commodity schedules to mica and mica films and splittings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6300. A bill to amend section 1231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 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. 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. 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. 611), 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 nationwide shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government service; 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:
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. J. Res. 301. A joint resolution prohibiting the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. 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 investigate 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 several referred as follows:

By Mr. ATCHINSON:
H. R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Vincent N. Cadiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AVERY:
H. R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H. R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Andreas Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:
H. R. 6816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomie Kawase Macy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:
H. R. 6817. A bill for the relief of the Memphis Stone & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:
H. R. 6818. 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. DONDO:
H. R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Jean Taylor Wandah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 6820. A bill for the relief of Priscilla Sook Chur Chang, alias Sook Chur York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFISTER:
H. R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Popwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:
H. R. 6822. A bill for the relief of Millard F. Bianton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:
H. R. 6823. A bill for the relief of Friedel Fraas and her daughter, Shirley Ilia Maria Fraas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:
H. R. 6824. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kit Ling Wong Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:
H. R. 6825. A bill for the relief of Lino Agullon 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 H. Pitchard, president, Local No. 201, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, and 140 employees of the Cleveland Worsted Goods Co., 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 alcoholics beyond the reach of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising in their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. By Mr. SCIOPETTI: Petition of M. H. White and 273 residents of Fourth District of Illinois who are destitute 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 controlling 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 adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution pertaining to the 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.

274. Also, petition of Leodegario M. Radaza, Poblacion, La Paz, Leyte, Philippines, requesting that service by his brother in the Filipino Foreign Service be considered service in the United States Army, and that he be entitled to death claim compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

275. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Texas Medical Association, Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution adopted by the Texas Medical Association at its 103rd annual session at Dallas, 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, spoke. Martha Davis 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:

By Mr. ENGEL:

EXCEPTS FROM ADDRESS OF IRVING M. ENGEL: Immigration policies—as reflected in the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act and the operation of the Refugee Relief Act—present a picture which is highly unfavorable to the American people. It is a picture of a well-intentioned but tragically inscrutable, inarticulate, and inhuman policy which has been allowed to be made by the United States in the past 15 years under which 14,000,000 aliens have been prevented from entering this country for humanitarian reasons which urge us to take them in. The American bureaucrats and lawmakers is a picture of a well-intentioned but tragically inscrutable, inarticulate, and inhuman policy which has been allowed to be made by the United States in the past 15 years under which 14,000,000 aliens have been prevented from entering this country for humanitarian reasons which urge us to take them in. The American bureaucrats and lawmakers 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.

When Crosi sought to cut down the red-tape curtain he not only encountered resistance, but we gave him the highest award 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 provisions 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.

Our economic and cultural progress and to our security system of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The American Jewish Committee believes that when the Senate Judiciary Committee opens hearings on measures to improve our immig-
get our 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, SHERRY NETHERLAND HOTEL, NEW YORK, Jan. 25, 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 not been a happy one. The American Jewish Committee and which I, and other Members of the Senate, expressed at the time of its passage will always remember one of the last appearances in the Senate of the late beloved Senator Brian McMahon, of Connecticut, perhaps the last one before his untimely death—when he spoke out and voted against the McCarran-Walter Act. How true was he then, and how right?

I have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle across our borders, will need to know the facts.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, and saboteurs.

I am glad to have the opportunity to explain how this has happened, and to tell you what I think is the proper way in which to handle it.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle across our borders, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers and saboteurs.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

I have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle across our borders, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

Distinguished visitors, scholars, scientists, and even plain tourists from abroad, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

I have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.

I hardly need to refer to the manner in which aliens who want to come and settle across our borders, have been treated like potential spies, criminals, subvercers, and saboteurs.
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rather than to clarify and explicate 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. The propagation of truth would be protected under the homiletic mania of communism against human freedom. It would gage the opponents of communism in the free world, and test their courage behind the Iron Curtain. Since the Communist totalitarian governments already have complete control of the print media, public information they have nothing to lose.

2. It claims a success for the Korean and German cases as proof of the theory that they have been flagrantly violated by the Chinese Communists. In Korea there is still a divided country despite pledges of 10 years ago to reunify under the United Nations joined, that it would be united and free. In Vietnam the Geneva Conference turned over half of that country and 15 million people to the Communists. This is their standard of a successful conference.

3. It provides 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 Germanies (like divided Korea and Manchuria) were unified, Germany back across the Atlantic to the United States • • • defense alliance.

4. Under the proposal our overseas bases would have to be dismantled to a "requital for discontinuity of a base in hand." In contrast, this trade a bird in hand for several in flight. What the people in the Western hemisphere are made available on an extensive basis to all nations of the Western world. And scientific atomic know-how will be used for constructive purposes.

5. It sets as the starting point for future negotiations with the Soviet Union, the location of the so-called "named atomic weapons" to cease in 1957. Since the location of our atomic plants and facilities are known and the Communist forces are not known and there is no adequate inspection system provided, this proposal is all to the advantage of Soviet military supremacy.

6. The proposal would result in yielding up of 50 out of 52 international agreements it has established by the terms of the Korean armistice. Since this system has prevented war, it is understandable why the Soviet Union now advises it in the highly sensitive field of atomic and armament inspection.

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, 1955.

Since the free world forces as of that date are known and the Communist forces are not set 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 the congress. The Congress and can be readily checked now.

In the Communist world this is not the case and we would have to rely on their "conclusive" and "definitive" results after the convention enters into force.

Unless and until Communist China becomes a member of the United Nations, the Senate can rest with the fact of "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
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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 defense of 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 voter 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 islands of Formosa itself? Second, should we use American forces to defend the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu? Third, should we use atomic weapons if necessary to repel any Communist attack on these islands?

The poll was taken on a sample of 50,000 registered voters in the 36th district of Ohio. The results are as follows:

Question No. 1: Should the United States defend Formosa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47,900</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>13,723</td>
<td>1,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early return in my 55,000 registered voter poll of Ohio sentiment records an overwhelming majority in favor of defending both Formosa and the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu. 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 results received:

1. Should the United States defend Formosa?

2. Should the United States use American forces to defend the coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu?

3. Should we use atomic weapons if necessary to defend Formosa and the coastal islands?
Here are some observations made by persons opposing the Bricker amendment.

"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 hear the decisions of our great President. If you and Vassar will back Ike to the hilt, you won't go wrong."

No. 1 and 2: "Yes, if we have promised to do so.

"Do please all in your power to pass the Bricker amendment. I tell them we will and if they continue, then do it. For once, let them know we mean what we say.

"For Formosa, use what is needed to do the place."

No. 1: "Formosa indefensible."

"Thank you and BRICKER will back Ike to the hilt—no ordinary person is in a position to discuss these matters.

"We have backed up so much now that no ordinar person is in a position to discuss these matters.

"Whatever you think about, give us the information. Protect our interests. Protect yourselves.

"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 buck down now.

"I have complete faith in President Eisenhower and his administration to take action as they think best in 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 my opinion on these matters.

"Can't afford to back down now.

"It is about time we keep some promises we made in the election. We must think we should get all 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 think we 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 hand tied behind their backs as Truman did. Sometimes I think Hoover's original hydrogen bomb prove to have been the best for America.

"Thank you for this opportunity to express your opinion.

"If they are of great value for protection of Formosa.

"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 this whole civilization.

"Let's let Ike alone. Certainly believe in democratic expression, but we elected a capable man as President.

"Yes.

"Whatever President Eisenhower decided.

No. 3: "I believe we not only should use A-bombs 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.

"To go along with the President's decisions, I trust him, don't you?"

No. 3: "Not unless the Reds start to use it first. I hope that atomic power bombs are never again used.

"Give us the atomic weapons. Let's use them with much forethought.

"Leave this to military leaders.

"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 think best in 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 my opinion on these matters.

"Can't afford to back down now.

"It is about time we keep some promises we made in the election. We must think we should get all 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 think we 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 hand tied behind their backs as Truman did. Sometimes I think Hoover's original hydrogen bomb prove to have been the best for America.

"Thank you for this opportunity to express your opinion.

"If they are of great value for protection of Formosa.

"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 this whole civilization.

"Let's let Ike alone. Certainly believe in democratic expression, but we elected a capable man as President.

"Yes.

"Whatever President Eisenhower decided.
The struggle on the battlefield is the one method by which we propitiate peace. The first consideration is given. Those who serve in the legislative halls of the State general assemblies and in the Federal government 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 men and women must be so focused that the most important fight is in the minds of the people for the American state of freedom. Armed forces, peace must always be on guard. Military must be trained and ready to defend our land. The people who serve in the three branches of our Government must be prepared to wage a cold war against an enemy philosophy. This kind of preparedness requires planning, new ideas, and a new effort.

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 property is an occasion upon which we should re-pledge and re-deed 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 the Federal government in the United States was that there should be a minimum of laws, and laws should be just, simple, and not irrationally enforced, and that they should apply equally to all citizens. The concept that the United States should be the protector of a minority group—rich or poor, business groups or labor unions; white, black or yellow race; for any religious creed—has been attributed to individuals who have an interest in the historic process 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 defined as a fight on the battlefield and in the legislative halls. But can we be assured that national socialism and communism abroad while permitting the 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 encroachment of 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 skies 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 schoolgirls and boys 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 parade passes, the marshals strike 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 the condition of the people, the state of property, the civil or religious establishments which did not fit in the country. The property was in full operation, and they were conceived in the very spirit of liberty. 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 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.

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 only wooden shoe factory in the United States is located at Holland, Mich., which is also famous as a center of furnace production. Graying 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 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 Alleghanies. It was set up in 1849.

This enumeration is far from complete but it gives you a number of reasons why we in Michigan take 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 of life for our people so that our State may go forward with the Nation.

Following is the concurrent resolution of the Michigan Legislature proclaiming Michigan Week:

CLAIMS AGAINST STATE OF MICHIGAN RECLAIMING MICHIGAN WEEK

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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; 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 many 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, woodworking machinery, paper coating and glazing, sporting and athletic goods, cereal preparation; and

WHEREAS many of Michigan's cities are nationally and internationally known because of the products they make: Detroit—vessels, Flint—chemicals; Grand Rapids— lumber; Battle Creek—cereals; Holland— furnaces; Grand Rapids—furniture; Kalamazoo—paper products and drugs; Midland and Wyandotte—chemicals; and

WHEREAS Michigan
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, and their advantages and opportunities in industry, national 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, in order 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. This attitude reminds me of some folks we know who refuse to consider the purchase of fire insurance. They feel that if they buy life insurance, this will in some way cause their death—that the mere thought of death will 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 and Youngstown now propose to get around this rule—by the Boy Scout slogan "Be prepared" and without any reason to believe that there is an increased feeling of unity among its people.

New Merger Efforts Made by Bethlehem and Youngstown; Action by Brownell Urged

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 Anti-merger 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 act help it along? 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.
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. More and more, American business is feeling the impact of several years of concern over the attitude of the American businessman toward that essential part of the bedrock of freedom, which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by man.

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 convince myself that the careless acceptance of this system as something that will go on and on, without due diligence, 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 freedoms 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. For, in the long run, 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 overtake 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 troubled? I think you can see the point of berating you concerning your attitude toward the system which has produced this situation?

If the 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 Government domination and control, even if the laws become confusing and their effects sharp, are the ones that expressed this confusion and concern so well that I want to read now what he said. Mind you, this was never intended that government should inject itself into the daily lives of business and professional men, know that we have, the greatest personal freedoms in the world. As businessmen, speaking as the American businessman toward that essential part of the bedrock of freedom, which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by man.

That, remember, was an individual American businessman, who came to the Senate 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 inject itself into the daily lives of its business and professional people that such confusion and question would arise. This is not the situation? Yet, it has, and this example is only one of hundreds of cases that have brought you to the point of berating you concerning your attitude toward the system which has produced this situation?

If the 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 Government domination and control, even if the laws become confusing and their effects sharp, are the ones that expressed this confusion and concern so well that I want to read now what he said. Mind you, this was never intended that government should inject itself into the daily lives of business and professional men, know that we have, the greatest personal freedoms in the world. As businessmen, speaking as the American businessman toward that essential part of the bedrock of freedom, which has provided our citizens with the highest standards of living ever known by man.
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them, at a greatly reduced proportion, money which it took from them in the first place. They have not, and with some money goes the inevitable regulation and control by the Government.

Now, ignoring their political manifestos, directed toward the social or the international scenes, I want to call your attention to a phase of their philosophy which applies directly to your business—to our economic system. One of the leaders of the movement is Mr. Reuther, the President of the A.D.A. 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 that our country, if it is to remain 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 statement, 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 subsidies and financing and, specifically, control by the Government...This is far better than a social system which is too well organized to be called merely an economic system who would wreck our good ship on the rocks of their philosophy."
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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—or 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 in agricultural knowledge, began discussions, exhibits, and fairs. They were more or less independent 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 200 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, 1855, at Fairfield, Iowa, and held its first annual State fair at that place in October 1854. The State fair was permanently located at Des Moines in 1878. 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, except their practical value. * * * brought a considerable and growing body of the most intelligent and progressive farmers into active relations with the educators with the encouragement 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 Agricultural College and 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.

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 growth of the Extension Service were the State colleges and the associated experiment stations. Early education was not always without its agricultural aspects, even a strong agricultural college, witness the Grasbrook College. 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 the Pennsylvania Agricultural 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 were credited to Elkanah Watson as early as 1819.

It is not the purpose of this paper to cover the history of the developments which preceded—the Iowa State Agricultural College, 1858; the University of California, 1863; Cornell University, 1865; or that of the committee in 1862 which made such recommendations when the Morrill Land Grant Act of July 2, 1862. That is in itself of interest and interesting. What we are interested in here is that these colleges strongly nurtured the experimental farm and were the staff of such colleges with their associated experiment stations, together with a portion of the brain trust who were in due course to carry education by extension to the dirt farmer.

The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations was originally organized in 1895. 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 sought 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 1903 and by creating a separate extension division in 1908. By 1907 State agricultural colleges in 35 States were carrying on some form of agricultural extension work.

The Smith-Lever Extension Act of May 8, 1914, which we will not discuss here, paved the way for the 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, and to extend the scope of extension work. The discussion was that of the committee on extension work of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations which made such recommendations when the Smith-Lever Act itself came into effect in 1918. 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.

State agencies, state and federal, and delay followed before the Smith-Lever Act itself came into existence.

III. THE COUNTY AGENCY 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 1903 expressed the hope that the Mount Hermon School near Natick, 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 1000 acres, a dairy of 200 cows, fruit orchards and a cannery for putting up vegetables.

It remained for a transplanted upstate New Yorker to inaugurate what came to be known as the 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...
one per township in southwestern Louisiana to show not only that the area it could be done. All of this could be feasible. The State established districts with local agents in charge, the district agents being lieutenants for the farmers themselves, Dr. Knapp established 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 conducting the varied lines of plant work in such a way that they could be brought directly home to the practical farmer and be practically successful with the control methods about 1901 but clearly underway in 1903, the Cotton Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

Similarly, the work of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the Gulf States to show that diversified agriculture could be done on a part or the whole of their land under directions sent out by the department. Such farming is to demonstrate 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 which was worked out in cooperation, but later was applied to a farm wholly worked according to the department's instructions.

Secretary of Agriculture Wilson in his 1904 report called attention to this cooperation with farmers:

With a view to bringing directly home to farmers of Texas and Louisiana, especially those in the boll-jeveel districts, the advantages of better methods of cultivation, 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 aided financially in the midst of crop failures, large plantings were made under the direct supervision of the Department. Tracts of 5, 15, and 50 acres were given to individual farmers, under working plans furnished by the Bureau, the object being in all cases to demonstrate the growing of cotton despite the presence of the weevil.

The cooperation with farmers has now reached the point where the same system of farming has been successfully put into effect in the pine woods region upon which a single crop is being grown.

"Farmers' unions" have been organized in prominent positions in connection with demonstration and extension work at prominent points in Texas. The cooperative extension work of the Department is to be the basis for the establishment of diversification farms at various places. The object of these farms was to show the value and importance of diversified farming, and in this manner to supplement the building up of the fertility of the soil and to their handling the same. As a specific example of this work there is now being attempted 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 to be demonstrated that would lead to the building up of the fertility of the soil and give broader opportunities to those handling the same.
such diversification and its bearing on the welfare of the different communities.13

The county agent in any form approximating the present was long missing from the scene of rural life. The future plan and function in the education of farmers was slowly but certainly evolving.

Burritt14 states that the first county agent in the South was W. C. Stallings in Smith County, Tex. True dates this as of November 12, 1866, 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.15 Burritt further states:

It was in Broome County, at Binghamton, N. Y., on March 1, 1871, that the first county agent in the northern and western States was permanently established; and this was by the chamber of commerce.16

The man was John H. Barron.

IV. THE FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND SIMILAR INSTITUTIONS

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 county agents 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. With the idea of being able to have meetings rather similar to teachers' institutes, but upon agricultural subjects, the purpose of such early group meetings appears to have included at least the following:

First. To discuss agricultural matters among themselves.

Second. Establish a series of lectures on agricultural, 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 for the future. How those ideas were to develop was to be seen later. Consider the suggestions of George Boutwell in 1857 that six districts, to visit farmers, institute experiments, advise farmers, give lectures, and hold institute meetings. Some farm papers drew special attention to information regarding these meetings, 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 agriculture but more than that and its relations to the sciences, delivered by college teachers or persons having special knowledge on the subject. In 1852 the Michigan Legislature passed an act which contained a provision that "the professors or other instructors of the agricultural colleges should deliver lectures to farmers away from the college."

About 1870 meetings called farmers' institutes began to be held in New York and Kansas, and these were gradually developed into a regular system of meetings under public control, organized and managed by the agricultural colleges, with the departments of agriculture, and supported by public funds. Whatever authority controlled the institution, whether 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 close of the lyceum movement, partly as a result of the Civil War, there began in 1874 the more systematic Chautauqua movement, an extensive concern connected with educational institutions but consisted largely of literary and scientific entertainment, and professional education given by agents summer schools and correspondence courses managed by university professors.

In 1886 the extension work was expanded in the State of New York to include (1) itinerant or local experiments as a means of reaching schools, with the idea of having these conducted in the lyceum interests of the students, (2) itinerant horticultural schools, (3) elementary instruction in nature study in rural schools, (4) county agents give instruction by means of correspondence and teaching 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 $35,000, to be spent under the supervision of the director of the New York College of Agriculture.

That year, besides the horticultural investigation college, 200 local experiments with various crops were conducted, 10,000 teachers were reached through visits to schools, and 1,000 farmers' institutes (not including expenses incurred by local authorities) amounted to about $196,000 per annum, and that about 700,000 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 5,521, 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 of those actually engaged in agricultural pursuits (about 10 million). The publications of the experimental stations, which are addressed to farmers, are illustrative of the interest in agriculture among those who are engaged in farming.

I recommend that an appropriation of $8,000 be made by Congress to enable the Office of Experiment Stations to aid the farmers' institutes during the fiscal year 1903.17

Early in 1903 occurred an event which has been called the beginning of the farmers' institute movement. This 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


13 True, The County Agent and the Farm Bureau, op. cit., p. 154.


16 Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1902, USDA Report No. 73, op. cit., pp. 73-79.
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 combine to illustrate by the extension career of Perry G. Holden, whom "Uncle Henry" Wallace attested was "one of the most remarkable men in Iowa," the State College had no adequate appropriation for a professor of agronomy, Wallace's General Farm was built on Holden's salary for the first 2 years. At the end of that time Holden had 5 counties cooperating in the growth of corn, oats, and alfalfa and in the eradication of quack grass, and he had launched his famous "seed corn Gospel Trains." By 1905 his demonstrations, made on the farms of county post offices, were put on in 10 counties; and his corn-gospel trains touched every county in Iowa.14

But to return to 1903 and the origin of county farm demonstration work in our 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 (proposed measures have since been adopted by 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 experiment 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 experiments will be of service to the farmers of Sioux County: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor such an experimental farm and that a portion of the poor farm or a portion of it can be secured for the purpose.

2. That the money necessary for carrying on the experiment be secured.

3. That the experiments for the first year be limited to the growing of grains, 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 for its 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 $250 to be used for an experimental station at the County Poor Farm. The committee appointed to superintend the work was composed of J. C. Hays, H. H. McKee, county farm superintendent, John Boeyink, auditor; William Dealy, county engineer; and C. W. Morgan in his history of the Extension Service of Iowa State College, discussing the official creation of the extension service, the 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 1905, 10 counties cooperated. The projects were with oats, alfalfa, corn, and quack-grass eradication. This county farm demonstration service was the beginning of county agricultural agent work. 14

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 the early development under Holden, says:

In 1903 Holden started the county farm demonstration work near Orange City in the Sioux County. In 1904, 5 counties cooperated; and in 1905, 10 counties cooperated. The projects were with oats, alfalfa, corn, and quack-grass eradication. This county farm demonstration service was the beginning of county agricultural agent work. 14

But perhaps we should supply the story of that major event as Morgan was able to reconstruct it:

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 the farmers 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 demonstration 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 in the work to attend and listen to an explanation of the work by some member of the extension department.

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

By 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 Morning Tribune for May 11, on the editorial page, in a column headed "Minneapolis Editors Say" which quotes from an article by Mr. W. A. Dill of the Northfield (Minn.) Independent.

Bill Schilling, as he is known to all of us in the Midwest, is one of the pioneers...
in the dairy cooperative movement, and in the development of the splendid proc­
cessing plants these farm cooperatives have.

Bill Schilling was attending meetings throughout all of the Midwest and of­
times speaking to dairy producers’ groups in the Midwest. When I first met him 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, which is one of the largest cooperatives in the Midwest, supplying approximately 90 percent of all the fluid milk consumed in the Twin Cities.

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

THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

(BY HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

That the privately owned American mer­chant fleet is engaged in a fight-to-the-death struggle to break into eastern markets with Minnesota milk.

Even the most cursory consideration of the possible outcome of that struggle immediately brings to mind a number of questions, the answers to which shed a great deal of light upon the matter.

In somewhat logical order, these are some of the 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 we not getting from our United States-flag vessels the prime reason that our merchant fleet is being priced out of business?

If wages are a factor in the difficulties of our shipping, is it the only differential, or are there others of equal or greater importance to explain why United States flag vessels are unable to operate, much less operate profitably?

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 Federal programs available to serve our Nation’s needs?

Will Government be willing continually 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?

Exploring this matter of costs further, it might reasonably be inquired at this point—

Just how was the American merchant fleet in the period since the American 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 waterbornes; * * * 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 operation of the Coast Guard, with the United States Revenue Cutter 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, for the problems are most complicated. The problems are so varied, and their implications run so deep, through the problems of national and international stature, that we can readily rationalize the lack of apprec­i­ation or those problems on the part of the average person.

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 be cleared from 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 15- to 12-year period.

At today’s inflated prices, such replacement will cost 6 or possibly even 8 billion dollars, of which the Federal Government, under the provisions of the 1936 act, will normally be responsible for 2 or 4 billions.

A considerable sum of money is left for the Government to pay. However, it is no more than Government spent to build a fleet of merchant 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 sea services after World War I. And that was like an oppressive storm cloud even today.

There, as briefly as I could summarize, are the larger 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 answer is in part, at least, because of higher wages and greater benefits to our seamen, and because of higher costs of supplies of all kinds and types used in shipbuilding and shipping.

In the case of American tankers, particular­ly, the answer is that American wages and overtime rates on United States flag vessels are 5 times the cost on a British ship with a crew of 55 men; and it was almost 3 times the cost on a French vessel, with a crew of 47.

At today’s inflated prices, such replacement will cost 6 or possibly even 8 billion dollars, of which the Federal Government, under the provisions of the 1936 act, will normally be responsible for 2 or 4 billions.

A considerable sum of money is left for the Government to pay. However, it is no more than Government spent to build a fleet of merchant 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 sea services after World War I. And that was like an oppressive storm cloud even today.

There, as briefly as I could summarize, are the larger 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 answer is in part, at least, because of higher wages and greater benefits to our seamen, and because of higher costs of supplies of all kinds and types used in shipbuilding and shipping.

In the case of American tankers, particular­ly, the answer is that American wages and overtime rates on United States flag vessels are 5 times the cost on a British ship with a crew of 55 men; and it was almost 3 times the cost 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, hit 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-roll­off type of vessel, capable of transporting loaded tractor trucks and freight cars. The development of refrigeration, and the greater security of such ships, help to accelerate turnover and reduce port charges. But, of course, the problems of varying 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 the shipping 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 toward improvement—knowing the nature and extent of the problem.

Coming to Government aids and attitudes toward shipping, I would express several general and specific observations. First, I am convinced that Government’s participation in war, whether directly or indirectly, to a large and wide extent, would definitively clear the atmosphere. These are, first, that the major effort toward the support of shipping, who do so reluctantly, are simply not conversant with the true facts in the matter.

Second, many of these persons, while champions of shipping or any other phase of our economy that is useful in war or emergency, are often not fully aware that the shipping industry itself, particularly, they will applaud the champions of shipping or any other phase of the shipping industry by completely sidestepping the normal supply and demand, and interest, in the matter.

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 war, we are forced to build faster and build, regardless of cost. Now, with all these ships on hand, many of them anything but manufactured or designed for fighting, we ship carry on a gradual modernization of the merchant fleet, and the other maritime nations have not only paid huge dollars to ship these vessels, but, in the building of them, are slow of cost, 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 dollars were expended in building our national defense, this Government should reverence its fiscal accounting so that it could be determined precisely the extent of Federal subsidies to shipping lines since the war.

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 these funds again. It has trimmed $25 million from the $80 million requested in the supplementary 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 operating differential payments due to shipping lines showing the favorable results from the very initiation of the subsidy operation. Over the 20-year period, such payments have totaled $105 million. The Stato-Surplus, as the Government used 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 of vessels by the Government, and the saving of differential payments. Over the 20-year period, such payments have totaled $105 million. The Stato-Surplus, as the Government used to equalize construction costs here with those abroad.

The current basis.

One significant difference between so-called "subsidies" and subsidies paid directly to agriculture, or, indirectly by tariff, to many industries, 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 the payments for ship mortgages, and interest payments, are now paid by the Government, the U.S. Treasury, as well as the Federal Government, is the Government owned vessels, and corporation income taxes.

The net cost of the subsidies, for wartime costs on such vessels were vastly higher. Even more striking is the fact that the Government made use of these vessels many months earlier in the war than they could have, had they been private vessels.

Always overlooked also is the fact that the owners from whom these ships were taken must replace these vessels at premium costs and with no guarantee of their being so, 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 do not understand the complex procedure. A man who makes watches, perhaps, or bicycles, or any other product, knows what his profit is or what he must pay to his competitors, will think it perfectly reasonable to request imposition of a tax on such items in order to protect his own company or his industry. Members of Congress oftentimes will join in such efforts, to serve their constituents.

For instance, demand, and secure, partly payments to equalize their net incomes with those of other groups. Operating differential payments to ship operators are in exactly the same vein as farm subsidies, and, for that matter, 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 Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and foreign nations. I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recent figures showing the favorable results in the matter.

I am sure it was news to many, many people that I made public in the Senate recent figures showing the favorable results of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and foreign nations.

I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recent figures showing the favorable results of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and foreign nations.

I am sure it was news to many, many people when I made public in the Senate recent figures showing the favorable results of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The Federal Government has sought to equalize costs of ship construction as between this country and foreign nations.
ment to shipping should continue to increase—so I suppose they will. Everything else has. And the point to bear in mind is that if we take all the alleged subsidies that have been paid to shipping since 1956—say $400 million or more—as well as we were to add an equal sum annually for construction and operation aids each year during the next 10-year ship replacement period, that would not equal the amount we wasted through hasty, inefficient vessel design and construction in peacetime, logistic demands of our privately owned merchant fleet.

Again, I am confident that the benefits to our peace-time economy during this next 10-year period—in jobs for shipyard, steel, and construction 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 peace-time, logistic demands of our militarily 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 private ownership merchant fleet.

And if management and labor in the industry, appreciative of their separate and joint responsibilities, will work hand in hand with our 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 Investigation into Juvenile Delinquency, I am in an advantageous position to view the accomplishments of civic groups 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 1965 issue of Woman’s Home Companion has named Mrs. Nellie Mae 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 stage the move of the Clara County Detention Home from its dungeon-like quarters to a modern structure. Nellie 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. John Corcoran and Mrs. Charles Burr, the Rev. Joyce Farr and the Rev. R. Marvin Stuart, Attorney Norman Stoner, Novel- list Kathleen Norris and Manufacturer John C. Stanford.

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 witnesses and for all the civic groups 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 communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record part of the article published in the Woman’s Home Companion, May 1965, page 229, on the subject of Mrs. Broderson; and--I wish to include the following part of the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"KIDS ARE BETTER THAN PIGS"
(By Albert Q. Maile)

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 coffers of the county as the “cost of doing business” for another “do-gooder.” Today, sadlier men but wiser, they know that—for energy, judgment, and sheer bulldog perseverance—Nellie Broderson can outmatch most men and women half her age.

When she arrived 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 words with facts and figures, the room becomes hushed. Everyone in the region knows that her quiet, measured, persuasive voice echoes the con­ sciences 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 worst of the trouble—providing luxurious county-fair pens for prize hogs. Tens of thousands more, who joined the battle, last fall forced through a $700,000 appropriation to replace the worst jail in California with a modern structure.

By the way, the Brodersons’ almost accomplished plan to install patruel-mutual 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’s clubs have a S task before them. The county officials, she said, are ready 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 it up, we may yet see plans for a new building. And after that, we maintain the pressure, the structure itself may gradually materialize.”

"But that," she continued, "will still be only a first step. We must get an appropriation for a new juvenile detention home. To retain or remodel the obsolete home is unthinkable. But it in a letter to the board of supervisors: as many as 16 boys must share 1 small room, sleeping in tier beds. . . . She said there is a cold there is no possible way in which boys in that 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 30 boisterous boys is a 1-story, 25-foot-by-25-foot yard, with a concrete slab on which they must remain in a small room 14 by 18, which also doubles for a dining room. Boys of this age have a superabundance of energy. Can you imagine the problem of supervising 60 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 countryside, where they will have space to run and play and learn the things that make for reform, instead of hardening any delinquent tendencies.

We women have got to recognize that our responsibility in the battle against the kind of complacency that locks kids up for months in iron-barred prison cells and consigns 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 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 Honor­ able Jack N. Beller, of New York, which appeared on page 639 of the Congressional Record on Tuesday, May 17, 1955.

"The 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 that these territories are noncontiguous. Certainly my record in support of civil rights is clear enough, and I cannot believe that you have not consulted it.

Among the many reasons for my opposition to statehood for these 2 territories at this time is that of their noncontiguity.

By publishing a letter on page 6535 of the New York Times published a letter from the late Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in which he said: "It is my judgment that the states are so vast and the 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 Times: 

"...the admission of outlying territories to statehood would mean a radical change in the status 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 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 factor, the strength has resulted from contiguity. Our highways, railroad systems and inland waterways carry the majority of our commerce. Being noncontiguous even with itself, Hawaii will never have the complete pattern of our economic development, our highways, railroad systems and inland waterways. And Alaska not for many years to come.

As Dr. Buller 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 the possibility of a souped-up Union. Such a Union and contiguous aspect do not exist. To be sure there is the precedent that only incorporated Territories can have the advantages of these means of transportation, and Alaska not for many years to come. If the precedent of contiguity is abandoned, it is not at all certain that future petitions for statehood would be confined to the basic structure of our country.

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 March 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 that are going to affect the world in 1980 may be predictable contrasts with the present rather than the similarities. If we picture ourself in the year 1980, we may possibly have predicted the vast changes that have taken place in the world's political and economic structures; who could have foreseen the fantastic developments in electronics, drugs, antibiotics, or atomic energy?

I have always been skeptical about flat predictions. I think we all prefer 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 steady improvement in living standards. Assuming these basic trends, we should be able to make some estimates a year or two ahead. We can't possibly control all the factors that shape the future, but we can work toward helping the world of 1980 become the kind of world we would like to see it be.

CHECKLIST FOR CONFIDENCE

A goal that may overshadow all others in importance to our Nation is the maintenance of continuing, enthusiastic confidence both for today and for tomorrow. This must be shared by everyone—businessmen, workers, investors, and consumers alike. It must be a confidence that is not only a self-induced one, but it must also be practical and justifiable. With such confidence, our Nation can move to new heights of productivity 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. The confidence that is necessary to prevent inflation must also be practical and justifiable. With such confidence, our Nation can move to new heights of productivity and services, create new and better jobs, and constantly push ahead on a sound basis to an ever finer future.

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, if confidence is to be maintained, is the soundness of the financial policies the current optimism may prove 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 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 return. Under our present system, so that the dollar of 1980 will buy at least as much food and clothing as the dollar will buy today—preferably and probably more. We can share the benefits of increased productivity, and the saver who puts away a dollar for his retirement may have a dollar that will buy more tomorrow than it does today. If we want a dollar that is worth more tomorrow than it is today, we must act to keep the inflationary trends down. We must give every encouragement to financial policies that will help us grow, and to give the leadership that will help us keep the dollar stable. We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not return.

We have some major economic problems ahead of us in the next 25 years. We must attack them as a nation. We must not be discouraged, but we must solve them as a Nation. The inflationary trends have been brought to a virtual halt. We must keep working at it and not let the inflationary trends get started again.

If we can keep the dollar stable, we will have a dollar that is worth more tomorrow than it is today. We must avoid the mistakes of the past. We must not let the inflationary trends get started again. We must keep working at it and not let the inflationary trends get started again. We must give every encouragement to financial policies that will help us grow, and to give the leadership that will help us keep the dollar stable. We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not return.

The inflationary trends have been brought to a virtual halt. We must keep working at it and not let the inflationary trends get started again. We must give every encouragement to financial policies that will help us grow, and to give the leadership that will help us keep the dollar stable. We must make sure that the inflationary trends do not return.
The flow of small savings into an ever broader stream of national and international flow in the past 50 years has been truly remarkable. Ownership by individuals in life-insurance policies has increased from under $2 billion in 1960 to over $10 billion today. Small investors' holdings of United States savings bonds now total nearly $50 billion. Moreover, all financial institutions have doubled even the amount of their own stock in American corporations. Whereas in 1900 individuals had liquid savings amounting to only $2 billion, today such savings total more than $225 billion.

You can see from these few examples what has been happening to the individual and the country in your wonderful economy today.

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 developments that have continued in the next quarter century, and in many quarters centuries beyond that. But the progress won't be continued unless we follow national policies that will enhance healthy advances of the day-to-day process of "betterment from the bottom up." By this I mean not only policies that will encourage investment in business, agriculture, and development of communities, but also policies that will encourage investment in human resources and quality of life. We need a 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.

UNDER NEW MANAGEMENT

To maintain a sound dollar in the years ahead we must continue the sound and flexible tax cuts that have characterized the Eisenhower administration during the past two years. Our methods of strengthening confidence in the dollar have been based on a gradually cutting down the maximum dollar cut with consistent with the requirements of national defense—would do much to encourage individual initiative and economic confidence. The value of the dollar will be maintained in the next quarter century will encourage the investment necessary for the Federal Reserve, and the fullton 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.

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 estimated $11.9 billion below the postwar peak spending of 1951.

We have cooperated with the Federal Reserve Board to assure a smooth meshing of the Government's debt-management and monetary policies. 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 economic development of the next 25 years.

The Eisenhower administration inherited a public debt heavily weighted in short-term obligations (the average maturity of the debt in 1953 was slightly more than one year). The 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, issuing intermediate and long-term securities.

Last February the Treasury offered a 40-year maturity of zero percent inflationary security offered by the Treasury since 1911. The 1956 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 interest of long-term investors. Long-term investment money was available, and the economic situation permitted long-term refinancing without danger of unsettling the economy.

If in the next 25 years we use proper opportunities to lengthen the average maturities of Federal debt, we can do so without disrupting the money markets and the economy. We can hope that 1950 will find us with a Federal debt that is cut by a quarter of a total of $278 billion. Of course, I very optimistically hope also that the total amount of the Federal debt will be somewhat smaller than at present.

A HALLER TAX CUT?

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 decrease national security spending. This would give us a long-sought opportunity to lighten substantially the Federal tax burden by internal revenue cuts, a quarter of the total national income. This objective is continually before us. For a cut in the tax rate of each income dollar is the maximum cut consistent with the requirements of national defense—would do much to encourage individual initiative and economic confidence.

In spite of heavy defense spending, we have already been able to reduce taxes. The 1954 Revenue Act 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 and its 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. It did not remove all hindrances to business incentive. Thus our tax program to date has not only smoothed the 1954 transition from a high to a lower tax rate, but it has helped provide a more favorable climate for economic growth over the long run.

In carrying on, 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. This requires that we work 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 1960 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, is expected to rise at the present rate of increase. The United States population growth will affect our entire economic life; the size of our industries, our homes and stores and may change the whole face of urban and rural America.

A Federal debt policy that will not encourage international trade, the Communist countries will make themselves operating under increasingly severe handicaps.

The present and future of free-world people in this year of 1955 look good. An American generation that allowed our nation to see a present—and a future—finer than our minds of today could even dream.

Reemployment Rights for the Disabled Veteran
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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 Committee which is my very good friend Maj. Gen. Mervin J. Maas, USMCR, retired.

The Committee is a voluntary citizens' committee which seeks to create a public awareness of the contributions which handicapped men and women workers can seek and find gainful employment suited to their skills and abilities. Under the able leadership of Chairman Naas, 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, insasmuch as it relates to the work of a group of which I am a member and which is concerned with the welfare of the handicapped, the Committee on the Rights of the Blind, last year and the community built a home for them. Today Jack Thornton, a hero when he tried to save his foxhole buddies from an exploding hand grenade, is also blind, and the community built a home for him.
is learning a new job at the Wood Con-
version Co. plant in Cloquet, Minn.,
to the work of Mr. Maas' com-
munity group. The man in charge of
management of the Wood Conversion
Co. Jack has memorized the specially
operating a shredder at the plant.
reach him via horn system.
of veterans' benefits and rehabilitation of
the physically handicapped.
was to make the medical profession hundreds
of years to progress from the preglades of Long
Job to a new one. It is a step in the right
direction. To the veteran who is not familiar with
how to get a new job, it is a new task.
It took the medical profession hundreds
of years to progress from the preglades of Long
Job to a new one. It is a step in the right
direction. To the veteran who is not familiar with
how to get a new job, it is a new task.
Congress passed the Selective Training
at the Hotel Des Invalides. For it was not
impossible for these veterans to find a job
and attempted to hurl it back to save
himself and three other soldiers in his foxhole.
Mr. MULTER, the Bureau's regional
representative in the Washington, D. C., office,
became quite familiar with workers' compen-
sation cases, and he was able to assist a
disabled veteran who was rejected by
the employer's cooperation, however, the veteran
is once again employed and with the protec-
tion of full compensation.
health of the public can be safely used. I haven't any doubt that as long as you are the right to perform your duties as required by you of law, you will make sure, within the realm of possibility, and within that degree of certainty that a length of time can have that only safe vaccines will be used, as well as serums and everything else that comes with the patrons of our democratic system, and that the minute you discover something is wrong, either in a plant or a laboratory or in a production room 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 out 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, and it is certain that on the same day, April 12, both the Canadian Government and our Government released this vaccine.

With this difference, however—and I won't pull any punches—I join with every last one of my colleagues who are laying the fault right in the lap of Mrs. Hobby. If she has been preoccupied with other things, at the same time to put into effect government, and I don't mean any of this as being critical of you. I can't too frequently or in too many places how good a job you have done in the years that you have done it. But I think whether political organizations or otherwise. She is your superior, so I don't ask in the present instance, but her due respect for you. I don't mean any

He has been derelict in her duty in not reduced bills, not trying to tell you, 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 of Health, about the vaccine. You indicated to us when Congressman Davison last week read to you a section of the law which you 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 doesn't apply, nobody 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 vaccine, the way we have done and continue to do it, and every 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 be establishing with Government assistance. One intent behind those contracts was to protect the independent segment of industry. 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.

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 for the independent using aluminum and the other primary producers as equals or exceeds those amounts.

This specious rationalization is in direct conflict with what is commonly known to have been theintent and purpose of both the contracts and the cutback.

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
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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 independent producers is for 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 industry. 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 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 for the independent using aluminum and the other primary producers as 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 for the independent using aluminum and the other primary producers as 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 for the independent using aluminum and the other primary producers as 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 for the independent using aluminum and the other primary producers as 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.
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 prevent 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 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 attempt to avoid surplus aluminum stocks 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 believe that 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 contemplate 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 would result in Alabama stockpiling. Thus, even if there were to be no stockpile demands during a particular period, two-thirds of the available quantities could hardly equal the amount formerly sold to the independents. And if the Government took the full amount of stockpiling, the independent 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 nearly 60 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 amount.

Whatever the precise data may be there can be no doubt that Reynolds is not selling to the independents at the 1954 rate plus any cutback, as implied by your statement that the 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 not appropriate in view of the defense cutbacks, which will result to the independent nonintegrated users of aluminum and is a rather shortsighted policy, in which not all of the aluminum intended to be released.

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 this 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.

Mr. DEAN 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, wish to emphasize to you in this matter. These companies should not be permitted to relitigate their uses of surplus in amounts 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 have the right to decide on the basis of 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 cooperation 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 do not abruptly checked in their present actions.

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. Carroll, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:


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 (H.R. 1573) (63-31) (W.P. 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. Johnson of South Carolina and Mr. Collins 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 and for other purposes." 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 except 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 rate of growth, following the previous record rate of $389 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 the entire 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 at the same rate we were doing it with fewer people in many manufacturing processes, which is why we still have such large unemployment.

Under normal circumstances—if the expectation was that we would have a depression in the economy that had continued through 1953 and 1954 instead of being interrupted by the recession we went through—our rate